

Doorkeeper: "All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order, Members, please be in their seats. Be led in prayer by the Rabbi Marks of Springfield, Illinois."

Rabbi Marks: "Lord Our God, we come before You in prayer. Grateful for the blessing You have bestowed upon us. The universe around about us, the recurrent cycle of times and seasons, the miracle of life, all give evidence of Your presence within creation. Your teachings of love and compassion, justice and righteousness enunciated by sages and saints of the past. But speaking also in that still small voice within each of us, guide us on the path of life. May we always be aware of Your presence, never losing our sense of awe and wonder as we receive Your gifts of love may we bestow our compassion and love upon our fellow creatures. How awesome the responsibilities and challenges we confront in a world ever changing, even becoming more complex and intricate. How difficult the decisions that must be made in these chambers affecting the lives and well-being of our fellow citizens. Be with us to guard and guide us, help us to use the gifts of reasons, understanding and speech with which You have endowed us. That all our endeavors might lead us closer to Your Kingdom of justice and peace. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley, will you come up here? Representative Madigan, are you seeking recognition? Roll Call for attendance."

Speaker Bradley: "Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Capparelli, Chairman of the Committee on Executive to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken June 21, 1978, reported the same back with the following recommendations. Be adopted House Resolution 865 and House Resolution 974. Not be adopted House Resolution 913."



Speaker Bradley: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1009, Ralph Dunn. 1010, Wikoff. 1011, Yourell. 1012, Peggy Smith Martin. 1013, Dawson. 1014, Stanley. 1015, Dawson. 1016, Holewinski. 1017, Waddell."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, R. Dunn, House Resolution 1009. Notes Paul Hibbs and associate professor of speech of Southern Illinois University. 1010 by Wikoff, talks about the Lanphier Baseball team. 1011 by Yourell, mentions the twenty-one years services by Mrs. Grell. Peggy Smith Martin's Resolution 1012, talks about Jamaica. Dawson, 1013, congratulates Walter Wiese. Stanley, 1014 recognizes the 'Dear Illinois Neighbor' program. Dawson, 1015, honors Reverend Walter. Holewinski, 1016, designates the birth of a new baby girl. And 1017 by Waddell talks about the institution of marriage. And I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Is Pierce going to be a Judge? The 'ayes' have it and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1008, Harris, et al."

Speaker Bradley: "Committee on Assignments. Representative Ryan. House Bill, Second Reading. Representative McBroom is within earshot of the Chair, would he please come to the floor of the House so we can commence with House Bill 3276, the DOT. What purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman arise?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, could you advise us which will be the next Amendment on this Bill?" What, Jack? 59? What's your total number of Amendments?"

Speaker Bradley: "Second Reading, House Bill 3276. We are on Amendment #59, correct? Read the Amendment."



Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #59, Skinner. Amends House Bill 3276 as amended by deleting Section 24 and inserting in lieu thereof, the following...Section 24."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, Amendment #59 line items the capital projects for public transportation. I do not believe the department or anyone else objects to it, I ask its adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion?"

Skinner: "The amounts are the same."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion... all in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #60, Skinner. Amends House Bill 3276 as amended by deleting Section 24."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "We're about to start on a couple of the RTA Amendments that I've introduced. This one has particular relevance to anyone who is searching for highway money in their district and has not been able to find it...."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Am I about to be interrupted again by the Majority Leader?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, what is the status of the motion to reconsider the Reilly Amendment?"

Skinner: "That is clearly out of order at this point."

Madigan: "A parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Bradley: "Nobody has made that motion as yet this morning, Mr. Madigan. I made that motion last night and if I was in my seat, I would proceed with that motion. And if.... For what purpose does the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Robinson, arise?"

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, it's clear that many, many Amendments are



being filed on the DOT appropriation. We're already up to 78 Amendments, there are more that are going to be filed. I think that because of the timing we have undone what I had hoped Representative Reilly's Amendment yesterday would do. So, therefore, so that the House can move along, I move to....having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #57 was adopted."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to reconsider...and the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, on the Gentleman's motion to reconsider the vote."

Schlickman: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point."

Schlickman: "That motion is neither on the Calendar or in writing."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I know that....probably that Representative Schlickman, is very correct in his inquiry. However, I'm sure he can appreciate that all it takes is a written motion by Representative Robinson, which he is probably preparing at the present time, and to be recognized by the Chair. And I think that Representative Robinson's concern for the....for us to consider this Bill in due time, because of the introduction of all the Amendments that were in Committee, I think that the motion of Representative Robinson is very timely, I think it will resolve the same thing that will be resolved in the end. And I think it is in the best interest of the House to recognize him for that at the present time and I believe he's prepared now."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schlickman...the...Mr. Robinson has been... has filed the motion. In writing. Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well now that he has complied with that rule of the House, I would further object in that we are at the Order of Second Reading and not at the Order of Motions."

Speaker Bradley: "We are on Amendments, we are on Second Reading"





on Amendments and the motion to table an Amendment or to reconsider would be a proper motion at this time with the Amendments on House Bill 3276. I can't think of...it would not be in order on the Order of Motions, because the Bill would not be on Second Reading so that we could address ourselves to it."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, isn't that a motion? A motion is a motion is a motion. We have...."

Speaker Bradley: "There are proper motions and improper motions."

Schlickman: "We have an order of business and I believe that if you will look at the podium, you'll see on a card typed for your benefit...for other Speaker <sup>5'</sup> benefits an order of business. And one order of business is motions. Separate and distinct from the order of Bills at Second Reading. And I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this being a motion, it is not timely, the consideration of it at this time is not appropriate inasmuch as we are not at the Order of Motions."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schlickman, I think that you're incorrect in what you're saying. Because the motion would not be in order to reconsider an Amendment if we were not at the Amendment stage. And we're on the Amendment stage right now and we'll go with the Gentleman's motion. Mr. Robinson, has moved to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #57 was adopted to House Bill 3276. The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I have some order please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Certainly. We'll do our best."

Reilly: "If the House will indulge me for just a few minutes, I think I can save a great deal of time. Reluctantly, I have to agree with Representative Robinson. I thank those of you who supported me in my Amendment. I'm glad that the House has spoken on this issue and made it clear, the nonsense that is involved in the appropriation process to the extent that we load up a Bill in this way. But at the



same time on the very next Amendment, offered by my good friend, Representative Campbell they have reversed itself in a sense and put that Amendment on. And it seems clear to me as...even a freshmen observing the House that that is likely to be the procedure on all the other Amendments that are offered. So out of respect for the House, I will not make you sit here for four hours while we put these Amendments back on, one by one. The point has been made, I thank you for the vote but let me explain just briefly the point so that it can be driven home, so that we won't forget it. The point, and a lot of Members have asked me about this overnight, the point is that if we as a Legislature are to set priorities, that means we as a Legislature, taking the DOT Bill as an example, just decide what the total size of the pie is, roughly six hundred and twenty-five million dollars, And we must decide, not the Governor, we must decide what projects, what total of six hundred and twenty-five million dollars in projects goes into that pie. By passing a budget of a million dollars....of a billion dollars, which we ultimately will, which the Governor must use must then cut back to six hundred million dollars. We're in effect giving away our power of the purse and that was the point and I thank you for support on that. If I could speak just briefly also to the Press. We've had a lot of coverage of the Amendment, mostly favorable comments. But the point is, and I'm speaking directly to you now. If you wouldn't run the press releases that we send out when we offer these Amendments, the Amendments would stop. And so...don't just comment favorably on the Amendment, you can stop the process largely yourself. In any event with the Cosponsorship of the Speaker of the House and the Minority Leader and now with the help of the Majority Leadership and Minority Leadership in the Senate there is moving through the General Assembly a Resolution which will create a joint bipartisan



Committee to study the budget process of the General Assembly and report back to the 81st General Assembly on reform, including reforms, I hope in the way that we handled the Department of Transportation budgets. And I hope that those of you who had the courage and good sense to support me in this Amendment will remember the points that we made here at a very timely aspect of our proceeding in the House and will support the reforms that will come out of that Joint Committee, or which I hope will come out of that Joint Committee. I repeat, out of respect for the House and the time of the House and the lateness of the date and the inevitability of putting these Amendments back in, I reluctantly but firmly support Representative Robinson's motion."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Robinson's motion to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #57 was adopted. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion to reconsider signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question I have 110 'ayes', 35 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Mr. Reilly, you can withdraw the Amendment or table the Amendment. What is your pleasure?"

Reilly: "I would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Reilly, let's table the...the Gentleman moves to table Amendment #57. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is tabled. Now, back to Mr. Skinner on Amendment #60."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I'd first like to observe that under prior Speakers at least the deals that have been made... have been made in the back rooms rather than in front of us on the podium. I was just astounded to find myself interrupted by this convergence of powers...."

Speaker Bradley: "One more interruption, Mr. Skinner, if we might."



Skinner: "Why not."

Speaker Bradley: "For the...to save time and paper and printing those Members who have filed additional Amendments. If they were taken care of with the withdrawal or tabling of Amendment #57, would you please come up and withdraw the Amendments so we don't have to have them printed? Now, Mr. Skinner, Amendment #60 and you won't be interrupted again, Sir."

Skinner: "Want to bet. If you...."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "On that...just that previous suggestion that you made to the Members, are you saying then, with the Reilly Amendment now back out of the...being tabled, all those Amendments related to are back in their original position and alive and therefore, all the supplemental Amendments which were to replace those are being withdrawn?"

Speaker Bradley: "It is up to the Sponsor if they want to do it. But let me say, what they are attempting to do with further Amendments have already been done with Amendment in the Committee."

Schneider: "All right."

Speaker Bradley: "If the Sponsors don't come up, we'll have to call them. Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, if you will look in front of you, you will see the Amendment which now line item the Department of Transportation...public transportation capital expenditures for next year. You can look at either Amendment #59, 60, 61 or 62, they are all more or less the same with the addition or subtraction of a couple of million dollars. If one analyzes the Department of Public Transportation's expenditures for the purchase of buses or the building of railroads or stuff like that...you will find that 68% of the total program goes to the City of Chicago. Well, we all know the City of Chicago does not have 68% of the population. It has barely 1/3 of the population in the State of Illinois."



One finds that 95% of the money goes to the six-county area in Chicago, the RTA area and the entire rest of the state gets 5%. I don't know about you downstate Members, I'm half a downstate Member representing part of my district going all the way over to Rockford, but 5% for the rest of the state for approximately 1/3 of the population of the state doesn't strike me as fair. Now we have just adopted Amendments that adds three hundred million dollars to the Department of Transportation Budget. It wasn't in the public transportation area but this Amendment #60, which is now being considered, contains sufficient money to pay for all of those highway projects. Now that may sound like a sleight of hand because in reality Amendment 60 only takes out 9.7 million dollars. But these 9.7 million dollars are...represent front money for two extremely major and costly projects - the Franklin Street Subway and the O'Hare Extension. The three hundred million dollars to build highways in the State of Illinois can come from the money now allocated to the Franklin Street Subway. All of us will remember that the crosstown deal that was worked out last year had three basic elements. There was 1.5 billion dollars available from the Federal Government to build the crosstown expressway. By de-designating the northern leg of the crosstown expressway one-half billion dollars was freed up for use for other transportation related projects in the six-county area. Actually within an urbanized area within five counties... or parts of five counties. One billion was going to go for the crosstown, all right that billion...that billion is there and earmarked. Of the other five hundred million dollars, three hundred was earmarked for the Franklin Street Subway construction. The rest of it, two hundred million dollars went for highway projects in the urbanized area of Chicago and then the administration argued, and I think accurately, that money that had been previously



earmarked for urbanized area highway improvement could be used in downstate Illinois. It wasn't much but it was better than what we had before. Well sitting in the Franklin Street Subway is a pot of gold. It's three hundred million dollars that can be used for highway improvements with in, now it turns out, the entire six-county area. Well, if we've got three hundred million dollars to spend on improving intersections and building extra lanes to highways that are needed and bridge improvements and overpasses over railroads in the six-county area, that means that projects that would otherwise take state highway money can be spent in downstate Illinois. Three hundred million dollars. Now of course it will take the agreement of the Governor and the Mayor of the City of Chicago and I will leave it to you to apply the pressure where it is necessary now that you know where the money is. All right, that's where the money comes from to pay for all the highway projects which some people on this floor have characterized as boondoggles or pork barrel projects. All are certainly more needed than the Franklin Street Subway which will provide virtually no new public transportation opportunities and I believe is being backed and pushed primarily to raise property values on the Franklin Street....along the Franklin Street corridor. Now for those in the suburbs who are interested in increased public transportation opportunities, I would point out that the O'Hare extension is extremely important. This will cost one hundred and seventy-five million dollars to build. It will again provide virtually no new transportation opportunities because there now is express service from the Jefferson Street Station to O'Hare Airport. Alternatives that could be put into operation probably in less than a year and costs less than twenty million dollars, have not been given adequate consideration. May I cite the most tempting of the alternatives. The Milwaukee Road has



a west line running to Elgin, which passes within one mile of the O'Hare Airport terminal. The primary purpose of the O'Hare extension is to bring workers to the O'Hare office and business complex surrounding the airport. It is not to bring passengers, in fact, according to Joby Berman who is has been the mass transportation expert for the last three Governor's which must mean she has something going for her...and I think she has a great deal going for her. The cars which the CTA intends to spend in six hundred thousand dollars apiece for, to run along this line to O'Hare Airport are not even going to contain facilities for luggage. That means that the primary purpose of the extension to O'Hare is obviously not to take airline passengers from hotels to the Airport. Incidentally, if that were the primary purpose...one should consider that 95% of the hotel rooms where people use airlines are on North Michigan Avenue, not down in the Loop anymore. All right, so you've got a hundred and seventy-five million dollars that is going to be earmarked to public transportation in the suburbs on the O'Hare Airlines. If we spend it there we don't have the money to spend to improve public transportation facilities elsewhere in the suburban Cook County and the collar counties. So suburban Chicago Land Legislators have a real stake in the O'Hare extension. It is going to delay without a doubt the improvement of public transportation opportunities elsewhere in the six-county RTA region. Now there are a couple of other things about the O'Hare extension which are interesting to say the least. Besides being the most expensive alternative that has been reasonably considered for transporting passengers and workers to the O'Hare Airport area, this line is not going to pay its own way, it is going to bring a 7.1...almost 7.151 million dollar annual operating deficit. That means the CTA's incredible deficit will go up even more, about



up 5%. Now in addition, because of the sweetheart deals that were signed with the railroads...by RTA, the so-called purchase of service contracts, both the Milwaukee Road and the Chicago Northwestern Railroad are guaranteed to be reimbursed for any loss of passengers that result from building the O'Hare extension. This is estimated to cost an extra eight million dollars. Once the line gets into operation. Now for those of you who drive on the Kennedy Expressway...every once in a while. I wonder how you're going to treat the approximately two years in which there is going to be disruption of traffic. During which the closing of the inside lane and shoulder will be required during off peak hours, not to mention the dust and dirt. It seems to me that there are adequate reasons to...for the Illinois Legislature to thwart both projects. Either from the viewpoint of building additional highways statewide or from the viewpoint of improving public transportation opportunities in that part of the six-county RTA region where there are now inadequate public transportation opportunities. And it is for that reason that I offer Amendment #60, which eliminates the seed money for both projects. Amendments to follow will focus in separately on the two projects in case you don't want to eliminate both of them at one whack."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, on the Amendment."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment. As usual, his Amendment like almost all of his Amendments are rather shortsighted without giving true reflection to the needs of the entire State of Illinois and the metropolitan region of northeastern Illinois. What the Gentleman attempts to do is to eliminate the funding for two projects which will benefit the citizens of the City of Chicago and also the citizens of the entire six-





County region in northeastern Illinois. Certain people such as the Sponsor of the Amendment might feel that there is no need for a good and adequate subway transportation system in the City of Chicago. I disagree with him. Because more than 50% of the users of the El System and Subway Systems in the City of Chicago reside outside of the City of Chicago, they commute to and from Chicago to their place of work and home again to their homes in the suburbs. Secondly, regarding the extension to the O'Hare Airport, clearly the users of O'Hare Airport do not come exclusively from the City of Chicago. And I suggest to you that a overwhelming percentage of the people who use O'Hare Airport do not live in the city but on the contrary, live outside the City of Chicago. This Amendment is shortsighted and ought to be defeated."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, on the Amendment."

Schlickman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "What is the estimated total cost for the Franklin Street Subway Program?"

Skinner: "Well, the public...the cost that is being, that's run around in public is three hundred million dollars but virtually no one believes that will be the final cost. Probably closer to a half billion."

Schlickman: "Now of that conservative estimate of three hundred million, what percentage is federal funds, and what is the percentage of state funds and what percentage local funds?"

Skinner: "The bulk of both the Franklin street Subway and the O'Hare Extension are federal funds. 80% is federal, the rest is state and local. Most of the state and local is state. There is very little that is local."

Schlickman: "What estimate would you make of the 20% being the state responsibility and local?"

Skinner: "Well, with the O'Hare Extension, I'm fairly sure it is



all 20%."

Schlickman: "I didn't ask about O'Hare, I asked about Franklin Street."

Skinner: "With the Franklin Street, there is some local and I'm sure that a Member of the other side would have an exact figure, I do not. I'm sorry."

Schlickman: "Could you tell me how the local money will be raised?"

Skinner: "There is a...very logically as a matter of fact. There is a property tax on the central business district which will fund the local share. And indeed that probably is the way we should be financing most of RTA, through a property tax on downtown Chicago...since that is the area that is primarily served by RTA."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I reluctantly arise to oppose Representative Skinner. I know him and you know him, Mr. Speaker, as one of the more conscientious Members of this House. The Department vigorously opposes this Amendment and I urge its defeat."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Skinner to close."

Skinner: "Well, I think everybody knows what's at stake here. You can either have your local highway project or you can have the Franklin Street Subway. You can either have a fixed rail line down to the southwestern side, the very poorly served by mass transportation southwestern side of Chicago. Or you can have the O'Hare Extension, take your pick. Do you want to improve public transportation opportunities at minimum additional cost or you want to just throw money in a hole and close the Kennedy? I think the answer is obvious and I think that answer should be a 'yes' vote on Amendment #60."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion to adopt the Amendment will signify by saying 'aye', all



will indicate by....the Gentleman wishes to have a Roll Call. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 57 'ayes', 85 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #61, Skinner. Amends House Bill 3276 as amended by deleting Section 24 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Amendment #61 only eliminates the money for the Chicago...the extension of the Chicago Transit Authority Line to O'Hare Airport. As I stated, this will cost a hundred and seventy-five million dollars of state and federal money. An alternative would cost approximately twenty million dollars, would provide virtually the same benefits for the primary users who are those people who work around O'Hare Airport in the office and factory complexes. This takes the seed money out and will allow the purchase of more suburban buses, more suburban trains and even perhaps the development of a trolley system along existing railroad right of ways in the suburbs. It is a very clear choice for those of us in the six-county area, if you really believe that the Chairman of the RTA Board, Milton Pikarsky, may eventually be right in his prediction of four years ago, that within six months the price of gasoline would be one dollar per gallon. And because of that high price of gasoline people will be seeking alternative modes of transportation in the suburbs. Then passage of this Amendment and stopping of this project is essential. The money will just not be available from the Federal Government to provide public....the increasing of public transportation opportunities throughout the rest of the RTA region if this project goes forward. For that reason, I ask for its scuttling and a 'yes' vote on Amendment #61."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, again I rise in opposition to this Amendment for the reasons I enunciated on the previous Amendment. I don't feel that there is any need to go into the details again. The Gentleman is simply attempting to remove money which has been earmarked for the construction of the extension of the El out to the O'Hare Airport, a transportation system that will be used by all residents of the six-county region of northeastern Illinois. I recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Again for the same reasons that I reiterated a minute ago, the Department very vigorously opposes this Amendment. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Do you want to close, Mr. Skinner?"

Skinner: "As usual, the Majority Leader overstates his case. This quite obviously cannot be used by all the people in the six-county area. In fact, it will only be used by only thirty-six thousand, five hundred people at the most optimistic estimate on a daily basis. It will bring an annual deficit that will be funded primarily by this General Assembly of 7.151 million dollars. That deficit has increased from the original deficit estimated four years ago by about a factor of four. It is four times as large deficit as was estimated four years ago in the Voor Hee's Report. Which is sort of one of those...it is a consultants' report that was let by the City of Chicago in which you tell the consultant what conclusions you want and he brings it in and charges you for it. The O'Hare Extension will cause incredible disruption of traffic in the northwestern side, it will not provide public transportation opportunities to anyone except those living in the City of Chicago...because it doesn't run



anywhere but in the City of Chicago. If one wishes to get to O'Hare Airport from any of the suburbs, one will have to go virtually to downtown Chicago in order to take this line out to O'Hare Airport. <sup>Where</sup> ~~Were~~ as if the railroads were used one could, at least get from the outer edges of the suburbs to O'Hare Airport, at least some of the outer suburbs. The choice is very clear, do you want improved public transportation opportunities, more buses running in your area, more train...more modern train cars in your area? Do you wish to use the existing right of way to develop a trolley system in the suburbs such as existed fifty years ago or do you want to see the CTA be able to expand its empire to O'Hare Airport and I would not be surprised to see it extended even further as soon as they get to O'Hare Airport. This is just the wrong project in the wrong place, to solve a problem that doesn't exist where alternatives are cheaper for the very small problem that does exist. I ask an affirmative Roll Call on this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 60 'ayes', 93 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #62, Skinner. Amends House Bill 3276 as amended....."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, I can see by this last Roll Call that it is quite obvious we're going to need a new General Assembly before we have a reallocation of income within the Department of Transportation Budget. Nevertheless, as everyone knows, I don't give up easily. Amendment #62 would eliminate the front money for the Franklin Street Subway whose main beneficiaries will be the owners of the



Merchandise Mart, you know, the Kennedy Family. One can't help but wonder whether that is not the primary purpose of the Franklin Street Subway, to allow people to get from the Loop to Wolf Point and the Merchandise Mart easier than they can right now. Subways are incredibly expensable....expensive facilities to build. As anyone can see from the rather good series of articles written by David Young, on subways being considered and having been built in other cities of the United States and the world. I'm not sure that the people in the United States can afford a Franklin Street Subway, I know the people of the State of Illinois can't afford it and I know if given a choice between improving the intersections, the grades....improving the railroad grade crossings, creating overpasses over the many railroads through Chicago, building an extra bridge over a tollway here in order to facilitate traffic in the suburbs or even building a new four lane highway into Lake County, if the Lake County people really want one. If a choice were made between that and duplicating the present elevated system in Chicago, the people in the six county area would undoubtedly opt for the highway improvements. Those of you who are downstate, that are always crying about not having enough money for highways, I would hope...would not vote for against this Amendment. Because if you do you're really saying, you're not serious and you're not putting your vote where the money is when you plead for more highway money. And all of the Amendments that have been adopted previous to this Amendment, for all the local projects will be vetoed off by the Governor using the excuse that the money is not there. That excuse cannot be used if this Amendment is adopted because all the Governor has to do is convince the Mayor of Chicago to maybe trade off-track betting for three hundred million dollars worth of highway projects, which I think I would be willing to do, and the money is there. This is the



first step in digging a hole which will cost fifteen thousand dollars a foot to build. That is an awful lot of money at today's cost. The issue is clear and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment. This is similar to an Amendment that he offered very recently, two Amendments back. Again it is shortsighted, it seeks to deprive all of the residents of the six-county region in northeastern Illinois of their ability to use the subway systems in Chicago to travel to and from work and then again home to their suburban homes. I would recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, again I have to concur with Representative Madigan. The Department and I also urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to remind the Sponsor of this Amendment that Chicago by its geographical position is not only the crossroads of the six-county area but it is also the crossroads of the nation. The emphasis made by the Majority Leader, in my opinion, was well put that we serve not only the residents of Chicago itself, but the people in the six-county areas and the nation. And this request that we make here is one dictated by the reality of those facts that Chicago as a thriving metropolis...must be able to grow. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I arise in support of this Amendment. The Franklin Street Subway Program is strictly a local project. And a project that will be of primary benefit to the property owners within the City of Chicago and the businesses within the City of



Chicago. They will benefit by an increase in their property value, they will benefit by an increase in sales. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, like all local projects it should be funded at the local level. Now if the Federal Government wants to make a mistake and to participate in the funding of a local project, subeit.

We have no power to control that matter. But I don't think, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we in the General Assembly should compound a federal error by funding a local project. And I urge an 'aye' vote on Amendment 62, to this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment... Skinner, do you wish to close?"

Skinner: "Certainly. I would ask for a 'yes' vote on this extremely important Amendment. I am of the opinion, which I think is based on very many circumstantial bits of evidence, that the primary purpose of the Franklin Street Subway is to increase the property values of those living along the Franklin Street corridor. Now why would I suggest such a...audacious connection between property interests in Chicago and a public transportation improvement? Perhaps the reason goes back to the RTA Citizens' Committee for better transportation which had a four hundred and fifty thousand dollar campaign chest to pass the RTA referendum. We identified and tracted the land ownership of the contributors to the RTA Citizens' Committee for better transportation and found that seventy-five....approximately seventy-five percent of the money of the four hundred and fifty thousand dollars...that is, came from property owners in the central business district of Chicago. There is a very clear real estate connection in Chicago between public transportation and the politicians in Chicago and property owners in Chicago. This is not going to benefit the entire Chicago community, it would probably not benefit Chicago as much as a subway or an elevated line





between the Loop and southwest Chicago, around the Marquette Park area, which is very poorly served by public transportation in Chicago. One Representative has pointed out that Chicago is the crossroads of the Chicago Metropolitan area, well that is not by choice. It is by geographic necessity and when you think of the word, crossroad, you usually can go in both directions. You can go in four directions from the cross. In Chicago one can only go in three directions, if you go in the fourth direction you end up in the lake. So it would seem to me...this concentration of public transportation opportunities...very expensive opportunities in the Loop and in the near Loop area, is putting the money in the wrong place in the Chicago Metropolitan area. Three hundred million dollars would probably build the railroad line that Chairman Pikarsky recently mentioned would go for my hometown of Crystal Lake, to Hammond, Indiana, of all places. No one has ever suggested why anybody from Crystal Lake would want to go to Hammond, but nevertheless, that is the suggestion that he has made. Certainly as many people would want to go to Hammond on such a railroad from my district as will ever use the Franklin Street Subway... from my district. But that is not the best argument, the best argument is that the money that has been taken from the Crosstown pie and put in and designated for construction of the Franklin Street Subway, three hundred million dollars of federal money...may be spent on highway improvements anywhere within the six-county area and the money that would have been otherwise spent on those highway improvements may be spent in Quincy, building a bypass. Or in East Moline, building a bypass or in St. Louis...East St. Louis building a bypass and nobody will have to go into East St. Louis. It's highways or it's subways, take your pick. If you want highways, vote 'yes', if you want subways that won't serve your district, vote



'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment.

All in favor signify by....."

Skinner: "If you're afraid to vote, don't vote."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 85, 'ayes'....65 'ayes', 81 'nays'....Mr. Skinner, what purpose do you arise?"

Skinner: "Well, there are too many suburban Democrats that aren't voting. I would like a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees. The Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees. Call the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bowman, Rich Brummer, Caldwell...."

Speaker Bradley: "Caldwell, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Catania..."

Speaker Bradley: "Catania, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Ewell, Getty, Hart, J.M. Houlihan..."

Speaker Bradley: "J.M. Houlihan votes 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jacobs, Katz, Keats...."

Speaker Bradley: "Jacobs, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Katz, Keats, Klosak...."

Speaker Bradley: "J.M. Houlihan has had a change of heart and he wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Record him as voting 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Luft, Madison, Peggy Smith Martin, McGrew, Miller...."

Speaker Bradley: "Peggy Smith Martin wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Miller, Mudd, Mugalian..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mugalian wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pierce...."



Speaker Bradley: "Pierce wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schuneman, C.M. Stiehl, Terzich, Tipword,  
Wikoff, Willer...."

Speaker Bradley: "Willer, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Williams, Winchester....no further."

Speaker Bradley: "65 'ayes', 87 'nays' and the Gentleman's  
motion fails. 67 'ayes'. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #63, Matijeich..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that, that's identical  
to #29 which is now on the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman withdraws it. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #64, Yourell. Amends House  
Bill 3276 as amended by inserting...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the  
House, Amendment #64 appropriates six and a half million  
dollars for the Ridgeland Avenue improvements in the villages  
of Oak Lawn, Chicago Ridge and Worth. The reason for this  
Amendment is that those three communities, jointly, will  
have already committed two hundred and fifty thousand  
dollars of their own revenue funds for the engineering  
and the preliminary plans for the improvement of that  
arterial that runs through the three communities. Now  
the Department of Transportation indicated to those three  
communities that if they would put up the front money,  
then the improvement would become a matter of reality.  
The improvement encompasses an area within the community  
of Chicago Ridge, Oak Lawn and Worth. Ridgeland Avenue  
is classified as primary arterial providing the major  
north-south route for local residents, the majority of  
whom seek employment, recreation and health services  
outside of those communities. Harlem Avenue one mile  
west of Ridgeland Avenue and Cicero Avenue...two miles  
east of Ridgeland, the other two major north-south routes that



are continuous through these same and adjoining communities. However, due to the location of the Tri-state Tollways and Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, access to Harlem Avenue and Cicero Avenue is restricted to a few residential roadways. The development would allow predominantly residential communities...has increased the usage of Ridgeland Avenue and local side streets. Increase in traffic accidents and the severity of traffic congestion indicates the need for the improvement. Ridgeland Avenue is a two-lane undivided roadway through the majority of the project length. The roadway has gravel shoulders leading to open drainage ditches, concrete curb and gutter does exist, however, at several of the intersections. Sidewalks also exist at several occasions, however, they are not continuous along the route. There are no restrictions of access to and from Ridgeland Avenue as driveways, local streets and existing parking facilities provide numerous ports of entry to the roadway. Public transportation facilities on Ridgeland Avenue consist of a bus line operated by the suburban transit system. This route operates on an hourly basis during business hours, Monday through Saturday, with intermittent services on Sunday. School buses also use Ridgeland Avenue. Accident reports were obtained from the police departments of the three communities concerned for the period of January 1, 1973 to December 31, 1975, a total of five hundred and sixty-nine accidents were reported along the project lanes in this period. During that three-year period there was one fatality and seventeen pedestrian injuries. At present there are few marked crossways along the project. Numerous vehicles entering and leaving the roadway along the length of Ridgeland Avenue contribute to the traffic and friction along the highway. Now as I indicated in my opening remarks, these three communities have already expended two hundred and fifty thousand dollars of their own



funds for engineering fees and other work. They did this with the project being approved by the Department of Transportation, now with the conclusion of those funds and the spending of those funds they have been told that no fund for the improvement exist. So I ask for your favorable approval of Amendment #64 to House Bill 3276."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Representative Yourell and I have known each other for a long, long time and it is not a pleasant position to arise in opposition to a good friend. The only thing that I can say, Mr. Speaker, is what I think most of the Members know...at least the ones who are listening, is here we go again. We're over... we're over three hundred million in appropriations to the DOT budget. I don't know if Governor Thompson is supposed to divine the money or go to another state and borrow it or just what he is supposed to do. And I have to vigorously oppose Representative Yourell's motion."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, I wonder if the Speaker could tell us how he voted on the Franklin Street Subway and the O'Hare Extension Amendments?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman wish to yield? The Gentleman does not wish to yield."

Skinner: "Well then, I'll tell everybody. He voted 'no'. Now it appears that the Gentleman does not believe that this project in his district is more important than a project that will benefit only downtown Chicago. I find that lack of correct 'prioritizing' on his part, rather a good signal to the rest us on how we should vote on his Amendment. We have the money to build this project if we had not decided to build the Franklin Street Subway, we do not have the money if we do build the Franklin Street Subway. If it gets on the Governor will obviously veto it but I for one am going to vote 'no', right here



on the floor."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, to close the debate."

Youell: "Yes, well, if the Gentleman wants to engage in post haste debate on what went before as to predicate his vote on this Amendment, certainly that's his prerogative and his privilege and also I suppose his responsibility. But as you know in the debate furnished by the Majority Leader of this House, relative to the Amendments that he refers to, he indicated to you that sixty-five percent of the traffic on those...the subway and the other things that are important to the City of Chicago are also used by suburban communities surrounding the City of Chicago. And those three communities that I'm concerned with are Oak Lawn, Chicago Ridge and the Village of Worth. So I think that the Amendments that the Gentleman proposed were not in the best interest of the people that I represent in southwest suburban Cook County and that's why I voted against them. And I'm asking for approval of my Amendment #64 that has nothing to do with the Amendments stated before."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian, to explain his vote."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not rising to explain my vote but I would ask for the indulgence of the Chair and of the House. I wonder if I may have leave to be recorded as voting 'yes' on all subsequent Amendments to this Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "We've heard objections. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 82 'ayes', 72 'nays' and Mr. Robinson wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. And the Gentleman's motion prevails. Further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #65, Greiman. Amends House Bill 3276 as amended on page 15...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #65 deals with three small projects in the 15th Legislative District in Chicago...part of that district. One is a small recurring and resurfacing of a three-block area where they have done all the resurfacing on to the east and all the resurfacing to the west except for a three-block no-man's-land that is in the middle. The other is a reconstruction of Peterson Avenue and the other is McCormick Street. I sit here and I get all the DOT publications and I open it up all the time, I see... what's there for the 15th District and invariably very little. And we have come here a few times for roads in our district, Representative Laurino and Representative Peters and I, represent a district that should have its proportionate interest taken care of as well as the other districts...it is not different than the first fifty-six Amendments on this Bill and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is my understanding that streets in the City of Chicago, the priorities are accorded by the city. It is not my intention to get into a debate with Representative Greiman but I want to point out to the Members....I believe, Representative Greiman used the term, little on several occasions. The little that he is referring to is an additional two million, Mr. Speaker and I again oppose this Amendment. I don't have yet to have anyone explain to me where the money is coming from."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Greiman to close."

Greiman: "Well, it is a million six...not two million and the little is relative. Relative to what the Department of



Transportation budget looks to be necessary....extremely necessary and we ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 72 'ayes', 75 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion....Mr. Kelly will be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Leverenz, 'aye'. Mr. Luft, 'aye'. And Mr. Ewell, 'aye'. Dyer, wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Mr. Christensen, wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Kane, wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'.....'aye'. Bianco, wishes to be recorded as...."

Bianco: "No."

Speaker Bradley: "No.' Mr. Bowman, 'aye'. Mr. Meyers, 'no'. Mr. Wolf, 'no'. Mr. Margalus, 'no'. Mr. Bluthardt, 'no'. Mr. Gaines, 'no'. 78 'ayes', 82 'nays'. The Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees. Mr. Richmond, wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. All right, let's get everybody that wants....Winchester, wishes to be recorded as 'no'. Anybody else now before we poll the absentees? Okay, Mr. Harris, 'aye'. Anybody else? All right we'll poll the....Mr. Schlickman, what purpose do you arise?"

Schlickman: "Simply to request a verification if the 'ayes' exceed the 'nays'."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, let's get the Roll Call. What purpose does the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom, arise?"

McBroom: "I was just going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, if the Clerk could keep track of that he is a virtual Houdini and I see at least one name on the board that I personally know is not even in Sangamon County. What would you think of a whole new Roll Call?"

Speaker Bradley: "I think we've got all the names...just a minute I'll check with him. Are the T.V. cameramen finished for the present time? At the present time the count is 80





'ayes', 82 'nos' and Mr. Tuerk wishes to be recorded as a 'nay' so, that is 80 to 83. Breslin, 'aye'. Ralph Dunn, 'no'. Mautino, 'aye'. Emil Jones, wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Leverenz, wishes to be recorded as... evidently you have already voted 'aye', sir. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Campbell, Ewing, Klosak, Madison, McGrew, Sandquist...."

Speaker Bradley: "Sandquist, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schuneman, Vitek...."

Speaker Bradley: "Vitek, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Williams, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Speaker, 'aye'. On this motion...on this question there are 85 'ayes' and 85 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Amendment is lost. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #66, Edgar. Amends House Bill 3276 on page 4, line 3 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Edgar."

Edgar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment takes care of... I think, I believe a technical error. I don't think it is really intended in one of the previous Amendments which reduce the personnel line item for the Illinois Department of Transportation District 5, office in Paris from its original eight million nine hundred thousand dollars to less than two hundred and thirty-eight thousand dollars. The Amendment reduces it by over eight and a half million dollars. My Amendment would restore that to the original level introduced by the Department of Transportation. If this Amendment is not adopted it would resolve in a ninety-seven percent decrease in jobs in the Paris office. The current budget provided for five hundred and twenty-one jobs. As this Bill is now amended...without this Amendment the number of jobs will be reduced to fourteen. As I say, I believe this is a technical error in drafting and I believe the people of east central Illinois have



serious road problems as everybody else in the state. And

I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on it."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Sponsor of the Amendment is only partially correct. There was a technical error in the Committee Amendment #1, however, to clear up that technical Amendment and place the Bill as the Committee intended, we can defeat Amendment #66 and adopt Amendment #67, which places district 5 with a two hundred and eighty...two hundred and thirty-eight thousand dollars, two hundred reduction in personnel services as was the intent of the Committee. There has been an unusual increase in this budget. In one case an increase of 132.7% in the overtime pay. The overtime and part-time ratio has been too high in the entire budget. There is still a vast increase in this budget over the estimated expenditure in fiscal FY-78. So, yes Representative Edgar is correct, there was a technical error in Amendment...Committee Amendment #1. However, defeat this Amendment and we can satisfy that technical error by adoption of Amendment #67."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Edgar."

Edgar: "I guess I'll close if there is no other.... I appreciate what the Chairman of Appropriation I Committee has said. The mistake was made in the Committee, I...his Amendment which will be the next one, I believe offered would still result in the loss of seventeen jobs to the Paris office. It is my feeling, the roads in east central Illinois are in bad repair, we need these people. And again, I would ask for a favorable Roll Call to restore the Paris office as it currently is in this Bill, the office is decimated and we will be without any personnel to speak of in that part of the state."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."



McBroom: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I happen to feel that Representative Edgar, is absolutely correct and the department supports his position. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 79 'ayes', 73 'nays' and the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I think we have taken a party position on this....that there has been an unusual increase in the overtime and part-time pay, which is not justified by the Governor who says we must take cuts. And therefore, I would like to verify this Roll Call and find out who made the arrangements."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman requests a verification. Mr. Edgar wishes to poll the absentees. Mr. Dave Jones, what purpose do you arise? Dave Jones, 'aye'. Mugalian, 'no'. Mugalian, 'no'. Steczo, 'no'. Mr. Murphy, did you wish to be recorded? Murphy, 'no'. Mann, 'no'. Willer....all right now, Willer, 'no'. Caldwell, 'no'. All right now, we're going to take another Roll Call. And let's get on the roll because the way we're doing it here today, it is impossible for the Clerk to keep up when you're switching from 'aye' to 'no' and the voting so....all those in favor of the Gentleman's motion....Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, you'd... concur that people shouldn't vote that aren't in the building, wouldn't you?"

Speaker Bradley: "Why certainly. It is against the rules, Mr. McBroom. Let's vote your own switches and everybody in favor of Mr. Edgar's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? All right, the Clerk will take the record. There is 73 'ayes', 85 'nays' and the Gentleman



requests a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Birchler, Rich Brummer, Deavers...."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. Birchler, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Rich Brummer...."

Speaker Bradley: "Lucco, wishes to change from 'no' to 'aye'.  
Vinson, 'aye'. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Rich Brummer, Deavers, Ewell, Ewing...."

Speaker Bradley: "Ewing, 'aye'. Ewell, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Getty, Katz, Klosak, Lechowicz, Madison, Lynn  
Martin...."

Speaker Bradley: "Lynn Martin votes 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "McAuliffe, McGrew, McMaster, Meyer, Mudd,  
Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "The Speaker votes 'no'. 76 'ayes', 85 'nos'  
and the Gentleman's motion...the Gentleman's motion....  
Peg Martin, 'aye'. Brummer, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Peggy Smith Martin is from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Brummer, 'no'. 77 to 85. Deavers votes  
'aye'. 78 to 85. Now the Gentleman who requested a  
verification. The Clerk will call the Negative Roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bowman, Bradley,  
Brady...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, could I suggest that....as Speaker  
Redmond says, that we adopt Hanahan Rules on this please."

Speaker Bradley: "Hanahan's Rules will be enforced. Will the  
Members please be in their seats, clear the aisles and  
when your name is called if you will please raise your  
hand so the people who are verifying will be able to  
ascertain your presence in the chambers. McBroom."

McBroom: "I would even suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that some  
of the Members and some of the guests on the floor didn't  
even hear your last announcement. I don't feel that it  
had much impact, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. McBroom doesn't think it had much impact."



Would those Members please be in their chairs and all people not entitled to the floor...Mr. Doorkeeper, those people not entitled to the floor would you please suggest to them that they leave? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne, what purpose do you arise?"

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, maybe if you change the name of that rule it might apply a little bit more. Representative Hanahan is never in his chair. Why don't we name it, Representative Brummet's Rule, he's always there."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, let's proceed with the verification. Mulcahey, what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, could I be verified now please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mulcahey be verified now, Mr. Edgar? Fine. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Caldwell, Capparelli, Chapman, Christensen, Daniels, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, Ewell...."

Speaker Bradley: "Would the Members please raise your hands as your name is called?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Farley, Flinn, Garmisa, Giglio, Giorgi...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, what purpose do you arise?"

Bowman: "How am I recorded as voting?"

Speaker Bradley: "How is he recorded?"

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

Bowman: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Bowman as voting 'aye'. Proceed with the call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Greiman, Griesheimer, Harris, Hart, Hoffman, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, J.M. Houlihan, Hudson, Huff, Jacobs, Emil Jones, Kelly, Kent...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Klosak."

Klosak: "Mr. Speaker, I am not recorded, may I be recorded as voting 'aye'."



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

Clerk O'Brien: "Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Laurino, Leverenz, Levin, Luft, Madigan, Mann, Marovitz, Matejek, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain, McCourt, McLendon, McPike, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, Pechous, Pierce, Porter, Pouncey, Pullen, Richmond, Schisler, Schuneman, Sharp, Shumpert, Steczo, Taylor, Terzich, Tipsword, Totten, Van Duyne, Vitek, Von Boeckman, R.V. Walsh, Willer, Williams, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Questions of the negative....Mr. Daniels, what purpose do you arise?"

Daniels: "I wonder if Representative Hoffman and myself can be verified. We have to go to a meeting in the Speaker's Office."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Edgar."

Daniels: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, questions, Mr. Edgar. Mr. Lechowicz, what purpose do you arise?"

Lechowicz: "Kindly record me as 'no'."

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

Edgar: "What's the count?"

Speaker Bradley: "80 'ayes', 85 'nays'."

Edgar: "Mr. Brandt."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute. Mr. McMaster, what purpose do you arise?"

McMaster: "Would you kindly record me as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Mr. Meyer, 'aye'. Okay now, questions of the negative."

Edgar: "Representative Brandt."

Speaker Bradley: "Brandt. How is he recorded? Is the Gentleman in the chambers? How is he recorded? Mr. Brandt."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman voted 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Edgar: "Representative Darrow...no, he's there, I'm sorry. Domico."



Speaker Bradley: "Domico is in his seat."

Edgar: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Bradley: "Garmisa...he's in his seat."

Edgar: "Representative Hart."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Hart...how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll. Mr. Getty wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Further questions?"

Edgar: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative Emil Jones. Oh, he's back."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute, Mr. Hoffman...you wish to change your vote, Sir? Gene Hoffman wishes to be recorded 'aye' instead of 'no'. And Mr. Brandt has returned to the chamber, put him back on."

Edgar: "Representative...."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute, Mr. McCourt, wishes to be record...are you changing your vote, Sir, or you wish to be recorded as voting 'aye'? Changing your vote from 'no' to 'aye'. Further questions?"

Edgar: "Representative Nardulli."

Speaker Bradley: "Nardulli is in his seat."

Edgar: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker Bradley: "Terzich. Representative Terzich, is not in his seat...is he in the chambers? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "We'll take him off the roll. Terzich has returned to the chamber, put him back on. Further questions?"

Edgar: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Speaker Bradley: "Von Boeckman, is not in his seat. Is he in the chambers? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll. The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman, what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Schuneman: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker. Would you please change my vote to 'yes' please."



Speaker Bradley: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Friedrich, wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Record me as 'no', please."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Further questions?"

Edgar: "Representative Williams."

Speaker Bradley: "Williams....he's not in his seat. Is he in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off. All right now, Mr. Porter wishes to change his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer arise?"

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote from 'no' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Bradley: "From 'no' to 'aye'. And Von Boeckman is back in the chamber. Will you put him back on the roll?"

Edgar: "What is the Roll Call now, Mr. Clerk?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Katz, wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. The present total is 87 'ayes', 81'nays'. Further questions?"

Edgar: "No, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "No further questions? On this question there are 87 'ayes', 81 'nos' and the Gentleman's motion.... what purpose do you arise, Mr. McPike?"

McPike: "We request verification of the Negative..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll. Mr. McGrew, wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Holewinski, wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. John Dunn, wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Mrs. Macdonald, what purpose do you arise?"

Macdonald: "Well after....recorded their votes, I wonder if I might be verified. I have to leave the chambers."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. McPike, could Mrs. Macdonald's be verified





now? He agrees. Now the Clerk will call the Affirmative Roll. Wait a minute, Mr. Bennett, what purpose do you arise?"

Bennett: "Could I be verified?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes. Mr. Matijevich, what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevich: "No use being made a monkey out of, I'll withdraw that verification. Nobody else seems to give a damn and you might as well pass the Amendment that takes off over three million dollars. All of increase in overtime and part-time pay a vast increase. I would hope that some Democrats would oppose it, I'm going to vote against it. But nobody is going to make a monkey out of me."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman withdraws his....well, it was really, Mr. McPike's motion. He withdraws the motion. Lynn Martin wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. All right now, what is the total? 88 'ayes', 82 'nays and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Further Amendments? Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment...."

Speaker Bradley: "What purpose does the Gentleman....Mr. Lucco, arise?"

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise for a matter of introduction. We have in the gallery a Mayor of Witt, Illinois. Witt, Illinois is a community that I was familiar with many many years ago. Too many to remember, when I played ball there with, I hope that this Mayor will remember these names. Al 'Anisco' and the Schvinenko Boys and with us we have Margaret Pimbrook, the Mayor of Witt, Illinois. And also Pat Spary, they are represented by Representative Kane, Jones and Robinson. Glad to have you here."

Speaker Bradley: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #67, Matijevich. Amendments House Bill 3276 as amended on page...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich withdraws



the Amendment. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #68, Abramson. Amends House Bill 3276 as amended on page 10, line 13..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Abramson."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as of last week dramatically demonstrated the needs to update our aircraft operated by DOT. Amendment #68 provides adequate funds to DOT to purchase the new aircraft. I urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevec."

Matijevec: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wonder if the Gentleman would yield? Whose Amendment is this?"

Speaker Abramson."

Matijevec: "Oh, Abramson..."

Abramson: "This is my own idea. I fly the planes once in a while and it makes me nervous riding on a 13-year-old plane."

Matijevec: "You've got a lot of good ideas. Why...with that good idea why did you take it out of the Road Fund. Usually airplanes are up there, the roads are down here. Why did you take that money out...over a million dollars... I keep hearing that the Road Fund is in just bad state once you down to earth...take it out of the General Revenue Fund. Won't your Governor let you do that?"

Abramson: "This is where aeronautics traditionally got its equipment funds."

Matijevec: "I'm not sure about that. We have to pass the Legislature to get a lot of the road funds but I would think that some downstaters that are screaming about their roads in their districts and the needs for improvement of highways would start screaming now that here is over a million dollars for one airplane that is going to jeopardize the road programs in their areas. If you really feel that the need is there, I would think that you



find another vehicle to get the money, Representative Abramson."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Madison: "Representative Abramson, is this plane that you want to purchase with this Amendment, is this an addition to the state fleet or is this the replacement for the plane that we had some problems with last week?"

Abramson: "This is in addition. I would imagine they would want to retire one of the old ones though if they got a new one."

Madison: "Is the Governor requesting this plane?"

Abramson: "Frankly, this is my own idea, I didn't ask anybody about it before I introduced the Amendment."

Madison: "This is not for the Governor, this is for your comfort?"

Abramson: "Pardon me."

Madison: "This is for your comfort?"

Abramson: "No, I just thought we needed another plan."

Madison: "But you indicated that it was because you have been flying the other one and you apparently didn't like...."

Abramson: "Occasionally there is a seat available, I try to get on a state plane to save the state the extra expense of an Ozark ticket. But a couple of times, you know, you're riding a thirteen-year-old plane and it makes you a little nervous. When you see the landing gear collapse on another one, then you think maybe it is time to get a new airplane."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "To the Amendment. Yes, Sir."

Madison: "To the Amendment. With all due respect to the Sponsor of this Amendment, Mr. Speaker, if the state plane that he is flying now makes him uncomfortable, I would suggest that he take a commercial aircraft like the rest of us."



And I would oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser. Will the Gentlemen around Mr. Telcser, please sit down?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I really didn't intend to get into the debate on this particular Amendment. But I know from over the years that I've served from time to time, there have been Members on both sides of the aisle who have felt that there ought to be some new equipment in the Department of Aeronautics. The temptation is always great again, on both sides of the aisle to make it appear as though an aircraft which the state has in its service, is some type of luxury which we should not be funding. The fact of the matter is, in the era in which we live, air transportation is something which is important to the state as it is to private industry. And the fact of the matter is, the state officials from all branches, everywhere from our Supreme Court Judges to the Governor and on occasion Legislators are flying in that aircraft. And I think that ought to be the issue, if you believe that the aircraft which transports Illinois citizens ought to be safe you ought to vote for the Amendment. If you think the present equipment is safe and we don't need any more, then you ought to vote against it. But I really don't think it is a responsible position to make some kind of political attitude regarding Representative Abramson's Amendment. I sincerely believe that we ought to start upgrading the airplanes we have in our department because as I understand it and I don't know too much about aviation, as I understand it some of the planes are thirteen or fifteen years old. I don't know if age has anything really to do with the maintenance or upgrading or upkeep of aircraft. But if it does, I think that is the light in which you ought to consider this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."



Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think that we should note that Illinois has the fourth largest Air Force in the entire world. I really think that is the fact, we have more airplanes than we know what to do with. We have them all over the state and I really think it is sort of ludicrous to come in at this time to ask for another airplane. I just don't think that Illinois needs another airplane, I think that if some of the state officials can't find the proper airplane to fly they ought to ask the Governor to take one of his monsters and fly it around the state. God knows, he isn't in the state most of the time anyway. So it would be my feeling that we ought to vote this Amendment down and not buy another airplane for any useless purposes."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I heard Representative Telcser make a comment that...there is a temptation over the years by the Members of both sides of the aisle to ridicule the state planes and the use of the state planes. And it reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of an expression that a friend of mine used to have when he was called upon to speak at Rotary Club or a Kiwanis Club or a political meeting. We frequently ask, do you want me to make the five minute speech in favor of it or the five minute speech against it? I suppose we could make the five minute speech against the fact that the leadership is here days and hours longer than any of us are and they ought to drive home late on Saturday and drive back late on Sunday night. I suppose we could make that argument and conversely. I think we could make equally good argument that their talents and their resources and their abilities are better served if they have a little extra time with their families and they are not beating themselves up and down the highway. For those of you who want to know, it is not in the budget but I think that sometimes legislative



prerogative should be exercised. I support Representative Abramson's motion, I think Representative Kornowicz who got injured in one of our fifteen, twenty-year-old planes the other day, might be inclined to support that position too. I recommend an 'aye' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just want to bring out the fact that, whether you know it or not, we are spending more money for the maintenance of these planes simply because they are fifteen to twenty years old. And it's money that we're throwing down the drain. In lieu of what happened within the past few months with two of our airplanes and in many occasions I know of many of the Representatives who in time of an emergency had requested air transportation back to save time and we were granted that. So some of the previous Governor's didn't have the courage to come out and support buying the planes and we should have and could have kept the fleet up-to-date like they are supposed to be kept up. But the key issue here is that we're throwing good money against bad money and I would urge a favorable vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Leverenz: "Number one, what is...our head pilot, Arvin Sanders' position on your Amendment?"

Abramson: "I didn't ask the head pilot before I introduced this."

Leverenz: "Well, I understand there was a study which he was a party to, of three people who had about a hundred air years in the aeronautic field and it was their position that even though they recommended new planes last year and it was Arvin Sanders' feeling that they could get by on the aircrafts that they had. What we



tried to do is fix their...put into better shape the newest aircrafts and, replace the entire rest of the fleet for about the same amount of money that I think you are talking about here. But I would certainly want to find out what Arvin Sanders thinks about the Amendment. Further we did ask in Appropriation I that Arvin Sanders would provide the Committee Chairman with the information as to why the plane had a little mishap here in Springfield, that has not been responded to. Secondly, with a previous speaker here on the floor, the age of the aircraft had nothing to do with it, it was not a mechanical failure in term of the plane last week having a mechanical...so-called mechanical problem. That was not the cause of the aircraft itself. So, I don't think that should be used as a reason to support your Amendment here. And the final question, if you can respond to these, is why would we do it with Road Fund money when the cry is, don't take any money from the Road Fund. Why are we buying aircraft with road fund dollars? Sometimes they go on the road, I guess."

Abramson: "Well, first of all, regarding replacing this aircraft or other aircrafts particular one that this provides sufficient money for, is generally flown with the pilot and copilot which I think is safer than the smaller ones that have one pilot only. And as far as taking the money out of the road fund, all the other equipment in the Aeronautic Division Budget is designated from the Road Fund. And this is the way that I understood it to be done in the past."

Leverenz: "Couldn't you also see supporting doing away with all the aircraft and use commercial flights?"

Abramson: "It is a policy decision that has to be made on the House floor. I believe that the state airplanes provide a necessary service to the people in state government."

Leverenz: "I just don't see taking this Road Fund money to do



this and I definitely think it is bad. And I would certainly think that Arvin Sanders should respond to the Appropriation Committee in its request and would look forward to the defeat of the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, here is another case where the Governor doesn't have the guts to put the airplane in his budget. He has little messenger boys on the floor of the House, the Assistant Minority Leader, the Spokesman and Sponsor of this Bill, come and support this Amendment because he won't stand up and ask for the plane. You know why they want the plane, they want it for political purposes. Last Friday, Mr. Cohouser of the Bureau of the Budget, the people that are supposed to watch our money, Cohouser ordered a state plane to fly around for political purposes to fight House Bill 3279, the Circuit Breaker Bill that passed the House and is over in the Senate. The taxpayers Federation of Illinois was invited to go on that flight, to see the Rockford Newspaper, the Peoria Newspaper and to go around on this political election year flight. He got to the airport and when he found out it wasn't Ozark or it wasn't a private political flight...not being paid for by the Thompson campaign, which he thought was the case, it was a state plane that Mr. Cohouser of the Bureau of the Budget was renting, he refused to get on that plane, the Taxpayers Federation director refused to get on that plane which is being used strictly for political purposes, to campaign against House Bill 3279. They want another campaign plane for the election year, that's what they want....to fight House Bill 3279. Mr. Cohouser of the Bureau of the Budget should come before this House and explain why he is taking state planes for political purposes. The Taxpayers Federation refuses to go along. The Governor should ask for the plane for his campaign if he wants it."





Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Pierce, Mr. Schlickman is rising to advise that Gentleman sitting on the rail up there that he better not sit on the rail and fall over backwards. Thank you, Mr. Schlickman. You have another point?"

Pierce: "Vote 'no' on this Bill...."

Schlickman: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "A point of order....."

Pierce: "Political Amendment."

Schlickman: "It is a political tirade. Let's get to the merit."

Pierce: "The merits are the Taxpayers Federation refused to take that flight with Mr. Cohouses, last Friday to oppose House Bill 3279. I'm opposing this Amendment, I hope you all will if you're interested in economy in government."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Mr. Abramson to close."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First of all...respond to the last speaker, if it should be dignified by that. This is entirely my own idea, after my friend, Mr. Kornowicz, got hurt in the accident. I bring this for nobody else. I urge favorable consideration of this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 40 'ayes', 104 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion....Mr. Peters, what purpose do you arise?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I did decide to vote but I wondered whether Representative Pierce could please repeat that."



I didn't hear that entire speech, I thought it was pretty good."

Speaker Bradley: "We'll give you a copy of the transcript if you don't mind. It will save time, Mr. Peters. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Matijevich, on a point of order."

Matijevich: "I want to help, Representative Peters. Anything that happens here, you can get a tape from IIS, they handle that for the Governor and they will provide it for you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 40 'ayes', 104 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #...."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hudson, for what purpose do you arise?"

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sometime back Representative Reilly made a motion to reconsider Amendment #57. I'm recorded as 'yes' and wondered if I can have leave of the House to have that vote change to 'no'. It will not affect the results of that."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'... 'no' on the motion. Mr. Lucco, for what purpose do you arise?"

Lucco: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to introduce some people who are represented by Representatives Ann Willer, William Walsh and Emil Boucek. These are people up in the Speaker's balcony from Marquette Manor Baptist Church from the 6th Legislative District. Glad to have you here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #69, Skinner. Amends House Bill 3276 as amended on page 13, line 10 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, since the Regional Transportation Authority has been created, a great deal of money has flowed from the state sales tax and state license plate



fees to the Regional Transportation Authority. So much in fact, that the state education formula could have been fully funded. That is, we could have met our promise that we made in 1973, if RTA hadn't been siphoning off the hundred million dollars or so per year. Amendment #69 will cut one hundred million dollars from the amount that is appropriated to the Regional Transportation Authority from the Public Transportation Fund. As all of you should know by now, everyone in the State of Illinois pays the equivalent of ten dollars per person per year out of the State General Fund to the Public Transportation Fund and the equivalent of two dollars and twenty-one cents for every set of license plates that is bought anywhere in the State of Illinois, is diverted from the State Road Fund. This year we're told that the tax relief is a top issue, one of the Representatives that previously spoke about airplanes has sponsored a Bill which would give approximately seventeen dollars to every homeowner and renter in the State of Illinois if you use one person's estimate, his own estimate. However, the Bureau of the Budget estimates that the tax relief program in the first year will cost a hundred million dollars. And I have taken this opportunity to try to put stark relief, which indeed is the first priority of the Illinois General Assembly. Is it subsidizing public transportation in the Chicago area, 79.3% of which subsidizes that gone to the Chicago Transit Authority since the RTA was formed, or it is tax relief for homeowners and renters. If it is tax relief, you should vote 'yes' on this Bill...on this Amendment because it will give us a hundred million dollars which is what the Governor's people say will be needed to pay for the tax relief. I would ask for an affirmative vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr....."

Skinner: "If you think tax relief is number one priority."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan on the Amendment."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that the Membership ought to have a full understanding of the background to this Amendment. When the Regional Transportation Authority was created several years ago, the statute which created the authority provided that three thirty seconds of the sales tax collected in the six county region of northeastern Illinois would automatically be deposited in the Mass Transportation Fund. In addition the  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the vehicle license fees collected within the City of Chicago are also automatically deposited in the same Mass Transportation Fund. The process involved in this Bill is simply to appropriate that money from the Mass Transportation Fund to the Regional Transportation Authority. If this Amendment were to be successful or in the alternative, if there were no legislative appropriation to accomplish the transfer of funds, then the money would simply sit and remain in the Mass Transportation Fund. It would not move into any other fund, therefore, I suggest to you that this Amendment and the following two Amendments are exercises in futility. Please understand, that this Amendment and the following two Amendments will be of no impact upon the Mass Transportation Fund, because the money can only move from the Mass Transportation Fund to the RTA and nowhere else. I would recommend a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment and the subsequent two Amendments sponsored by Representative Skinner, the department vigorously opposes. I would respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, and I understand that there is two or three more Amendments after this. We've been on this Bill for two days and three hours today. Someone suggested to me that the Senate wondered if there



was a Department of Transportation appropriation, if we don't get it over there pretty soon, I would simply suggest that I would like to note that, I oppose these three Amendments, the Department of Transportation does. And why couldn't we let Representative Skinner, speak in favor, Representative Madigan oppose and go on with our business, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Fine. Mr. Darrow, what purpose do you arise?"

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Merely to state that on each of Representative Skinner's Amendments, the Sponsor of the Bill has gotten up and said that the administration opposes them. I wish he would explain why they oppose them, why the Republican Governor opposes, Mr. Skinner's good Amendments. It is very strange for us to sit here and not understand why this is taking place. So, on the next occasion would Representative McBroom explain the administrations position better?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to close the debate."

Skinner: "Frankly, I wish I could explain the administration's position on this issue. Certainly the Governor was elected by votes from the collar counties in suburban Cook County and if he is to be reelected he will be reelected by those voters. And so far all we have heard is rhetoric when he comes out to suburban areas. This... it is past time for rhetoric, it is time for action. I would suggest to the Majority Leader that what the General Assembly giveth the General Assembly can taketh away. And if this money is not transferred automatically, the Regional Transportation Authority then with a subsequent Bill we can authorize its transfer to a property tax relief fund which I'm sure would benefit more people than would benefit from the Regional Transportation Authority. The first Amendment will take one hundred of 133.7 million dollars that's budgeted to flow from the



General Fund and the Road Fund and stick it in a holding pattern until the General Assembly decides what it wishes to do with it. You've got your choice, property tax relief or subsidizing railroad riders."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? There are 89 'nos' also...the Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 54 'ayes', 98 'nos' and the Gentleman's motion... Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, considering we are waiting to consider ERA and there are probably a hundred and seventy-six people in the chambers and thirty-two people aren't voting. I would ask you to call the absentees."

Speaker Bradley: "Even if they are all here, you would only have 87....I see the Majority Leader was going to make that point. If they all voted in favor of your motion, sir, you would still only have 87 'ayes'. Do you persist?"

Skinner: "Well, I certainly do persist. I think the constituents have a right to know where they stand, if they stand."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Madigan, the Gentleman from Cook."

Madigan: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point, Sir."

Madigan: "If all the absentees voted 'aye' on the Amendment, the Amendment would still fail and I therefore, request that you rule that the Gentleman's request is out of order and is being dilatory."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner, for what purpose do you arise?"

Sumner: "I would like to change my vote to 'yes' please."

Speaker Bradley: "Sumner, wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye' Anderson, 'aye'. Levin, 'no'. That gives us 89 'nos' again. Daniels 'aye'. Winchester, 'aye'. Margalus, 'no'. Mrs. Reed, changes her vote from 'no' to 'aye'.



Mr. Boucek, 'no'. Polk, 'aye'. Deuster, 'aye'. 60 'ayes'  
89 'nays'. The Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amend-  
ments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #70, Skinner. Amends House  
Bill 3276 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, let's assume the Comptroller is more  
correct on his estimate of how much this tax relief  
program will be than he was in estimating how much money  
we could afford to spend during the last fiscal year.  
He says, it is going to cost forty-two million dollars  
and so the second Amendment only cuts forty-two million  
dollars from the Public Transportation Fund. Now, I can  
understand why some of my more conservative colleagues  
wouldn't want to over-withhold money from the RTA. But  
certainly they know that we don't have enough money in  
the budget to pay for forty-two million dollars worth  
of property tax relief. For that reason, I would ask  
that the General Assembly approve this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Again, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Membership  
ought to have some further information relative to the  
operation of this fund. In the event that there is an  
over appropriation by the General Assembly, beyond the  
level of money that actually flows into the fund,  
then again it is of no effect. Because if the money does  
not come into the fund...the Mass Transportation Fund,  
then it will not move to the Regional Transportation  
Authority. Therefore, again, I suggest that this is a  
frivolous Amendment and ought to be voted down. I re-  
commend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Skinner, to close."

Skinner: "I think the Gentleman protests too much. If anything,  
he ought to know by now I'm not frivolous on this issue.  
I think the issue is plain...I'll take a Roll Call."



Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 62 'ayes', 86 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #71, Skinner. Amends House Bill...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this is one that I can really get worked up over because it affects everyone in the State of Illinois who drives a car exactly as much as it affects my constituents as the RTA gas tax affects my constituents. 16.4 million dollars each and every year is taken from the state road...money that ought to go to the State Road Fund and given to subsidize bus riders and railroad commuters. That is totally unjustifiable, it would make sense only in a public finance course. We are not in a public finance course, we are in the Illinois General Assembly. The people who drew up the RTA Acts were superb propagandists, the law states that fourteen dollars times the number of vehicles registered in the City of Chicago shall be diverted from the State Road Fund to the Public Transportation Fund. But I would suggest that unless an additional 16.4 million dollars is not spent in the City of Chicago for roads, filling potholes or whatever that indeed everyone in the State of Illinois bears the burden equally. And that is were I derive my figure of two dollars and twenty-one cents going to the RTA every time anyone purchases a set of license plates anywhere in the State of Illinois. Are you for diverting money from the Road Fund to subsidize people who are fortunate enough to have public transportation? Or do you want the potholes filled in your district? If we put this money in limbo, in the Public Transportation Fund,





I assure you there will be some activity and give....and it will give us the time to put it some place else. Now I do believe that the opposition spokesman has been protesting much too much, since he voted for a Transportation Department Bill as did virtually everyone else in this Illinois House, which did not fully fund the RTA's statutory formula last year. Let him talk himself out of that one."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I rise in opposition to this Amendment and suggest once again that this Amendment is as frivolous as the preceding two Amendments. Again, Ladies and Gentlemen, please understand the operation of the Mass Transportation Fund. The money is automatically earmarked from the state sales tax and from the vehicle registration fees within the City of Chicago. Representative Skinner, has suggested that he will devise a formula which will work out to a certain amount of money and then he will deduct that money from the appropriation to the Mass Transportation Fund. Unfortunately for Representative Skinner, that is not how the fund operates. I've explained previously, the money flows into the fund; we appropriate the money from that fund to the RTA. If the money is not collected by the state through the normal collections then the money will not be there and the RTA will not get the money. Again, this is another frivolous Amendment, it ought to be voted down. I recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Skinner, to close."

Skinner: "All right, sometimes...."

Speaker Bradley: "Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Byers. The Gentleman from Madison."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Skinner, you said that downstaters are paying two dollars and twenty-one cents for every license plate



that they buy to support the RTA in Chicago."

Skinner: "The equivalent of two dollars and twenty-one cents for every set of license plates bought anywhere in the State of Illinois is diverted from proceeds that should go to the State Road Fund."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Skinner, when was this legislation passed?"

Skinner: "Fortunately, prior to your election. You don't have to take any blame for it at all."

Byers: "Okay. Well, I would like to rise in support of...Mr. Speaker and Representative Skinner's Amendment. I think it is a good Amendment, I know downstaters are tired of supporting programs in the Chicago area of this nature. We've got a lot of potholes downstate that need filling and many of the citizens are very irate. So I would rise in support of Representative Skinner's Amendment and ask other Members to join in voting 'aye' on this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was very surprised to hear someone call this a frivolous Amendment. Certainly for those of us who live in the RTA region, there is nothing frivolous about this. It is a very important Amendment and a very sound and responsible Amendment. And I should think for those who live downstate, it wouldn't be frivolous either. We in the suburban area do not want the downstaters to have to continue to pay for empty busses running down our streets. And I urge you to vote 'aye' on this needed Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Now, Mr. Skinner, to close."

Skinner: "I sometimes wonder if the Majority Leader knows the Bill as well as he ought to. He keeps referring to some nonexistent fund called the Mass Transportation Fund. It is my opinion that it is called the Public Transportation Fund. He is correct in that it will be in limbo but at 16.4 million dollars that then can be passed...that we can



then pass a Bill to allocate anywhere we wish to. I would suggest we allocate it to control of Bakalis's pothole plan. Would make a heck of a lot more sense than taking the money out of the General Fund as he previously suggested. If you vote 'yes', you think road money ought to be spent on roads. If you vote 'no', you think it ought to be spent on bus riders....be my guest."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 71 'ayes', 84 'nos', the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #72, Campbell-Stuffie. Amends House Bill 3276 as amended on page...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Vermillion, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment is a continuation of the Amendment that I offered yesterday. And the reason that I didn't have the two Amendments combined was because I did not have the latest updated figures. But this lends itself to an additional five miles of highway on FAS 331, from Collinsville to Potomac. And as I said before, the reason I didn't offer it all in one Amendment, I didn't have the updated figures. But this is one of those that has had the priorities that I mentioned yesterday of the County Board for about ten or fifteen years. It is a school bus route, it is badly in need of repair and I also mentioned yesterday that the middlefork reservoir would have cost the state about thirty-five million according to the...according to the staff figures. So I figure we had about thirty-three million, a hundred and eighty thousand left that we saved the state in view of the fact that we didn't get it. And I'm asking for an additional one million, three hundred and five thousand,



for this five miles. And I would appreciate your favorable support."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Leverenz: "Why have you held out on this in the past?"

Campbell: "It has been held out because we were anticipating... we've left our roads to be neglected actually because of the fact that we were anticipating the middlefork reservoir."

Leverenz: "Has there been any Governors out to verify that this should be done? Or anything along those lines?"

Campbell: "We have gone through the process of the Department of Transportation and we've been ignored by them but it has been a priority in District 5, and a priority in the County Board."

Leverenz: "Has the Department of Transportation ever come to you and asked what projects that you would like to see done and what you think are the priorities for the Department of Transportation?"

Campbell: "As you know, one of the things that happen when the state builds a road then the maintenance is taken over by the county. Particularly on FAS federal aid secondary road. And I think the input should be given to the county as to which roads they should be taking over and this is a priority of the County Board and has been for a long time."

Leverenz: "It is just terrible that they never check with you to see what should be done because the local people do know what should be done better, I think, than the Department of Transportation. And it is horrible that you have been ignored in your District and I support the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Mr. Johnson, the Gentleman from Champaign...on the Amendment?"

Johnson: "No, I was just going to inquire of the Sponsor and



Representative Edgar whether by supporting this we can promise that we'll never hear about the middlefork reservior again."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. Mr. Campbell, do you wish to close, sir?"

Campbell: "No such promise. I would appreciate your favorable support."

Speaker Bradley: "All right now, the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom. Would the people around Mr. McBroom please give him some air?"

McBroom: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, simply what I said on some...most of the other Amendments. The money is not in the budget, everybody knows what the Governor is going to have to do. This is another million three, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? You can still get on there. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 75 'ayes', 55 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #73, Ryan. Amends House Bill 3276 as amended on page 1, line 11 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #73 replaces eleven million, six hundred and nine thousand, nine hundred and sixty-three dollars that was eliminated in Amendment #1. They reduced the operation in central administration planning in central divisions of highway and day labor, motor fuel tax administration and the Washington D.C. offices...."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, Mr. Ryan. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I would like the Parliamentarian



to look over this Amendment, I believe after the adoption of Amendment #66, that Amendment #73 is now out of order."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Ryan....in the opinion of the Chair....

The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "In view of the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Thank you very much, Sir. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #74, Keats. Amends House Bill 3276 as amended on page 32, by deleting Section 53 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keats."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...."

Speaker Bradley: "What purpose does the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Reed...from Lake, Mrs. Reed, arise?"

Reed: "Just....Mr. Speaker, I don't think that Amendment has been distributed. We don't have it back here."

Speaker Bradley: "You are absolutely correct. I think we have got 74 to 3069. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, has the Amendment been printed?"

Speaker Bradley: "I understand the Amendment has not been printed....."

Madigan: "When was the Amendment filed?"

Speaker Bradley: "Within the last hour...probably less."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, in light of the logjam that we face and the need to move ahead with the business of the House and under Robertson's Rules I move that...I suggest that you move this Bill to Third Reading."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "I couldn't concur more. Let's go."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams arise?"

Williams: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to Rule 10 (b), I move that we change the order of business to Second Reading, Constitutional Amendments for the purpose



considering Amendment HJRCA 44. I do have the necessary  
five Members."

Speaker Bradley: "You weren't recognized for that purpose, sir."



Speaker Redmond: "Constitutional Amendments, Third Reading. On page 7, House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 54. Representative Tipword. Corneal Davis. Representative Tipword. Representative Tipword is recognized."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, I call upon you at this time and ask you why we must move to this order of business that has been heard twice in this House when June the 27th is the last day for handling Senate Bills and it might be that if this was... we waited on this, if you must call it and if it may be legally called, which I doubt, until after we've completed the necessary work of this House, it would certainly give us an opportunity better to expedite the work of this House and maybe someone might get home for an hour or two over the weekend. But I call upon you to ask you, why should you call this that has been heard already when there's so many things that have not been heard? And also to ask you, if you must call this, will we stop getting these reports on how far we are behind on everything else?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich, for what purpose do you rise?" Well, it's the province of the Chair to call it and I called it on this order of business."

Matijeich: "Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, very often I've..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich is recognized, Representative Collins."

Matijeich: "Very often I've risen on the floor of the House and I've said that there's unauthorized persons on the floor of the House. And I've always stuck by that. And I really have enjoyed serving in this General Assembly on those occasions when it's been free and clear of unauthorized persons. That's the way it ought to be all the time. I had somebody come up here who was a staff person and said, 'John, can you get this person on the floor of the House during the E.R.A. vote?' I said, 'In twelve years I've never done it for anybody and I wouldn't do it for anybody.' And I think,





Mr. Speaker, that the Doormen ought to clear every single person out of the floor that does not belong here."

Speaker Redmond: "The Doorkeeper... all unauthorized persons leave the floor. The Doorkeepers enforce the rules of the House. All unauthorized persons leave the floor. All unauthorized persons leave the floor. In connection with House Joint Resolution 54, on the motion Representative Deavers is recognized... Representative Deavers is recognized. Representative Deavers. Representative Deavers is recognized."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a motion on the E.R.A. vote and what I would like to propose is that it be voted on immediately with one opponent and one proponent speaking in behalf and no explanation of vote. And I so move for the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers has been recognized in connection with the motion on House Joint Resolution 54. The question... Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to speak to the Gentleman's motion. I supported this type of motion in the past. However, today if we have the time, if we have the time on the floor of this House to go through this again, then I think certainly we have the time to hear everybody... during debate if they want to talk on the issue during debate and I think we have time to hear everybody explain their vote. We're going to go through it all over again if it takes all day today and all day tomorrow. As far as I'm concerned, let's stay here and listen to everybody explain their vote, talk on the issue, explain why they are for it or why they're against. We're cutting off debate on something that we've heard time after time after time. I'm not at all in favor of even going to this issue; but if we're going to go to the issue, then let's make sure everybody has the opportunity to speak on the issue and explain their vote... their vote as the rules of this House provide. And I suggest that we vote against the Gentleman's motion to cut off debate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll speak on this motion, too. And I



~~feel that~~ if we sustain this motion we are sustaining nothing less than a gag rule on this House as far as this issue is concerned. As the previous speaker mentioned, this particular Amendment has been brought to us time and time and time and time again. However, I don't think that's any reason or any excuse for us to at this point to foreclose on debate of this issue. The arguments are still valid and I think everyone here is entitled to listen to the arguments whether they really care to or not. I have a feeling now that the game plan is to bring this to a vote just as quickly as it can possibly be done, vote it up, get it out of here, get it over to the Senate and the debate can just be disregarded. And I feel, Mr. Speaker, if we sustain this motion, we're making a grave mistake and it's a mockery to the... to the true parliamentary process that we should be engaged in in this House. And I would urge defeat of this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the motion, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jack Davis."

J. Davis: "Mr. Speaker, although I am going to support the motion, I think the motion is a bit out of order. The transcript will show that Representative Walsh had a parliamentary inquiry that you, Mr. Speaker, promised to rule on before we went to this order of business and before the vote is called. Now I would hope that you would yield right now to Representative Walsh to renew his inquiry and answer the questions that Representative Walsh has legitimately brought before this Body."

Speaker Redmond: "I will get to Representative Walsh's motion and I will put that question. Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that the motion probably is in not good form pursuant to Rule 72(a) which requires that the specific Section be noted. However, I won't urge that. I will suggest to the Chair that this, the effect of this motion is to suspend Rule 55(f) with respect to debate and Rule 56(b) with respect to explanation of votes. It is therefore, two separate issues and I want a division of the question so that we could vote



on the ~~opening~~ of debate or closure of debate on the one hand, but perhaps leave explanation of vote open on the other. I would ask for a division of the question, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there leave to... is there leave to divide the question? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I don't believe leave is required on a request to dividethe question. I believe anyone can request that and it has to be granted."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Parliamentarian says that it's two separate rules so we divide the question. Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker, there's too much confusion and I'd like to withdraw the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's withdrawn the motion. Representative Walsh has submitted a motion. Will you read Representative Walsh's motion?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, Motion. Pursuant to Rule 10(b), I move to change the order of business to the Order of Constitutional Amendments, Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "No, no, no. That's not the motion. Wait till we get the motion. I'll get back to you, Mr. Collins. We can't read Representative Walsh's handwriting. Representative Walsh, do you have a copy of your motion? We can't... the Clerk doesn't seem to be able to find it. There it is. Will you read Representative Walsh's motion? I'll get back to you, Representative Collins. Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I had an inquiry of the Chair a long time ago that was never answered."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it was the decision of the Chair to proceed with this order of business, Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "I was asking you though why we should do that before doing our other business..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, in my judgment it was to the best interest of the General Assembly to proceed with it."

Tipsword: "Thank you. We really appreciate your consideration on the other business."

Speaker Redmond: "Did you find Representative... maybe the determination



of Representatives Walsh's motion will settle everybody down here.

He filed a motion. You filed that, didn't you, Representative Walsh?"

W. Walsh: "I did not, Sir. I don't have a motion pending on that particular point. I do have the motion that the Clerk read and I would suggest that we dispose of that first and then dispose of the question I have."

Speaker Redmond: "No. The motion that you submitted was that according to Robert's Rules of Order that we could not consider... wait a minute."

W. Walsh: "Speaker, on my point of order, I will be glad to proceed."

Speaker Redmond: "Point of order with respect to..."

W. Walsh: "I would suggest, however, that you recognize Representative Collins who has been trying to get your attention."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you want to proceed? Do you want to proceed with your objection to considering House Joint Resolution 54? Representative Walsh."

W. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the question of the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment having been heard in this House one time before on a Resolution, having been defeated at that time and postponed and then again heard, Mr. Speaker, means that we may not again consider this question. And I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to House Rule 71 which states, 'The rules of parliamentary practice comprised in the latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order, newly revised, shall govern the House in all cases in which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with the standing rules and orders of the House.' Robert's Rules on the question says and this is the point, 'A main motion is a motion whose introduction brings business before the Assembly.' And I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that a main motion in this House is a Bill or/and a Resolution. Robert's continues, 'The d... main motion is in order...'"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that issue has already been decided when this Resolution was introduced. If



there's ever a duplication, this motion is out of order. It has been decided on on the introduction, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "No, I'll have to rule against you on that, Representative Matijevec. Representative Walsh did make this point on several occasions and I told him that at the time before this matter would be up for consideration that we would... we would put the question with respect to his objections. So that's the way. Representative Walsh."

W. Walsh: "And I hope, to begin with, Mr. Speaker, that you will conduct the business of this House like a gentleman. There are people who have strong feelings on both sides of this issue and that you will recognize people who have something to say on the issue and permit me, Sir, to respond to what your decision with respect to this point that I raise is."

Speaker Redmond: "That I will do. That I will do and I will request that every Member on the floor exercise the same ladylike and gentleman courtesy that you expect the Chair to extend to you."

W. Walsh: "And now, Mr. Speaker, no main motion is in order which presents substantially the same question as a motion previously rejected during the same Session which clearly the question of the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment is and this is a duplication of that question, of that main motion, Bill or Resolution. And apart from a motion to rescind or to amend something previously adopted, no main motion is in order that conflicts with a motion previously adopted at any time and still in force. No main motion is in order that would conflict with or that presents substantially the same question as one which has been temporarily disposed whether in the same or the preceding Session and which remains within the control of the Assembly. And now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you rule on my point and that when you rule, I be permitted to respond provided the ruling is... adverse to my position."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh, I will rule that I will recognize you to respond if you either agree or disagree. If you disagree, I will assume that you will make a motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair. That motion will be put. That motion will



be put. All courtesy will be extended to you and to every other Member on this floor. The only thing that I request in return is the same kind of courtesy, which you expect, will be extended to the Chair. Representative Walsh."

W. Walsh: "I do not wish you to assume anything, Mr. Speaker, but to recognize me and treat me as a gentleman and a person who represents two hundred thousand people in this state."

Speaker Redmond: "Your district's too big then. You give back those seventy thousand in DuPage County and give us the Third District. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. The Gentleman was quoting from Robert's Rules of Order and he used the word 'Session' and I wondered if in Robert's, the context of Robert's, Session doesn't refer to what we would call Legislative Day because as I recall, one of the rules he read indicated that if a matter had been decided upon in the current or disposed of in the current or previous Session, it couldn't come up again for a vote. If you interpret Session in the way that we interpret Session, that means that anything rejected in the 80th... 79th General Assembly couldn't be reintroduced into the 80th General Assembly. I think what we're talking about is Legislative Day and I think the motion is out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the motion is in order. And Representative Walsh together with some other of his colleagues came to my office probably two weeks ago and submitted their position in writing. And since that time, we've had the opportunity to research the matter. I know... I've been advised by the Parliamentarian that this is a matter upon which there is no debate at the present time. Representative Bradley, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bradley: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. And before you make your ruling, I think of... on page 12 there may be an item that would bring some bearing on your ruling. And I refer to House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #55. Just to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if you rule against Mr. Walsh, we go with the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. And I assume that everybody as they thought two weeks ago that they had the votes to pass



it, let's assume that it doesn't pass. Then we assume that we... Mr. Speaker, then we would be in a position again to discharge House Joint Resolution #55. If you rule against Mr. Walsh, we could go with 55 on a discharge motion and we would be right back in the same position that we are today. Now Robert's Rules of Order protects the Body from just exactly that happening. And Mr. Speaker, I hope that that would be taken into consideration by you when you make your ruling. You can see what could happen. We could take this issue up every week from now on and I think that, Sir, is not what Robert's Rules of Order had in mind when they said, talked about the main motion being put. It's right there in the Calendar. We can go to it again and again and again when we've got a lot of work to do in the House and I hope you take that into consideration, Mr. Speaker, when you're making that ruling."

Speaker Redmond: "Well as I said, Representative Walsh was in the office the other day and in writing he submitted his objections and called the Chair's attention to Robert's Rules of Order. We have given considerable thought not only to the contents of Robert's Rules of Order, but also the custom of the House in previous rulings in the House. The same objection was raised in the last Session in connection with the veto motion. The issue is whether a motion to override a veto could be renewed by a different Sponsor after once having been defeated. At that time, the Chair ruled the motion was renewable in the form of a new motion by a different Sponsor on a different Legislative Day. Our rules granted and still grant each Member the right to file a veto motion. The Chair held that the identical motion on the same day would be dilatory and that for purposes of our Legislative Body, the provision in Robert's regarding Session means a particular Legislative Day. On numerous occasions the Chair has ruled that subsequent Amendments to a Bill which are inconsistent in substance to a prior adopted Amendment are in order and that if adopted, a later Amendment can wipe out a prior Amendment. In this Session, the budget for the appropriation for the Department of Insurance was defeated. That same appropriation was attached as an Amendment to another Bill. If we



were precluded from hearing the same or comparable measures, we would not be in a position to pass upon the appropriation of the budget of the Department of Insurance. The Habitual Criminal Bill is another one. The exact content of the Amendment with respect to Representative Kosinski's Habitual Criminal Bill has been considered and it is again before consideration here. It is my judgment and in a bicameral legislative Body where the practice has been ever since I have been here that if a Bill is defeated in one House, that it's permissible to introduce it even in that House and certainly to introduce it in the second chamber, that that has always been the practice and the custom as far as the General Assembly is concerned. Anything else, I don't believe, makes it possible and workable to have a bicameral legislative Session that extends over a period of two years. We do not have any Joint Rules, so it is in my opinion Representative Walsh's objection is not well taken and that I will rule that the consideration of House Joint Resolution 54 resubmitted by Representative Davis is in order. Representative Walsh."

W. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, you said that a group of us called on you a couple of days ago. I have my memorandum that we submitted to you nine days ago on June 13. At which time Representative Collins, Leinenweber, Hudson, Deuster, Ebbesen and I stopped to see you and we laid on the table exactly what we had in mind. We gave you a copy of this memorandum, Mr. Speaker, and from time to time since then I have talked with your Parliamentarian and have asked him and the last time as recently, it seems to me, as Tuesday when I said, 'How are you going to rule on my question?' And he said, 'It is under consideration.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of times and as recently as yesterday requested of you some indication of how you were going to rule on my objection. You said to me that however we rule, the Chair will be appealed. There will be an appeal of the ruling of the Chair. I agreed that that was probably correct but you gave me no indication, Sir, of how you were going to rule. You, Sir, with your vast resources, the staff that you have, have had nine days to look over our procedure and you request of me and the people that are interested in some kind of





parliamentary procedure that is not madness, you request of us two minutes to digest what you just said. Now in view of your position, Mr. Speaker, I move under the provisions of Rule 61 that this matter be postponed to Monday, June 26, at three p.m. And I ask, Sir, for a Roll Call on that question."

Speaker Redmond: "The motion is in order. Any discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I see some of the opposition to bringing this up at this time, I've heard some say that we've got a lot of business to do. We've got a lot of business to do before the June 30th, hopefully, adjournment of this Session. The only purpose for this motion, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is to try to defeat the Equal Rights Amendment by further delay. The maker of the motion knows as all of us do that the last time that the motion... that the Equal Rights Amendment was brought before the floor, that it in fact had the required number of votes. And possible if we sat around for another half hour, everything would have worked out all right and the votes would have been there. The maker of this motion is fearful that possibly the votes may be here and he further wants to delay. That's really what it's all about. And I think that if... if they say on the one hand that we've got so much time, we have so little time around here that this matter shouldn't be brought up because it's a matter of duplication, that's one thing. But here by making this motion all the maker of the motion is trying to do is delay the matter in bringing it up at a time when we have less time to consider the Equal Rights Amendment because we are getting near the end of the Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Everything the Gentleman's saying is assumption on his part, his personal opinion. He's not speaking to the motion and he either ought to speak to the motion or sit down."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."



Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's proper, I think, to move the previous question on the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "The question...it's a proper motion and the question is on Representative Van Duyne's motion that the previous question on Representative Walsh's motion be put. The question is, shall that main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Two-thirds vote. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I've been trying to get your attention since you took the Chair and I find it hard to believe you couldn't hear me. You, Mr. Chairman...Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind you, not only are you Speaker but you are Chairman of the Rules Committee. And apparently the rules, to you, Sir, mean something to be used to attain your own purposes and end. When you took the Chair, Representative Williams had risen on...on a motion, which was quite proper...properly in order, on Rule 10(b). Mr. Speaker, every time they don't agree with what we're saying they think they have a point of order..."

Speaker Redmond: "That seems to be kind of an endemic problem around here, you disagree and you raise a point of order. Conclude your remarks."

Collins: "A difference of opinion is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker and I think you would rule that."

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct."

Collins: "But I'd like to further point out, Mr. Speaker, that not only did Representative Williams make a valid motion, which you chose to ignore in your position as Speaker and Chairman of the Rules Committee, but I made...I made the similar motion the other day and rather than rule on it you quickly adjourned this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, we're all Members with the same rights and privileges of this House, I believe. I resent the treatment that many of us are receiving here, at your hand, Sir. Especially I resent the treatment that I have received. Representative Williams was victimized by the same high-handed methods today and I think that you should entertain that motion



which he put. It's a simple matter to dispose of, it takes 89 votes and you should put that motion, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like you to at least pretend like you're listening to me even if you don't choose to."

Speaker Redmond: "Well the only problem is, I listened to the remarks that directed themselves to the motion and I filtered out those that did not refer to the motion."

Collins: "What you've afforded some of us is much less than courteous and I think that if nothing else you should afford the same kind of treatment to us that you asked us to extend to the Chair. It becomes extremely difficult to act in a courteous and gentlemanly manner, Sir, when you are hit over the head with strong arm tactics. And I say that only you...you are accountable for these strong arm tactics."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 'aye' and 54 'no'. The motion carries with the necessary two-thirds vote. Representative Bowman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bowman: "On the main motion, what is necessary to...for the motion to carry?"

Speaker Redmond: "A simple majority."

Bowman: "A simple majority or a Constitutional Majority?"

Speaker Redmond: "Simple majority. The question is on... Representative Walsh, to close."

Walsh: "Well my argument, Mr. Speaker, is one of just simple fairness. The proponents of this measure...and I openly confess that I am not one of them, I am an opponent and consider myself a strong one. There's some question here, Mr. Speaker, of whether the motion for previous question prevailed and it did in my view. I ask though, on the Roll Call, on the question of postponing this matter until Monday, June 26, at 3:00 p.m., that you consider fairly the fact in the matter. None of the allegations that I've made have been denied by the Speaker. We did go and see him nine days ago, on June 13, and we did lay out our case pretty well, as much as we had at that time, and gave him a copy of our



memorandum. He has not shown us the courtesy of responding, if indeed he knew, unless he made this up in the last five minutes and I seriously question that he did. I wonder what motivates the Speaker. I wonder what and who and how he can possibly react in the way he does but he manages. I submit to you that in simple justice and in simple fairness, regardless of your position on the question of the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment, you sustain this motion to postpone. It is fair, it is right, it is just and I ask your indulgence.

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to postpone consideration of House Joint Constitutional Amendment 54 until Monday the 26th. Those in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, in support of the Gentleman's motion, I'd like to point out that in simple fairness equal rights should be granted to all people, not just those who favor the E.R.A. or the misnamed Amendment to the Constitution that's being proposed. Equal rights means that each Member of this General Assembly, no matter which side he sits on, no matter what he favors or disfavors, no matter what his feelings are, either for or against, or his right to not participate or refuse to participate by voting should be granted by the Speaker and by the presiding officer at any time. I find it very odd that equal rights has not been offered to all Members, just to those who happen to favor this misnomer called E.R.A. and I resent it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Sponsor of this motion has defended this motion on the basis that he felt he was treated unfairly and he gave the Speaker nine days to consider a ruling and asked for, I guess, a like amount of time to consider the Speaker's ruling. It seems to me that the Sponsor of this motion ought to be aware of the fact that the Speaker's ruling in that hallway or in the Speaker's Office is not a ruling of record, which would not be binding upon the Speaker unless it was made out here



before this Body. Secondly, the fact that the Speaker needs to give this Gentleman a like amount of time to give a ruling is of no force and effect because he does not have the power to rebut. The only recourse he has once the motion is made is a motion to overrule the Chair. And I suggest that that motion does not take nine days but something less than nine minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have watched the proceedings here for the last half hour and first of all, I want to commend you for being very, very fair. I think that you did some things that were not necessary because we elected you as the Speaker of this House to conduct the business of the House. And I think that anyone in this room and within the sound of my voice will recognize that up to this point you have been fair and reasonable and I would suggest that now we move ahead with the order of business... And cut out these delaying tactics because this is a matter that is going to have to come to a resolution and it might as well be now as on Monday at 3:00 o'clock."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, in support of the motion, let me remind you that on your Calendar there are two full pages of Appropriations Bills that are House Bills. These are important Bills because they will determine whether on July 1 there is money to operate state government. That has to be done between now and then. Some of those will take two days in the House and a minimum of three days in the Senate and probably more than that. Today is the 22nd of June. We've got nine months to consider the E.R.A. but we've got seven days to run state government. Now, I think we have time to do both and I think that the E.R.A. vote should be postponed until at least the House Bills are out of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that



one of the...a resolve to this is that it contains, in a motion that I have filed..."

Speaker Redmond: "I intend to call that on the next order of business."

Jones: "Then I would like to see that that is called..."

Speaker Redmond: "I will call that the next order of business. Have all voted? Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, I know that the patience of every Member...individual Member is really worn thin. And that none of us who ran for this office expected this kind of pressure and I'm sorry that I have to...I feel compelled to utter even one word because I know everyone is anxious to get on and do what is in their heart and what is in their conscience. Out of fairness to Representative Walsh I would like to say this, that I understand his motivation and I'd like to tell you what it is. We want this House to be fair to the Speaker and fair to every individual Member and fair to all of the thousands of people that we all represent. The reason for this motion, to give the House and the individual Members a little more time to consider the next order of business, which would be an appeal of the Speaker's ruling, is that most of us do not spend our evenings in Springfield reading Robert's Rules of Order, nor much of the time on the House... And I don't think many of us even have a copy of Robert's Rules of Order. And we want, at this time, so that... the opportunity for this grave subject to sink into everybody's mind. Now I know we can explain our votes on the appeal of the Chair but I know all of us have a tremendous respect for the Speaker and for the office of the Speaker, no matter how worked up and frenzied we get over individual issues and particularly when we suffer from what we feel are unfair and adverse rulings. It's a tough job that the Speaker has, we respect the Speaker and it is very rare that this House overrules a ruling of the Speaker. And so out of fairness to the Speaker and fairness to the...every individual Member we wanted a little time and we thought it was fair to put it off to a fixed time. You see, the



proponents have us all hanging here. They pick the time. That's not fair. How about letting the opponents and the proponents in this House together fix the time? Isn't that fair? So all know, so we can all... now I'm saying this in concluding my remarks that Robert's Rules of Order define a Session as a continuous series of meetings that adjourn with a motion to adjourn sine die. And we all know what that means. It means the end of the Session without a day. If the Speaker's ruling is to prevail and he said that a Session is one day, that means on Monday, we can debate E.R.A. On Tuesday, we can debate E.R.A. On Wednesday, on Thursday and then, should it pass, we'll have a Resolution to rescind and we'll be debating that Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday. We don't want that. That's not orderly and I suggest that we consider that carefully and when we get to the next order of business, when we consider appealing the rule, the Speaker's ruling, that we consider Robert's Rules of Order. And I thank you for your indulgence and your tired patience."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, you said you were going to enforce the rules of the House. Members have one minute to explain their votes and that's all."

Speaker Redmond: "Point is well taken. Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my dad served in this Assembly for eight years and I've been here four years. And based on what he told me when he was here and what I've observed since I was here, what the Speaker has ruled has been the rule all the time. Every one of the proponents of the opposition from time to time have presented rules, Resolutions and Amendments that are their pets time and time again. And they have been insulted if anyone even intimated that they were bringing them up once too often. So E.R.A. is just being treated like every other measure before this House. It is brought up as many times as the rules allow. So I say let's proceed on with the business."



Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 69 'aye' and 97 'no' and the motion fails. Representative Jones is recognized. Representative... Representative Walsh again."

W. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, we did not get to the appeal of the ruling of the Chair."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I..."

W. Walsh: "I had asked that you... that this be postponed so that we could make up some arguments. Now I would like to kind of wing it because your ruling, Sir..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute, I'll... give the Gentleman order, please."

W. Walsh: "Your ruling, Sir, is absurd. It's made out of whole cloth. Your Parliamentarian is a better Parliamentarian than that. And so I strongly feel that your Parliamentarian was pushed into this ruling. And if we are recognized now for that purpose, I'd like to be heard on the question of the appeal of the ruling of the Chair."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh is recognized. Representative Madison, point of order."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, my point of order is simply this. You made your ruling. It seems to me that timeliness would dictate that the Gentleman appeal the ruling of the Chair..."

Speaker Redmond: "I believe that that's what he intends to do."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, what he did do instead was to offer a motion to postpone rather than appeal the ruling of the Chair. I suggest to the Speaker that by offering a motion to postpone instead of appealing the ruling of the Chair, that he is not now timely in asking for that appeal."

Speaker Redmond: "No, I disagree with you, Representative Madison. I think that Representative Walsh is in order if he makes the motion that I anticipate that he will. Representative Bradley, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, certainly not going to be critical at all of your ruling, but if the rules are going to apply as Mr. Byers suggested to everybody, I think they should. I had risen to take





one minute of the time to explain my vote on Mr. Walsh's motion and evidently you did not see the light flashing or I was denied. But whatever it might be, I would suggest that from now on if we're going to go by the rules as some suggest and I certainly would go along with them that if my light is flashing or anybody else's light is flashing to speak, to explain their vote, that they certainly should be recognized. And I regret very much that I was not given that minute to reply and explain my position on that particular motion."

Speaker Redmond: "The Chair apologizes. From here on, I will recognize as I always have in the past to the best of my ability, anyone who seeks recognition. I will turn on the timer switch. You will have one minute to explain your vote. Representative Walsh."

W. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I recall the Speaker's objection to my point of order, he used as examples of matters that are considered not just once, but on several occasions - consideration of veto motions, Amendments, Concurrences, et cetera. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that those are not main motions and Robert's makes a distinction, a very clear distinction as to what a main motion is. And I should like to read once more what the definition is. A main motion is a motion whose introduction brings business before the Assembly. A veto motion does not do that. The matter is before the Assembly in the form of a Bill or a Resolution. A main motion can be made only when no other motion is pending and it ranks lower... lowest in the order of preference of motions. Mr. Speaker, clearly, Robert's Rules distinguishes between those things that you mentioned which are subsidiary motions and a subsidiary motion generally, Mr. Speaker, is a motion that affects a main motion - an Amendment, for example, a veto motion, a Concurrence. But it is not a main motion. Mr. Speaker, Robert's is clear. Common sense is clear that a main motion is a Bill or a Resolution and cannot again be considered. Because if it could, Mr. Speaker, then we ought to have a truck with about three thousand, three hundred Bills and about one thousand Resolutions rolled up that aisle and we ought to have Clerk O'Brien reading them and as they're read,



have Members make motions with respect to each and every one. Mr. Speaker, your ruling is absurd and you know it's absurd. Mr. Speaker, if it weren't... if it weren't for the fact that the people that feel as I do have some kind of fiscal responsibility, we would have done that to demonstrate the point to you, Sir. But we don't have to demonstrate the point, Mr. Speaker. I suspect you're wriggling. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, you feel worse about this than those of us, who are affected that, you're treating this way do. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that you have sold out to the tremendous forces... and you know, I don't think you're the only one that sold out either, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order. Is there any... On the Gentleman's... the Gentleman has moved to appeal the ruling of the Chair. Does anyone desire recognition on that point? Anyone desire recognition? The question... the question is, shall the Chair be overruled? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 61, 62 'aye' and 90 'no' and the appeal fails. Representative Kane, for what purpose do you rise?"

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, just to note that the rules do prohibit personal attacks on other Members and I think that we'd get through this afternoon in a much better order if speakers would not follow the example of the previous speaker and engage in personal invective. I don't think that that adds anything."

Speaker Redmond: "On the Calendar on page 12 appears a motion with respect to House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 54 by Representative J. David Jones. Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Schlickman: "I object, Mr. Speaker. You are going from one order of business to another order of business. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a hundred and seventy-seven elected Members of this House. You are but one of us, Mr. Speaker, who serves on that podium by our grace. Now, Mr. Speaker, you were on that podium earlier today when a Member sought recognition and received recognition by the Chair. And that Gentleman, a Gentleman from your side of



the aisle went to the order of motions. Specifically that motion which has been on the Calendar for a long, long time regarding a proposed Amendment to the Illinois Constitution. And, Mr. Speaker, that Gentleman duly elected to this Body was told he wasn't recognized for that purpose. Now, Mr. Speaker, where is the fairness in this House? Where is the equality in this House? Now, Mr. Speaker, may I have your attention? Mr. Speaker, this year we are celebrating the fifth hundredth anniversary of the birth of Sir Thomas Moore. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, may I have your attention? And I wish you'd look at me, Mr. Speaker. This year we are celebrating the five hundredth anniversary of the birth of Sir Thomas Moore. A Gentleman, Mr. Speaker, who like you was a civic... civil servant, who was a Gentleman, who was a lawyer. Mr. Speaker, he served his leader well - the King of England - as you have served your leader well. But Sir Thomas Moore stood for something, Mr. Speaker, that you don't acknowledge. And that's principle. He did what his King wanted until he reached the point where he could go no farther because of principle and conscience. I plead you, Mr. Speaker, subscribe to principle. Subscribe to conscience and treat us all equally whether you like what we want or don't like, but treat us equally. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, by your going from one order of business to another order of business, you're trampling the rights of Members. You are dishonoring, Mr. Speaker, your office as Speaker. I respectfully plead, Mr. Speaker, not to go to this order of business. If you want to stay at the other order of business, so be it. But let's not jump around willy-nilly as you want. Please, Mr. Speaker, let's stay where we were and not go to this order of business. But if we do go to this order of business, Mr. Speaker, I refer you to the rules of the House which say that when you do go to an order of business, you take matters in numerical order. And the first matter under... of motions, Mr. Speaker, is House Bill 2779. And that's where you'll start if you want to go to motions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman, we went to the Order of Constitutional Amendments, Third Reading. As subsidiary motions to that main motion, there were two motions. One by Representative



Deavers which he has withdrawn. The other one by Representative Jones. And I have been advised by the Parliamentarian that it is perfectly proper to take Representative Jones' motion. It's not only proper but necessary to take his... his motion - that the vote on the final House passage will be withheld until similar legislation has been proceeded in the same passage in the Senate. Now that is the ruling that it is proper to go to Representative Jones' subsidiary motion to House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 54. Representative Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a point of order. I'm looking at Rule 10, changing of order of business in our rules. It says, '(a) Any order of business may be changed at any time by the Speaker.' I suggest that we're going on and on and on in dilatory tactics. If you don't want to vote for E.R.A., don't vote for it, but don't keep delaying and delaying for nothing. We're wasting a lot of valuable taxpayers. time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, there's another principle that some people should acknowledge, the end does not justify the means. We are a deliberative Body, governed by rules, not by people's desire to achieve certain ends. That's the only way a deliberative Body of participatory government can survive. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are governed by Robert's Rules of Orders...we're governed by our rules first. Our rules say, Mr. Speaker, nothing about subsidiary motions. What our rules say is that when you go to an order of business, by your discretion, we take items within that order...in numerical order. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you want to go to the order of business...this order of business, which is unfair to at least one other Member of this House, a Member who sought and secured recognition until you found out what he wanted and then you just ignored him. You took him out. If you want to do that, Mr. Speaker, for god's sake, please comply with our rules which say when you go to an order of business...motions, you take them in numerical order and that's the



way it should be."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to endorse what Representative Schlickman just raised and I take it that you ruled Representative Geo-Karis' motion, in reference to Rule 10, is in order. And I suggest to you, I'm still waiting for an answer from you, as is Representative Williams, on the second part of that rule, Rule 10(b), which says that any Member may make a motion to change the order of business supported by any five Members. I have made that motion, Representative Totten has made that motion, Representative Williams has made that motion and you choose to ignore all three of us. As a matter of fact, the other night, rather than answer me you gaveled this House to an adjournment. Mr. Speaker, this is a proper motion and I would suggest that if you want to dispose of this motion put it to a vote, if you have the votes, beat us but please treat us equally. It is a proper motion and it is in order and I'm sure your Parliamentarian would so rule... And it was made prior to any other order of business after you assumed the Chair today."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I've quietly sat down when the Minority Leader said I was presupposing too much, I assume too much. I wish the Minority Leader would talk to his own people over there and have them sit down as quietly as I did when you said that I presuppose too much, that I assume too much. All I've heard is assumptions since I sat quietly down. Now lecture your own people over there."



Speaker Redmond: "The order of business is Constitutional Amendment, Third Reading. Representative Jones is recognized with respect to a motion which he has filed with respect to the Constitutional Amendment. Representative Jones."

J.D. Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a vote on today... on E.R.A. today in the House will be to no avail if similar action is not taken in the Senate. In order to insure that the Senate does take such action, my motion proposes that we withhold any action on this E.R.A. Resolution today in the House until the Senate has taken action to put the E.R.A. proposition into the same posture as it is in the House today. It's an exercise in futility to vote on this today not knowing what fate awaits it in the Senate. As we all know, the proposition must pass both Houses in order to ratify this Federal Amendment. My record will show that I have voted for E.R.A. every time it's come up, some thirteen times, but I will have to withhold my vote until the concept of this motion is an actual... actually accomplished. I move that we adopt this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

W. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, do I understand that if this motion prevails that you will not return to the Order of Constitutional Amendments and consider Constitutional Amendment 54? Is that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "I will return to... we will... we're on the Order of Constitutional Amendments, Third Reading. And on that order..."

W. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, we're on the Order of Motions and you know it."

Speaker Redmond: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 54. We will return to the main question when this motion, if this motion carries, we'll go to something else. If it fails, we'll proceed to consider House Joint Resolution 54. Representative Walsh."

W. Walsh: "Well then, what point is there, Mr. Speaker, in considering this since if it, whether it fails or is adopted, we are going to consider House Joint Resolution 54? What possible gain can there be in adopting this?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think you listened. If the motion carries, we will not consider House Joint Constitu... Resolution Constitutional Amendment because we'll have to wait until after the Senate



has considered it in accordance with Representative Jones' motion. If his motion carries, we will not consider the adoption of it. Any... Representative Greiman. Greiman."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the motion is in order. I don't want to stop the filibuster. Everybody's having fun over there, but it would seem to me that this is the suspension of rules as well as custom. Representative Davis is the Sponsor of the Bill. The Bill is on Third Reading. The... we've come to that order of business and this is... would be sort of tantamount to a temporary striking of the enacting clause I suspect. I think it's probably out of order. I don't object to it. You know, I certainly have a lot of respect for Representative Jones and wouldn't want him to be ruled out of order unnecessarily, but I think probably it is out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann. Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, we are not a unicameral legislative body. We are a bicameral legislative body. And in my sixteen years in the House I have yet to witness one instance where this House did not proceed to action on a measure because it had not yet been considered by the Senate. It's obvious as to what's happening. There is desperation among the opponents of E.R.A. They do not and will not recognize that the historic moment has arrived for the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment. Mr. Speaker, we fought that battle for human rights over a hundred years ago in the State of Illinois. Let's get on with the action of the House, let's vote this E.R.A. into law and let's give women the full rights of citizenship to which they're entitled. The motion's out of order and let's proceed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, in essence to... in the effort to save time, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, this is too serious not to make... everybody says they've got a point of order, but they don't want to make it. And I'm making this point of order totally unrelated to the



E.R.A. issue. This is the worst precedent I've ever seen to hold hostage to any Bill, legislation, Resolution and I mean that. Forget about E.R.A. because we are establishing a precedent and I don't want that precedent. And I therefore make the point of order that this motion is out of order, Mr. Speaker, and I ask you to rule on it because be careful of what your ruling could be in the future."

Speaker Redmond: "It's the ruling of the Chair that the motion is in order. Representative... anyone further? Representative Van Dwyne... motion. Question is on Representative Van Dwyne's motion for the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 99 'ayes' and 6 'no'. The motion carries. Representative Jones. Representative Jones to close on the motion."

J.D. Jones: "Mr. Speaker, this is a simple resolve to the questions that have been discussed here that we postpone, not take any action here until the Senate has put it in a proper perspective in the same posture because to pass it here today would be of no avail if the Senate does not take such action. And I've seen the proponents and they have seen fit to promote it over there and I think that that... now is the time."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor of the adoption of the motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "What type of vote does this require?"

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

Brummer: "What vote does this require for passage?"

Speaker Redmond: "Simple majority. Have all voted who wished? Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I think there's been some misstatements about the motion that Representative Jones has put. The motion does not require that the Constitutional Amendment shall have passed in the Senate, but just that it shall have moved to the point of passage with a motion over there that it shall be adopted - in the same position that we find ourselves now in on





this motion in the House. Just that they at least move that far. It doesn't say it has to have passed in the Senate already and I think it's no more than right and fair. We've been put through this emotional binge three times now in this term of the General Assembly and the Senate has not acted even once. I think that it is to no avail to anyone for this Constitutional Amendment to be adopted in the House and not be adopted in the Senate. It should at least be brought to the place where they have an opportunity to have it adopted. All this says is just, let them bring it up to the place where a motion is on the Calendar ready to be called before we also call our motion a third time in this House or a fourth or a fifth."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 71 'yes' and 95 'no' and the motion fails. Mr. Clerk, will you read the Amendment? House Joint Constitutional Amendment 54."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment to House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 54, Huff. Amendment #1 amends House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 54 on page 1, line 19 by inserting immediately after 'rights', the word 'of women'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, just to clarify something for my own use now.

Would you tell me how much time is going to be given to the proponent and the opponent? Are we going to go to that order of business, that type?"

Speaker Redmond: "There has been no restrictions imposed by this House. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, the order of business at this time is the Amendment. I would suggest you recognize Mr. Huff on the Amendment. And then would you recognize me because I have talked to Representative Ryan and I have a proposed motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would table this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman withdraws the Amendment. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I discussed this motion with the Minority Leader,



Mr. Ryan, and I now move that the debate on this Resolution be restricted to one proponent and one opponent and that the explanation of vote for each Member be limited to one minute each."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you repeat that again, Mr. Madigan? The Parliamentarian was talking to me."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I now move that the debate on this Resolution be restricted to one proponent and one opponent and that the explanation of vote be restricted to one minute for each individual Member. I so move, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's a very good motion. I would like to make an inquiry though of its Sponsor. Mr. Majority Leader, how much time are you suggesting that the proponent and the opponent each be given?"

Madigan: "I have no opinion on that, do you have a suggestion?"

Griesheimer: "I would say that the ten minute rule that is normally given to each side is more than adequate."

Madigan: "That's acceptable to me."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Bradley, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Gentleman's motion.

This is an issue that started some six years ago, six and a half years ago and we've debated this thing on the floor of this House every year that I've been here and sometimes two and three and four times. If it's that important of an issue then it certainly is that important that every Member be able to enter debate and every Member be able to explain his vote. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that I'm not able to support Mr. Madigan's motion to limit debate. Let's give everybody an opportunity to speak during debate. And there may be some new issues and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is a new issue that might want to...we might want to bring out. We've had hearings in Washington on the extension of the deadline for E.R.A. and I don't think that's been discussed on this floor. There's been some interesting testimony given by the attorneys...



the Federal Attorney General's Office and we might want to talk about those things. So, I oppose the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, this motion that the Gentleman makes is a confession as to the correctness of our position with respect to whether this should be heard or not. And I'd like to point out that I was a maker of a similar motion when the House Joint Constitutional Amendment was on Postponed Consideration the last time. And I suggested that it be treated in this way, in the short debate manner, because it was on Postponed Consideration and it's customary for Bills and Resolutions that have been heard once to be...to have debate cut short the second time. Now, Mr. Speaker, you have agreed to permit this to be heard. This particular numbered Constitutional Amendment has not been heard before and so there's really no justification for cutting off debate. I think those people who are Equal Rights Amendment proponents ought to have to suffer through another several hours of debate on this matter and not cut it off. So, I would oppose the Gentleman's motion with Representative Bradley."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. Purposes of an introduction. I think at this point everyone in this room would like to know that the First Lady of Illinois is in the gallery, in the Speaker's gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support the motion to limit the debate to ten minutes for the opponent, ten minutes for the proponent and one minute for explanation of vote. We have heard this issue for six solid years. There is nothing more the opponents could tell us. All we've been hearing today is motions, dilatory, dilatory and dilatory, so let's get on with the business of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, everybody knows when an introduction is made I



follow up with an introduction. Because that introduction was made, I'd like to say and introduce our Comptroller, Mike Bakalis, right here in back."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question once more."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Representative Porter."

Porter: "Would the Chair advise the Members as to what vote it takes to pass this motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "89 votes. The question is on Representative Madigan's motion. Representative Porter, for what purpose do you rise?"

Porter: "Isn't this in effect a motion to cut off debate and wouldn't it take two-thirds?"

Speaker Redmond: "The motion to suspend the debate rule is the Parliamentarian's advice. Representative... The question is on Representative Madigan's motion to limit debate. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Schuneman.

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I believe you ruled previously on the question that was presented by Representative Porter and your ruling was contrary to the one you just made."

Speaker Redmond: "That was a different motion."

Schuneman: "I believe not, Sir... Because I raised the point at the time. I don't remember the issue but it was during this particular Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 108 'aye' and 43 'no' and the motion carries. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, you...the House has now voted to limit debate, I think we can limit it even further if you'll impose the restrictions in Rule 54. I specifically refer to the last line of Rule 54."



Speaker Redmond: "I can't disagree with you but... Will you read the line that you're referring to?"

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. And I think this rule should be imposed, the line says: 'No filming is permitted while Members are explaining their votes.'"

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on... Read House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 54."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 54. Whereas, the Ninety-Second Congress of the United States of America at its Second Session in both Houses, by a Constitutional Majority of two-thirds thereof, adopted the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America. Joint Resolution. Resolved, by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States America in Congress assembled (Two-thirds of each House concurring therein), that the following Article is proposed as an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several states within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress: Article. Section 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex. Section 2. Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this Article. Section 3. This Amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification. Therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that such proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be and the same is hereby ratified; and be it further resolved, that a certified copy of this Resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State of Illinois to the Administrator of General Services of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Illinois in the Congress



of the United States. Third Reading of the Constitutional Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Corneal Davis, on the Resolution...

Representative Griesheimer, for what purpose do you rise?"

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Do we understand now that the limiting vote that was just taken on Representative Madigan's motion limits each speaker to ten minutes..."

Speaker Redmond: "One proponent, one opponent, ten minutes.

Explanation of votes one minute. The timer will be on and if you get cut off don't blame me. Representative Corneal Davis, on the Resolution... Representative Tipsword, for what purpose do you rise?"

Tipsword: "It appears to me that the House floor is extraordinarily filled today and it also appears to me that there are people who might not be entitled to the floor of the House. That does not include the Senators who are visiting with us but I would suggest that all people not entitled to the floor be removed from the floor, we've got enough help on this issue."

Speaker Redmond: "Your point is well taken. All unauthorized persons leave the floor. It is the intention of the Chair to call for a Verified Oral Roll Call on this matter. All unauthorized persons leave the floor. Representative Corneal Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to thank you for recognizing me. Frankly, I don't know whether to speak or whether to cry. It seems that for a little while that this House had lost their reasoning but thank God we've come now to the time when we're going to debate this issue. Because this is no longer an issue that affects Illinois, this is an issue that affects this nation. This nation that, despite all the humiliations I have had to endure, I still love this nation and say it is one of the strongest, one of the greatest nations on God's green earth and my prayer is that it will continue to be great. Now you heard the 27th Constitutional Amendment proposal read to you, certainly I want go over it I'm just going to cover some of the myths, the many myths. One, they say that E.R.A.



is anti-male. Now, you heard it, it does not say men and women are the same but it does say they should be treated equal before the law. You've heard the myths that E.R.A. will destroy the family. The last six Presidents of these United States have endorsed E.R.A. Are you saying that the last six Presidents of these United States would destroy the family, the foundation upon which this nation was established? Then let me point out to you that 35 states have approved, have ratified this Amendment. Are you saying that 35 states in this nation is against the family? Is that what you're saying? There have been some people who have said that this will permit...I'm talking about the myths now, homosexuals to marry. In all of these 35 states that have ratified it, do you know of any case where any homosexuals have married? If you do point them out. This state says that women will not have the right to be supported by their husbands in any state. Have you known of any law, can you tell me of any law where women don't have the right to be supported by their husbands if they can prove that the husbands should support them? Now, let me say this, the great Governor of this state is behind this Amendment. My distinguished friend over there said that we were stalling the Amendment. No, I was not stalling the Amendment. I have been courteous. I have been kind. I have respected every Governor in this state. Out of respect for his excellency, Governor Thompson, whose charming and beautiful wife sits up there, who my wife and I dearly admire, I postponed consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Please, give the Gentleman order. Some of the Members have indicated that they can't hear. Please give him order. All unauthorized persons off the floor. Members, please be in their seats."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, take that off of the time now. I have not only given him respect but he's still for this Amendment. The champion ...of this Democratic Party is standing here in the rear, Michael Bakalis, he's for this Amendment. Are you saying that these men whom you've entrusted to run...the man whom you've entrusted



the running of this state to would destroy the family? Is that what you think? In these 35 states there has been no law... and I hate to have to bring it up but it has even been suggested that we would have to establish separate toilets. There's been no states among these 35 where we have separated toilets. I say this, E.R.A. will not affect the social relationship between men and women. You say, 'Well what will E.R.A. do?' It will outlaw discrimination because of a woman's sex. And let me tell you this here and now, why should Illinois...and I love that Illinois, Illinois. I love that name Grant and Logan. You can't love it like I do, that's the name that freed my grandfather. I love that name Grant and Logan, do you hear me? Why would Illinois follow ten rebel Southern states? These are the states that have not ratified this Amendment. Ten rebel Southern states. I call it back here now because they have said time and time and again that black men were the cause of this Bill...this Amendment being defeated. I called it back because you said that the white men were hid in trees, white man was hid in bushes, white man was hid everywhere... I call on those men who believe in liberty, climb down out of your trees now. Mr. Moon, Moon, bright and silvery Moon, shine on those men and let them climb down out of their trees and let them see whether or not they stand for liberty. Let me tell you this...and I'm sorry that I have to do this. The ten states that seceded against this nation are the states that are blocking it. I hold in my hand here the most scurrilous literature that has ever been distributed in this state, listen to what it says: 'E.R.A. is a plot to wreck Christian homes. The E.R.A. is promoted by anti-Christian Jews who want to destroy this nation. It's promoted by Jews...' Let me tell you this, some women sent for me and said they were ashamed of me because I was a Preacher. Let me tell you this, when you start to run down God's chosen people...hear the words of the great prophet Isaiah, hear his words, if you will, that 'A virgin shall conceive.' This is what he said and that virgin did conceive. And who did she conceive?





A little beautiful Jewish baby... He was born of her bones, flesh of her flesh, not the flesh of a man and a woman.

That little baby, that little baby is the baby I wish that... God in heaven knows... That little baby is the baby that millions of you wish... Read this scurrilous literature here, that Jews want to take over this... Read it, if you please.

They're God's chosen people. Why would you have anti... American...this is addressed to six black Congressmen asking them to vote against the Jews. Why would... Let me stand here and say this, I pledge now...allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God...do you hear me? How in the name of God can you say that you pledge allegiance to one nation, under God, indivisible, when you seek to divide this nation. You seek to divide it by race. You seek to divide it by color. You seek to divide it by creed. Let me tell you, freedom, freedom is indivisible, do you hear? And this is what you say in your Constitution, 'with liberty, with justice, with freedom for all.'

Either you swear that this nation is indivisible or you swear... and when you swear that it's indivisible and you would do things to divide it, you swear to a lie. Do you hear me? If you pull things like this to divide this nation that's exactly what you swear to. Let me bring you back now and I'll finish: There was a man on your side of the aisle. Do you know what he said? People doubted whether or not he wanted to free the slaves. And I'm going to tell you what he said in his second inaugural, in his second inaugural address, this is what Mr. Lincoln said, 'For every drop of blood that has been drawn with a lash, I'm going to draw another one with a sword. I'm tired of trying to reason This is what Mr. Lincoln said, 'to bring you back into this union, to make it one nation indivisible. I'm tired of trying to reason with you.' He let down the bars. He let men and women of all races and creeds. Come into the army. Two hundred and fifty thousand black men camped with General Grant at Vicksburg, two hundred and fifty thousand black men rode



with Sherman to the sea; this land was saved; the slave was set free and the dream goes on. Will you stop that dream of freedom? Freedom for everybody, freedom now. The same people who promote this, the same people who are against this, the same people who distribute this scurrilous literature were the same people who were against the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Who are the people that promote this? They are the people which marched with Dr. Martin Luther King. Jews, Gentiles, Christian alike marched with him until the separate but equal doctrine was overthrown. And I can walk down the streets of America with an upright step of a man, I can walk and feel that the country that I've been wounded for... Come look at me... That the country that I've been scarred for, that country loves me because that country has destroyed the separate but equal doctrine. Stand up now for your President on that side of the aisle. Stand for freedom, I say to you, for by it your forefathers stood and moved in truth... Living, defending, dying from their billows with their last blessing the passed it on to you."

Speaker Redmond: "The Chair recognizes Representative Deuster in opposition. Representative Deuster. Please give the Gentleman order."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order." Representative Jones, give the Gentleman order."

Deuster: "Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, the former...the prior speaker, Representative Davis, is a person that I regard as a dear friend. And if I have deep affection and respect and love for any other Member of this House, it's the feeling that I have for Representative Davis. And I have the highest regard for his sincerity and his devotion and his many years of contributions to the cause of freedom and equality. However, the matter before us, of course, does not involve the individual personalities of these Members here. It involves a subject of which we are weary. Some say that the eyes of the nation and I think President Carter said the eyes, maybe of the world, were on us here in Illinois. And as individual Members many of us know that this is not



a historic moment but this is a moment that has been historic and we've had it over and over and over and again. I don't want to provide us with any oratory, I want to provide the Members of this House who want to follow their conscience and want to deliberate and do the right thing, the thing that in their hearts and in their minds they can live with the rest of their lives... Not on the basis of pointing to God or pointing to the flag or pointing to lovely ladies or pointing to anything, but pointing to the Constitution and the facts and the law. We have before us a suggestion by some people that there's something wrong with the United States Constitution. It was about a year ago the Judiciary Committee met in this chamber and there was a Rabbi from Skokie who said, and I think it's important for all of us to remember this, he said; 'When someone comes before you and says the Constitution of the United States is defective, the burden of proof is on that person to convince you beyond all doubt that there's something wrong with that Constitution and that Constitution needs to be changed.' I think all of you, as I have, have gotten letters from ladies saying, 'Please put us into the Constitution. We are not in the Constitution.' And I have been sending Constitutions to the women and to everybody in my district because all you have to do is open up the Constitution and read it and you'll see that women are in there. The question before us is not whether we're for women or how we provide equality for women or freedom for women or rights for women. The question is not whether we do that but how do we do it best? If you'll read the Constitution you'll see that women are equal now. My wife, my four daughters, your wife, your husband, every person in this chamber, every individual person in Illinois and every woman in America is a person. If you have any doubt about that, there have been over 180 cases heard by the United States Supreme Court and the Federal Court in which the plaintiffs were women and the plaintiffs were successful and they were asserting their Constitutional rights. If you have any doubt, we all know about the



abortion decision, who do you think the plaintiffs were in the abortion decision? Men? We can't have abortions. It's clear that the women of America have equal rights and they have those equal rights now and if there are any problems the only thing we have to do is to enforce those...those points. I would like to say this, I'll go over some of the points that Members say are scare tactics, or aren't true or...as a matter of fact, my wife and I were watching television one night and we heard Dillon Smith of W.B.B.M. come on and say the opposition arguments were dishonest. Monday morning I wrote him a letter and said, 'What did you mean, dishonest?' He said, 'On this argument about military service.' Military service. I have in my hand the Judiciary Committee Report of the United States Congress, made up entirely of lawyers, they've got a staff of lawyers...about 50. They heard hearings on this subject and when that...that Committee heard this proposed Equal Rights Amendment they concluded that it would...and I'm reading from the report, require that women be compelled to serve in the military and serve in combat. This is nothing specious, this is nothing dishonest, it's right there. I don't think any individual Member and particularly new Members who are having any doubts and are wrestling with their conscience, should vote for this change unless you've read the report of the United States Congress. That's one document. Now, when Congress heard this in the Judiciary Committee they realized that this would require American women to be compelled to do what no civilized nation, including Israel, does and that is to put women into combat military service. So they adopted an Amendment. And it was a hard fought vote inside that Committee, 19 to 16 they adopted the Wiggins Amendment which reads as follows: 'This Article shall not impair the validity of any law of the United States which exempts a person from compulsory military service, or any other law of the United States or of any state which reasonably promotes the health and safety of the people.' Now, when this Bill came to the floor of the U.S. House, that place...



we were in the middle of the Vietnam War and barefoot college girls all over there, they were trying to get us out of the war...and Congress, bowing to the pressure of militant feminists, the Wiggins Amendment. And that's the reason that this proposal is in such trouble. This is why four states have rescinded. This is why we are in our, going into our seventh year to consider something that no other Constitutional Amendment has ever done. Now, the prior speaker mentioned that every President of the United States has endorsed this. I want to make this statement... and I was there, so I know. There was only one President of the United States that had an opportunity to vote on the Equal Rights Amendment and that was former President Jerry Ford. Some of you know how he voted. The women came to him and said, 'You've got to vote for equality.' And he said, 'I can't go back to Grand Rapids, Michigan, and face those people and say that I voted to send women into combat.' And they said, 'Well, symbolically it's important.' He said...as Republican leader, he occupied the same position that George Ryan occupies, they said it wouldn't look good for the Republican leader not to be for equality and we don't want you to vote 'no'. So, President Jerry Ford took a walk. He took a walk. And he's the only President who is on record on this subject, he's the only President. Now, I'll say this..."

Speaker Redmond: "Is that like Ryan?"

Deuster: "If you'll... I think all of us are under enough pressure without having officials of the Executive Branch, who constitutionally are not involved in this, telling us how to vote. I think we are all...as Legislators have to vote. One point about the Equal Rights Amendment is, first, it's unnecessary. Women are already in there, they're persons and they've got equality. Secondly, it's inflexible because Congress struck the Wiggins Amendment, which would have allowed us to adopt reasonable regulations. The other day we had an Amendment concerning sex discrimination in insurance and it would have prohibited sex discrimination in insurance. And what did we do with that? We



defeated that Amendment because we knew, in that special area, the insurance companies had some valid reason for grouping. . . . The Equal Rights Amendment is inflexible. Congress, 1972, as some of you may know, adopted the Education Amendment and they...they said there will be no sex discrimination in educational policies. And they gave the Department of Health, Education and Welfare rule-making authority, I'm holding their rule up here. If you want to turn over to the Federal Government authority to regulate your lives in every area, divorce, marriage, adoption of children, everything, then just give some attention to what they did in the area of education. Here is one of the regulations they came up with. This is the Federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare, they said this is okay, 'A recipient may provide separate toilets, locker room and shower facilities on the basis of sex.' I submit to you that if it was necessary for the bureaucrats to dredge up an exception, there is some legitimacy to the concern that E.R.A. would force the Supreme Court of the United States, case by case, to come up with these kinds of exceptions. Another provision in here is that abortion rights are guaranteed. There are many Members here who are for the right to life and against abortion. And right in these regulations it provides that when you prohibit sex discrimination you cannot deny anybody the right to have an abortion, even under a college health insurance program. That's right in here, this is not oratory. These are federal regulations and I would suggest, particularly to the Members from Chicago, that they consider this testimony of the Justice Department as to what E.R.A. will mean. It will mean preferential quotas to get an equal number of women and men on police forces and fire departments and in the armed services. You want Judge Prentice Marshall to have another tool to come in and run your City of Chicago Personnel Department? I suggest to this that we already have equality. There's no reason to fall over backwards or forwards and give the Federal Judges further tools for intervening in your areas of local government. I have this feeling, Ladies and



Gentlemen, that we are being subjected to pressures from political leaders who, for political reasons not Constitutional reasons, think that there's a woman's vote out there somewhere. And they have put their fingers up in the air and if they're running for some office or they're a political leader, they think that they should call you and say, 'Vote 'yes'. because we want to get women's votes.' And I think it's...any of you who have had your eyes open during the last days, you have seen hundreds and thousands of women down here who don't want this..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "If anything, these seven years have proven it's that the women are equally divided. No consensus has been developed. There are great dangers in here, for goodness sakes vote your conscience so that from this day forward when you look...yourself in the mirror in the morning, either to put on your lipstick or shave or whatever you do in the morning, you can sleep...you can say to yourself, 'I voted. I voted my conscience. I did what was right and I stood up and I took the heat and I can go back to my people and say I voted against this because it's wrong and I don't think the women of Illinois or America need it.' And I thank you for the time and I urge you to vote 'no' or if you have to, 'present' on this question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan. I believe that Representative Madigan's motion was for ten minutes in chief for both the proponent and the opponent and there was no provision in the motion for closing, is my memory. The question is... No, we're in good order here and I see that there aren't unauthorized people on the floor. I think we can do it faster by just having a regular Roll Call. The question is, shall the House adopt House Joint Constitutional Amendment 54? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Anyone desiring to explain his vote? Representative Kent. Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Rule 54 I would urge you to direct that the cameras can no longer film on explanation of vote and ask the Doorman to close them down and remove them."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword has pointed out that Rule 54 does not permit filming while Members are explaining their votes. In accordance with the rules, filming will not be permitted now. The t.v. camera light is out. Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This will be the eighth time that I have voted 'no'. Equal rights. Who could be against them? I am not. I spoke before 500 girls at the Girl's State in Jacksonville just Tuesday night. And I...and over three-fourths of those girls stood when I said I am opposed to the Equal Rights Amendment. The other part was, the thing...the big problem that they have is that they have co-ed physical education classes and they want it stopped. Do you think it will stop if the E.R.A. passes? I say it won't. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady. One minute to explain your vote, the timer is on."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also, after several years debating and voting on this issue... In my own mind I think it can best be expressed by putting it in the format of an accounting ledger. I think the question is before us, should we vote 'yes' for equality or should we vote 'no' because we feel that women may have to serve their country in some capacity during a time of war? The question is, should we vote 'yes' for equality or 'no' because we feel our family units, which we hold as precious, may in some way be threatened? The question is, should we vote 'yes' for equality or 'no' because we feel the Federal Courts may in the future interpret this Amendment to mean something other than the basic equality which we as a nation are committed to? Ladies and Gentlemen, I stand here today fully realizing that there are those who differ with my position in good conscience and I can understand that. But I feel very strongly, as an individual who has always supported protection measures for women of our state, as one who has always voted in favor of pro-life issues and the protection of the family unit and as one who doesn't think we should allow the Federal Courts to dictate legislative intent, that we as a legislative Body meeting today, at this moment





in history; should vote overwhelmingly in favor of equality for all. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson. The timer is on, one minute."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise again in opposition to the E.R.A, as I have so many times before. Woodrow Wilson once said that 'The history of liberty is the history of limitations of governmental power, not the increase of it.' He also maintained that when we resist the concentration of power we are resisting the powers of death because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberty. Section 2 of the E.R.A. is a mandate for the concentration of power on the Federal Government. It gives Congress the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of Section 2, about which...this Amendment, very few agree. I cannot, for one, equate the concentrated power of the Federal Government and the court to restructure our social fabric according to their current ideologies as freedom. I cannot equate a Congress forced to draft young women and send them into combat, with freedom. I cannot equate the forced dissolution of single sex organizations, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Masons, Knights of Columbus, fraternities, sororities, with freedom. I cannot equate the forced..."

Speaker Redmond: "...time, Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "...into a doctrinaire mold of sameness, with freedom. Quite to the contrary, the E.R.A., in spite of its..."

Speaker Redmond: "Your time is expiring, Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I am closing. I cannot equate the destruction of rights and freedoms of our American women who have taken so long for granted, with freedom. It's a legislative snare, a cruel... delusion...and I remain firm in my conviction that this is counter to freedom in this country and we will live to regret it if we pass this. I implore each of my colleagues, before they cast their final vote on this..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson, your time has expired."

Hudson: "Representative Greiman. The timer is on."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, if I had sons I would not want them to serve in



combat, I suppose, but I have six daughters and I want them not to serve in combat either. But I want them to be treated as equal citizens. One of the responsibilities of being a citizen is to stand up when your country is in trouble. Whether you're a man or whether you're a woman, it's to stand up and say, 'I will serve.' If my daughters are called upon to serve they will serve. I'm for the Equal Rights Amendment and I'll be for it today and I know it's going to pass today. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've sat through this for six years and I've never spoke on this issue but I'd like to remind some of my Democratic friends from Chicago of what's going to happen when the Federal Courts get through interpreting this rule. Ten years ago they passed a Civil Rights Act. Now the courts are telling the police departments and the fire departments in cities all across the country how to hire...a preferential quota. When they get through with...if this Amendment passes and the Federal Courts get through with their mischief they'll be telling you you have to have 40% men and 40% women and 20% homosexuals on all the police departments and fire departments in the country. And you may laugh at this now because it sounds funny but we all know that the Federal Courts are liable to rule any way. And some homosexual group is going to go to court and...and get a Judge to pass down a decision that they've got to have 10 or 15 or 20% homosexuals on the police and fire departments and in the schools teaching your children. This is what's going to happen. I know many of you people on the other side of the aisle are voting for this because your arm has been twisted off and possibly when you vote green you'll have to go in the bathroom to throw up, because I know you're against it. But stand up for what you think is right and vote 'no'. Just think what's going to happen to our City of Chicago when the Federal Courts get through interpreting this new rule."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison. One minute to explain his vote."



The timer is on."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I sat very quietly and I listened to the opponent of this measure as he went through his debate for his allotted amount of time and the applause that was given him after he finished. And I agree that the applause was deserved, in terms of some of his presentations, but Mr. Speaker, I deeply resent his references to the ruling by Judge Prentice Marshall as it related to the sex and race discrimination case being handled in Chicago, relative to the Chicago Police Department. Now, this Gentleman had the audacity to suggest, to ask rather, if you would want your lives placed in the hands of Judge Prentice Marshall. Well let me just say this, if that applause that you gave him included applause for the statements he made relative to Judge Prentice Marshall's ruling, then I'd gladly place my life in the hands of Judge Prentice Marshall and I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the proposed 27th Amendment to the United States Constitution, E.R.A., has two major deficiencies. It's in conflict with the equal protection of the law clause of the 14th Amendment and it would apply only on the basis of sex without consideration of the basis of age, race, religion and ancestry. The equal protection of the laws clause, unlike E.R.A., applies to all persons. It insures that no person shall be unreasonably discriminated against by any of the states. As a consequence, the Supreme Court of the United States has handed down a long line of decisions prohibiting discrimination against women under the equal protection of the laws clause. The beauty of the equal protection of the laws clause is that while the states are prohibited from unreasonable classification, they can provide for reasonable classification; and therefore, can provide protection and benefits on account of sex. On the other hand, E.R.A. would allow for no classification, reasonable or unreasonable. If E.R.A. is ratified, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, for the first time



in the history of this country we will have two conflicting Amendments to the Constitution; one that allows for reasonable classification and one that does not allow for any classification. Furthermore, we will have an Amendment that will prohibit classification of any kind on account of sex, but it will not prohibit classification on account of age, race, religion and ancestry. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, a long time ago a U.S. Senator said, 'Let's vote for E.R.A. on account of symbolism.' A distinguished Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, a former Member of this Body said, 'Let's vote for E.R.A. on account of symbolism.' On the other hand, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, a distinguished U.S. Constitutional authority, Phil Kirlin of the University of Chicago, a son of Illinois stated, 'Let's not vote for E.R.A. because it's mischievous.' I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the past you've heard me oppose the E.R.A. because of the drafting of women and the fact that the N.O.W. organization, in their platform, wants to take away all the veteran's preferences. So... but now I got a letter from a group initiated A.D.A.M., Adams, that is the first sinner. All right, these fella's are... represent the American Divorce Association for Men. This is a men's group that are divorced. Now, with all due apologies to the male Members of this Body who are divorced, I want to start off by saying the worms have come out of the woodwork. Now here's what they say... I've taken excerpts from their letter here, it says; 'There's sexual discrimination in our courts on matters relating to spousal maintenance, property, child support, custody and the payment of attorney fees in a divorce situation. Judges still continue to award custody of children to mothers, ignoring the equal rights of the fathers to have custody of their children. If a father does get custody, rarely, if ever is the mother required to make child support payments to the father for their care. Women are not required to pay alimony for maintaining. Now,



they want...passage of the E.R.A. will strengthen the law by putting the force of the Federal Government behind it. We need the impact of that Federal Amendment...will provide in eliminating these abuses. So, you see now the women are getting treated good and the children, that's my concern. And now with the passage of the E.R.A., if it were ratified, the men...the women would be brought...shut up, let me finish. This would bring the women down to our level and I want them to stay where they're at and that's why I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Equal Rights Amendment is an issue of equality under the law. I hold in my hand the Congressional Digest, June - July issue of 1977. I would like to address the matter of privacy and... the right of privacy, the decisions of the Supreme Court as predicated in the legislative history. And none of these...and under this type of legislative history, it has been stated in the Senate Report 92-689, that under two legal principles the power of the state to regulate...cohabitate in sexual relationships of unmarried persons and the constitutional right of privacy as e nunciated by the Supreme Court in 1965 relative to the separate sleeping, bathing, toilet facilities of public institutions, colleges and military barracks, would be permitted. Now, as far as military service goes, I call your attention to the, Article I, I believe it is, in the United States Constitution and to the Section 8 and you will find that this says, 'to raise and support armies!' it didn't say just men. If this country needs us we should all help. I'm an ex-servicewoman. I'm an immigrant daughter of immigrant parents. My mother and father were people who had self-respect and respected in each other and the rights of each other. My mother was the best homemaker anyone could ever have, she never worked outside the house a day in her life, my father was the provider. But if they were living today they would be for the Equal Rights Amendment because they believe in equal dignity and equal importance and I could



not minimize one over the other, it's as simple as all that. Your Constitution of Illinois has had the Equal Rights provision in it for seven years and you will find it didn't hurt anyone. But I'll tell you something else, Pennsylvania has it written exactly as the Federal Amendment and it hasn't hurt. In fact, it's helped men there. As far as alimony, Illinois law... Illinois law for twenty years says men can be entitled to alimony if the circumstances so necessitate. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, legal equality is simply equality under the law. And the ones who will benefit the most are the homemakers, not those of us who are in business. I don't need it but I tell you this, there was a case, the 'Herra' case in Washington where two homosexuals wanted to marry, they couldn't get the right to marry, they appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States and the Supreme Court of the United States said even if the State of Washington had passed the Equal Rights Amendment those two homosexuals did not have the right to marry because the state still has the right to regulate its marriages."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Geo-Karis: "So that argument is out the window. I say to you, let's cut out the garbage, this is the same kind of garbage that took place when the women wanted the right to vote and we had to have the 19th Amendment because the 14th Amendment, if you look back to the legislative hearings of Congress only related..."

Speaker Redmond: "Your time is up, Representative Geo-Karis. Representative Bartulis. One minute."

Bartulis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In my tenure here in the Legislature I've never got up to speak on this Amendment and I've had the chance to vote on it many times. Now there's 177 Members here, representing 59 districts, possibly 180,000 in each district. Now I don't know how many of you have surveyed your district or got the pulse of what the people think since they can't have a referendum... instead of listening to the Governor... twist your arm or the phone calls from Betty Ford, when she should be out on the golf course



helping Jerry with his swing, or t.v. stars coming into our state and President Carter, of all people, coming here to tell us about E.R.A. and twisting the arm of the new Mayor of Illinois and getting the people who have two jobs and twisting their arm to vote for it. I think he should have stayed in the State of Georgia, where he was Governor and they don't pass it and therefore, I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey. One minute to explain your vote."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As you all know, for the last three years down here, on this particular issue, I've always voted 'no' and I've consistently voted 'no'. And I've heard both sides of the argument. I've heard from the N.O.W. people, I've listened to the 'Equal Forum' people and I've met with them. I've listened to people from the extreme right and I've listened to people from the extreme left and I've listened intently and tried to listen intelligently. This never will be an easy vote. This is a vote that probably politically, for me, is the wrong vote to make but I think it's the right vote. I weigh this, I've thought about it for a long time. You might be looking at a guy right now committing political suicide, it could be. Maybe it is...at this point maybe I don't really care but I think tonight I'll sleep better. If that one-third of the people in my district that I represent, for at least one-third of the people in my district...that do indeed want this Amendment ratified, I cast my vote for you. And hopefully, history will dictate that for all the 190,000 people in my district, it will be the right vote. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. We are voting on a, as we all know, a very major Federal Constitutional Amendment today. I have studied Constitutional law but I am not, certainly, a Constitutional expert. One of the most renowned, generally accepted, Federal Constitutional experts was Senator Sam Ervin. He proposed various Amendments to the proposed E.R.A. Article when



it was considered before Congress, including an exemption of women from the military, compulsory military service. He proposed an Amendment, which read as follows: 'This Article shall not impair the validity, however, of any laws of the United States or any state which extend protections or exemptions to wives, mothers or widows.' Both of those Amendments and several others were rejected. Now the court, when interpreting the meaning of the Equal Rights Amendment, will look to the Congressional debate and the intent of that debate as illustrated by the rejection of those Amendments that were proposed. I think this is not what the people want. I think, also, it is very important that we look at Section 2, which delegates to the Federal Congress the enforcement of authority. Senator Sam Ervin, the foremost Federal Constitutional expert said, 'That would reduce the state to meaningless zeroes on the map.' We ought not to do that. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Lovely First Lady, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the House stands again on the brink of making an irreversible error and I would plead with any who are weakening, do not stab your conscience with the happy thought that a mistake that you make here can be corrected across the rotunda in the Senate. I assure you that those Senators will yield to the same unconscionable pressures that have caved you in. And it's safely predictable that if this Bill slips out of here today or next week, two weeks after November 7, 1978, it will be ratified over in the Senate. Do your duty and stand firm in this moment. History will record the position you've taken. Half of the letters I get say, 'Drop dead.' and the other half say, 'May you live forever.' Under that polarized condition I suggest to you that the better part of valor and common sense...we should have a cooling off period. We have nine months, or you have nine months to think about it. Don't remove the...the reason for being in the Eighty-first Congress. Finally, before you ring the bell I want to





say this, it might be a case of much ado about nothing, because if disaster should befall us and if women are reduced to the level of men, they'll still find that their historic role remains the same, they'll have to go on bearing the children, they'll have to go on working like horses to support their family and the supreme irony will remain that if they're discriminated against in salary they'll have to go to the Federal Court and use the same old laws that are already on the books to get the simple justice to which they're entitled. Thank you and vote 'no'.

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell. The timer is on."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, E.R.A. has been gagged by lies, bound by misrepresentation, wounded by libel and crucified by slander, but I say to you, her truth will go marching on. Yes, just like John Brown's body, Abraham Lincoln, Martin Luther King, John F. Kennedy, they all lie in the graves but their truth is going to march on. I tell you, we have but one role as leaders and that role is to face the sun so that we never see the shadows. I say that we must seek a better world for ourselves, our children and our women. In the name of Abraham Lincoln, Martin Luther King, John Kennedy and the countless others, I ask that we set the women free, set them free so they may be free at last and thank God Almighty they will be free at last. And I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to take this opportunity since we're graced with the presence of many of our august Senators to urge them to support the Amendment we passed yesterday when we give all the people of the State of Illinois an opportunity on November 7 to vote on this issue. I'm convinced the people of this state are against this matter, but I would rather explain my vote on the question of the procedures that have been followed in this House. The alleged purpose of the E.R.A. is to assure equality. However, some proponents have abused every rule, standard of fairness and degree of legislative



equality there ever was in this House. The proponents don't want equality but rather preference to the powerful, disrespect of individual rights under established generations of parliamentary procedure and ruthless domination by economic threats. So as far as I'm concerned, there's no equality in tyranny. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."

I rise to explain my vote. It was suggested by the proponent or one of the proponents that the great State of Illinois should ratify and 35 other states have. I'd like to point out to you in the first year and it was pointed out also that how could you be against E.R.A.? But in the first year there were some 30 states to ratify this Amendment to our Federal Constitution. And I ask that proponent who suggested that the great State of Illinois adopt it and become the 36th state, well, what happened? Why all of a sudden did the brakes go on and start people in the states start wondering if they ought to ratify this Constitution? After the first year when the 30 states, the first 30 ratified, five more ratified and four rescinded for a net gain of one. Five and a half, six and a half, six years and three months later, we're still trying to get an extension of the ratification deadline in Washington because they feel that they can't ratify it in seven years. This appears to me to be very similar to a tax referendum, a school tax referendum if you will, that the people defeat time after time after time; but then the day it passes, bang, it becomes law and I suggest to you that they have the votes today. If some of you are voting here 'yes' saying it will be killed in the Senate, you'd better think again. If it flies out of here today, I suggest before we leave here on June 30th that those Senators will see it flying right out of that Senate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I just wanted to clear up what was said about President Gerald Ford. As a Ford delegate to the '76 convention, I want to assure all



of you that I was there when it was made quite clear that President Ford supported keeping ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment in the Republican Party platform where it has been since 1940 before I was born. And our Illinois delegation to the Republican Convention was two to one in favor of ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as was pointed out a short moment ago, we did adopt the Amendment yesterday which would put the E.R.A. on the ballot in November. I would ask those of you, particularly that are proponents of E.R.A. to consider voting 'present' until your constituency have an opportunity to vote on this subject. E.R.A. is not popular with the people of your district or with the people of Illinois. And if it was, I assure you the proponents of E.R.A. yesterday would have accepted our challenge and allowed the E.R.A. to be placed on a November ballot. That was not met and I say that that is a proven fact that E.R.A. is not, would not pass the test in Illinois. One final point, there has been references in earlier debates that there is a comparison between this and the right to vote which was adopted by Illinois being the first state in the nation to give this affirmative right to women. I would like to point out that when this passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, the vote in the Senate was unanimous - 46 to nothing; and in the House - 135 to three. Ladies and Gentlemen, there isn't a Member of this House that would not have voted to give the women a right to vote. It's not the same issue. It's a different issue and I ask for you to join me in defeating this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steele."

E.G. Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote I would like to point out that a recent meeting of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, they refused to endorse the E.R.A. because of the uncertainty as to its consequences for family life. They point out and I'm quoting now, 'The broad sweep of this Amendment may very well destroy the unity essential to a



stable family relationship.' Other church groups have expressed serious concern regarding its uncertain and possible detrimental consequences to family life. For these and other reasons, this should be voted down. If the proponents have to spend a hundred and fifty thousand dollars in Illinois to get it passed, then it ought to be defeated. If the proponents have to call for a vote twelve times in the last seven years, if they have to call it for a vote two times in the past two weeks, bypassing Committee, bypassing the orderly procedures of this House, then it ought to be defeated and I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer to explain her vote. The timer is on."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have never spoken on E.R.A. before but I must answer the Gentleman who just proceeded me. Everybody is fond of quoting the statement of the Bishop, but they never quote the whole thing. They stated quite clearly they were taking no position. So they were speaking, in my estimation, from timidity, from a sense of conservatism which we find in the church. I would remind the Members here that it was members of the hierarchy of the Catholic Church that were some of the chief opponents of women having the right to vote. So I don't think it's fair to be quoting a body that's known for its extremely conservative attitude on anything new. They did say and they emphasized they were taking no position. It was not a statement of opposition."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, would just like to correct one of the statements of the last speaker, the speaker before Representative Willer that is. I want to remind him that I supported his Amendment to have a referendum in November. I would have supported one back in 1972. The offer then was withdrawn by the Gentleman who wanted to have a referendum. We have had our referendums here in Illinois. We had it in 1970 when we adopted our State Constitution. We have a very strong equal rights section in our State Constitution. Because of that, we have a seven year record now to look at. Not



one, not one of the horrors envisioned by the opponents have happened. We do not have coed bathrooms. We have not legalized homosexual marriages. It has not affected our abortion laws one bit. Dr. Richard Wesley of Loyola University points out that there is no connection between abortion and the Equal Rights Amendment. Not until a man can have an abortion will there be any connection. None of the horrors have happened, but because we have an Equal Rights Amendment in our Illinois Constitution, we have been able to change over a hundred laws that in some way discriminated against women. And we've equalized our laws in credit and education and employment and insurance and in pensions. I urge you, look at the record and vote 'yes'. Extend the benefits to the other 49 states. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, I don't... not going to speak on the issue, but you made a rule at the start of this that we're going to vote here as big Ladies and Gentlemen without the benefit of the candidate, for Lieutenant Governor or the lobbyists for the Governor's office. We can vote here and we don't need lobbyists for either side, the Democrats or Republicans telling grown men and women how to vote on this issue and I resent it. And I wish you'd ask them to stay off the floor and let us vote on our own."

Speaker Redmond: "All unauthorized persons leave the floor. Representative Miller."

Miller: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to correct the statement made by the Lady from DuPage with regard to the records of the Illinois Constitutional Convention in 1970. If she had an opportunity to review the verbatim transcript, the proposal - equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex was rejected at the Illinois Constitutional Convention and in its place we put the provision for equal protection of the laws which we presently have in our United States Constitution. Those who are in favor of the Amendment who say we have it in our Illinois Constitution are not telling the truth and I want the record to so indicate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."



Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, someone sometime back admonished the Chicago Democrats in voting for the Equal Rights Amendment. I'm not from Chicago, I'm from North Chicago and that's about thirty-five miles away. I am a Democrat and I have the democratic state platform of 1976 in front of me. And it says the Democratic Party unequivocally, unequivocally supports the immediate ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. Now we've had the testimony that both the Republican and the Democratic Party in their platforms support the Equal Rights Amendment. And I'm a man, I'm a human being and I'm a Democrat, I'm a human being first. And all this Amendment says is that if there are rights that belong to human beings that you cannot subordinate those rights, you cannot diminish them, you cannot discriminate against these rights. They should be equal to all and that's why I think we should support this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the past I have voted 'yes' and I've voted 'no' on this issue because it has much merit and at the same time it has much misgivings. There's confusion as to what will be the final effect on our society if E.R.A. is adopted, but there's still good and convincing arguments that can be made of both sides of this issue. Giving unchecked legislative authority to the federal Judiciary for final interpretation of this Amendment makes one question the righteousness of adopting this Amendment. Our society for over two hundred years has been identified by our goal of equality for all. A famous author in writing about achieving one's goal said the important thing in life in achieving one's goal is not that we might fall or stumble and, yes, stagger from right to left while attempting to achieve our goal, what is important is that we keep forging ahead towards the goal we seek, always forward. I now believe that E.R.A. strives toward the ultimate goal of our society - equality for all - and I vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Up on your podium up there there's an American flag and Committee meetings that Representatives and



Senators go to, we're asked many times to... as we start the meeting with the pledge of allegiance to the flag. And I think we should be aware of how the pledge of allegiance ends. It says 'liberty and justice for all.' It does not exclude any one group of people and we take that pledge willingly and..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order. We've been in good order most of the afternoon. We're kind of getting a little restless here."

Byers: "We take that pledge, the pledge of allegiance to the flag that ends with liberty and justice for all. It does not exclude women. And I would ask that we vote 'aye' today as a resident of Madison County where one of the leading opponents to this measure lives. I'd like to point out one other thing, that this woman has ran for office three times and has been turned down by the people of our county so I don't think that she's a very good spokesman for anyone in leading a charge against this particular Amendment. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, just two brief things. First of all I somehow wonder why both proponents and opponents of this thing who continue to ride us seem to miss the point of equality itself because it seems to me that people on both sides have stopped giving us the benefit of being equal and having a right to voice our own opinion on this after due consideration. Secondly, I'm somewhat tired as are others of being painted with the broad brush of somehow being for abortion, somehow being against veteran's preference, somehow being against property rights, somehow being for homosexuals simply because I believe in equality between men and women. I'm not for those things, but I'm for equal rights and I'm damned sick and tired of both sides riding us and forgetting that we're equal, too, and we have a vote. If they want to vote us out of office, let them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peggy Smith Martin."

P. Martin: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of H.J.R.C.A. #54. I have a number of reasons for supporting this Amendment and they are -



I am a woman, black and Catholic - all of which have and still causes some form of discrimination. As a black woman, we have helped to build this country. We have hoed tobacco road and we have made cotton king. This Constitutional Amendment will guarantee equality for women and men in employment, education and housing. And we as women who have to support or help to support our families, will get the fringe benefits that we do not now receive which are medical insurance, life insurance, sick leave, maternity leave and pensions. These are crucial to the health and maintenance of our families. We have and must be role models to encourage our youth and to break this vicious cycle. The Equal Rights Amendment will help insure..."

Speaker Redmond: "The time is expiring, Representative Martin."

P. Martin: "...economic power for all of us - women and men. I urge you today as a woman to vote for this very human right - Equal Rights Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sumner. One minute to explain her vote. The Gentlemen standing between Representative Sumner and the Chair please sit down."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What I'm about to say has been said before, but I think it is so very important. Section 2 says that Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this Article. That is the U.S. Constitution, Ladies and Gentlemen, and I feel that that will say we are going to relinquish state's rights and I am going to vote 'no' for that reason."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, one of the previous speakers said, 'Let's put this off. Let's have a referendum. Let's find out where the people stand.' I suggest that there's been a referendum, that every Member here was elected by the people and that in the districts, many of the districts this was an issue and this is something that was taken into account. It's not something that we need to say, 'Let's wait again.' We... people have already spoken. I know in my district the people continue to speak. They send me letters that are overwhelmingly in favor and we've done constituent





polls that show at least 85% of the residents of the 12th District support ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment now. I think now is the time to pass it. We've tried three times this Session. Let's make this the time that it succeeds."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Emil Jones."

E. Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In all the times that the E.R.A. Amendment has been..."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order. Representative Geo-Karis can't hear."

E. Jones: "In all the times that the E.R.A. Amendment has been before this Body, I have never spoken on the issue and I have voted 'yes' all except one time. I feel very proud today to follow my distinguished Assistant Majority Leader, Corneal Davis, who has championed the rights of people ever since he's been a Member of this Body. But, Ladies and Gentlemen, I see we have worked for what you may call a Mexican standoff. There are those, I see, who voted 'yes' two weeks ago who are waiting for other individuals to get on the train. Well, I tell my friends that I see there who are not voting who voted green two weeks ago, that Emil Jones do not mind being a leader and jumping on the train in front of you. I feel very proud, Ladies and Gentlemen, to speak for the first time on this issue and if you were sincere two weeks ago, then you will follow me and I know you will because I do have a place to go and I am voting green."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, like my good brother on the other side of the aisle, Representative Jones..."

Speaker Redmond: "The noise level is too high here. Please give the Gentleman order."

Gaines: "I see persons who two weeks ago voted green and I see others who were supposed to vote green. I'm voting green today and I've also followed my old scout master, Corneal Davis. And I want to say this. All of us were born of a woman who carried us as part of her own being until we were ready to take our place in the world of the living. So how can anyone not want their mother,



sister or daughter to be treated equally to anyone on God's earth? I support this legislation knowing and loving the difference between men and women. I firmly believe that women can be treated equally without their becoming anything other than the loveliest creatures God ever put on this earth. I'm voting green."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pechous."

Pechous: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it seems to me that fear of the unknown has plagued the passage of E.R.A. in Illinois. Now I have examined the Equal Rights Amendment, I've asked learned attorneys, constitutional experts to follow my reading and to give me their viewpoints as well as to listen to the viewpoints of my constituents. Upon new studies, I've concluded that E.R.A. will be a healthy Amendment to the United States Constitution. This will be my third opportunity to vote on behalf of E.R.A. and I do vote 'aye' and I ask my colleagues to join me. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich. Please, please, please. The noise level is getting higher and higher. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want you to know that I'm not impressed by the fact that 33 states have ratified this Amendment. And as far as I'm concerned, Illinois is still a sovereign state and I'm one of the Members of this Body that was elected by the people in this sovereign state. I don't care what they did in New York, I don't care what they did in Ohio. I live in Illinois and it is a sovereign state. My real problem with this Amendment is that the ratification will be the giving up of our sovereign rights in this state for the Congress of the United States and the whims of the Supreme Court. That giving up will be irreversible and inflexible and that will be the last time you or your successors will have any right to have anything to say on the subject. Mr. Speaker, is it reasonable that I can have a little order or do you care?"

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order. The noise level is getting higher and higher."



Friedrich: "I can't hear myself, Mr. Speaker. Now maybe the rest don't care whether they do or not, but at least I'd like to be heard."

Speaker Redmond: "Members please take their seats. I think the trouble is that when we go wandering to visit with our friends. Please sit in your own seats. Representative Friedrich, proceed."

Friedrich: "I want to say again that if this Amendment is ratified by all the states, it's going to be irreversible, it's going to be inflexible and no one ever elected to this Body again will ever have anything to say on the subject. And I say again, do not be deceived by what is being said. This does not elevate women. This reduces them to the level of men and I can say that if you get it, you're not going to like it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Corneal Davis to explain his vote. According to the board, this is the last person seeking recognition. Representative Corneal Davis."

C. Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for this minute I wish to say to you, the distinguished Members from the State of Illinois, the great State of Lincoln, I wish to say to you that if you refuse to vote for this Amendment, you will be following the ten states that was against the 19th Amendment that was against women's right to vote. Let me close by giving you what the... Carl Sandburg said, these ministers said this was the outstanding sermon delivered over the Great Emancipator and it is recorded in a tree is best measured when it's down. And it was by that great liberal way back in... contemporary Mr. Lincoln, it was by Henry Ward Beecher. Here's what it said. 'Four years ago, Illinois, we took from you and took from your midst an untried man and we return him to you now a mighty conqueror. Not... he is not yours now anymore, but he belongs to the nation.' He's not ours anymore, but he belongs to the world, that's who he belongs to. The whole world and then he said, A new... renew your zeal and patriotism, ye proud people of Illinois. Behold a mighty martyr whose gut pleads for liberty, for justice for all is buried here in the sacred prairies of this great State of Illinois. In the name of the man who set



my grandfather free, I call upon you to pass here and now the E.R.A. that will free our women."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not going to stand here and say one word about the pros and cons of the Equal Rights Amendment. But I will say this to you, you have one major obligation. And that is to vote your conscience on this very important issue. There should be no other basis for your decision today but your conscience."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You spoke, you've heard me speak on this before, but I'd just like to call a couple of things to your attention. First of all, I want to commend the Governor of Illinois and the Mayor of Chicago for using the pressure of their offices for something that is great for all of the people cause the eyes of Illinois... I mean, the nation are on Illinois and on the... on the City of Chicago. And don't forget there's been tremendous pressure put by the anti's, too. And you know what kind of pressure they have used. That's what we're here for, to listen to their various sides and to sustain that pressure. But I want to say this. This is an Equal Rights Amendment for everybody and don't forget that. I want it for my two sons as much as for my two daughters. It's important for all of them and let me also say this. To my seat-mate here... the Senator... Representative Jones, I'm sorry he's taking a position that he has because he's voted for... thirteen times he's voted for this. He should vote for it today and we'll send it over to the Senate and they can have the opportunity to vote. And I'd also like to say this. For those on this side of the aisle, we lost out on this two weeks ago. Don't let us lose out today and say it was the Republicans who put it down. Let's support our Governor, let's support our party platform and let's support our former President and support this. Vote for 'aye' now."

Speaker Redmond: "The Members please be in your seats. There isn't any question that there will be a verification and the only way



that we can proceed in an orderly fashion is to be in your seats. Please be in your own seats. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Representative Lucco, for what purpose do you rise?"

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know that all of us in this great hall have been pressured tremendously by both sides. I know that all of us have been unjustly accused and hurt by both sides. I'm sure that many of us in this hall have been helped by both sides, either side, one way or another. But in thinking of this particular issue, I can't help but think if the 1st Amendment of the Constitution of the United States were here before us today and we had the opportunity of whether or not to vote on freedom of speech, might it not be twisted just like many people are twisting it today? The fact that the Constitution gives everyone the right to speak, the freedom of speech does not mean what some people might read into it that they have a right to slander, to talk about people, to say things which are not true. Still under our Constitution, in spite of the fact that everyone has a right to freedom of speech, we have ways of dealing with people who do not do the right thing. I really... it's been a difficult vote for me and yet, it's not a difficult vote because I vote because I believe that everyone should have an equal opportunity. And I'm still proud to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wyvetter Youngue."

Youngue: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm voting for the Equal Rights Amendment because I believe that there ought to be a Constitutional Amendment which says exactly what is the standards of law on a federal level. We here in this state have a similar Amendment in the State Constitution and I believe that since we're one nation under God, we ought to tie this state into the national country and have an Equal Rights Amendment on the national level so that we'll be one nation. I think that the message that we ought to send to the other states and to the world is that we believe in equality under the law for all people. And women are people, that we believe in justice and that we believe



in freedom and that we believe that people ought to be treated fairly. What is a Constitutional Amendment? A Constitution is a document that tells what the government should or should not do. It is a document that sets the standard of the law for government. We should say unequivocally that we believe in equality under the law, that if you are a government official, if you are a Congress, if you are a court, if you an administrator, we want you to speak and act fairly to all people. That's what we're talking about here. We're talking about fair treatment under the law. Our law is a body of rules and precepts as to how the various officials who administer the law should act. We should set the standard here today and say that equality under the law shall not be denied or abridged because of sex. That's what we're here about today and I urge you to follow the law, to uphold the law, to say that we are a nation of justice and of peace and liberty for all. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise to explain my vote and this is truly a hard vote for me today because I believe in an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. I do believe in that. But I'm going to try to place myself above that today. Those five or six Members who claim that I have been trying to seek a Leadership position, that was a lie. I have read every newspaper throughout this state the past few weeks and I know the quotes that you are making. And just from reading, I could tell from the individual that it came. But I can tell you this, that today I am in a position I believe to defeat this Amendment. But I gave my word when I spoke here a week ago and I think any of you that know me know my word have always been good if I give it to you. Yet, I had some fifteen or twenty persons to come to me today and ask me to make a speech, to tell me what to say or what was I going to do. Didn't have to do that. My word was given. My word is good. Jim Taylor votes 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff. Please give the Gentleman order. Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My personal opinion of this Amendment



is that of one which was written by idiots - full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. And yet my words fly up and my thoughts remain below because the vote that I'm about to make would be contrary to that statement. In light of that, I can only make this observation that there are times, Mr. Speaker, when you can't judge a man by his words or his actions. When this occurs, Mr. Speaker, he's generally thought to be insane. And in the belief, Mr. Speaker, that history might possibly come to regard those who voted for this proposition as being so afflicted I want the record to show, Mr. Speaker, that I am admitting now that I was. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Poll the absentees please. Would you poll the absentees?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk, poll the absentees. Please be seated in your own seats. Please be quiet. All unauthorized persons off the floor. All unauthorized persons off the floor. Please, according to Hanahan's Rules, please be in your own seat. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Dave Jones."

Speaker Redmond: "Who? That is correct. Under the rules, under the rules of this House, Members please be in your own seats."

Clerk O'Brien: "R.V. Walsh. No further."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh votes 'no'. Representative James Houlihan, for what purpose do you rise?"

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "It's too late, Representative Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "It's too late to explain your vote."

J. Houlihan: "But, Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, I believe our rules allow every Member to explain their vote while the Roll Call is being taken. The Roll Call has not been taken."

Speaker Redmond: "The Roll Call... we're not on the Roll Call. I told them to take the record."

J. Houlihan: "But, Mr. Speaker, the Roll Call is not over when you take the record. You know it, I know it and every Member here,



even the ones that are yelling against this, know that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the rules say that until the vote is recorded and announced, any Member has the right... the right... now, we're talking about equal rights, the right to explain his vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute, the Parliamentarian is consulting the rule book. And whatever the rules say is what we will decide. Parliamentarian advises me that under 56(b) that up until the announcement of the vote, a Member has the right to explain his vote. I have not yet announced the vote. Representative Houlihan. One minute to explain your vote."

J. Houlihan: "Well, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan, one minute to explain your vote. The timer is on."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. This Amendment as you know was stalled because of some particular differences, not necessarily because of the merits of the question last time. Unfortunately, it looks as if we're short today because of some particular differences: If any Member feels that they have one or another particular reservation, maybe that we should consider it the same time the Senate does; but put aside those particular differences and vote on the merits of the Bill. The merits of the Bill are very clear - equal rights for all Members. We've had discussions about the rights of Members and family unity. Family unity depends on the integrity of the individuals in the family. Family unity depends on the core of the people making that family a healthy body. It won't be affected by the Equal Rights Amendment. This family unity is strong if people are strong."

Speaker Redmond: "The timer is on and the time has not yet expired."

J. Houlihan: "I implore each of those Members to consider not to vote..."

Speaker Redmond: "Time is over, Representative Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "on... but to vote on the merits of the question."





Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski to explain his vote.

The timer is on."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We have, we're at the point now where we have... are a few votes short of adopting this Constitutional Amendment, a very serious and historic matter. And there are a few, I know, in the audience, in the Membership of this General Assembly who have reservations because of the parliamentary procedures that we are undertaking on this measure. Let me suggest to those Members that this far too serious a matter to vote on that basis alone. This is a matter that is far more significant than the parliamentary procedure... than parliamentary procedure. We did have problems in this Assembly, we did... internal political problems that resulted in the defeat of this measure last time. I think today we should put aside those differences, those political differences, those procedural disagreements and vote on the merits and many people, some people who are not voting on the merits... are not voting on the merits but are voting on another basis. I would urge those Members to reconsider their votes, to get on the proper side of this motion, to vote for the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I was just going to ask that you have the gentleman from the Governor's office quit hassling Dave Jones."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, you in the past have consistently ruled that this type of explanation of vote is untimely. You're changing your own rulings today. Everybody in this House has expressed themselves on that board except two Members and they have declined to vote. Now are we to be subjected to a filibuster because this measure has failed again and again and again? Mr. Speaker, show some consistency please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins, I originally ruled that Representative Houlihan's effort to his explain was not timely. Representative Matijevich called the rule to my attention and the Parliamentarian confirmed Representative Matijevich.



Representative Schuneman. Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, you have repeatedly departed from the rules of this House to permit the proponents of the Equal Rights Amendment chance after chance after chance, Mr. Speaker. You've just once again reversed yourself on a consistent ruling that you've made from that Chair. You have not permitted Members to explain their vote unless they were absent on the Roll Call, Mr. Speaker. And I ask you in the sense of fair play, Mr. Speaker, to cut off this debate at this time, take the record and put this matter to rest now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman, I suggest that you read Rule 56(b). Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker, will you keep the press from... of the floor, out of this corner. They have no right to be down here questioning the Members of this House."

Speaker Redmond: "Press please... That is correct. The press will return to the press box. Representative Geo-Karis, please return to your seat. Representative Dyer, for what purpose do you rise?"

Dyer: "Have we polled the absentees?"

Speaker Redmond: "The absentees have been polled."

Dyer: "Okay, then I think we're ready to verify the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative... Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, give me some order please. May I have some order?"

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

It appears that we will need one person who has voted 'no' to change their vote at this time. And, Mr. Speaker, it appears that we will need one more person to change their vote at this time and it seems to me that we do have to consider the very important depth of the issue that we're addressing ourselves to. This is an Amendment to the Federal Constitution that will provide equality for 52% of our citizens. I did not speak in debate. Now just because I happen to favor the E.R.A. and every-one here knows it, okay... let's play by the rules."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats voted for some rules he doesn't like now."

Bowman: "Okay, okay."

Speaker Redmond: "I was wrong before."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "You have one minute to explain your vote, that's the only purpose."

Bowman: "On many, many issues that come before this House, we have an oppor... we have a rare opportunity here to be statesmen, to really be statesmen and stand up and be counted, and now is the time to do it. Now is the time to send to the Senate for their consideration and put this before that Body which has not had this Constitutional Amendment to consider for several years. Let's put this before that Body and let's get the people of Illinois on record in favor of equality for all citizens. Now is the time to be a statesman and put aside..."

Speaker Redmond: "Your time is up, Representative Bowman. Representative Chapman, one minute to explain your vote. The timer is on."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as many have pointed out we have..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson, for what purpose do..."

Johnson: "I ask one more time that you enforce the rules of the House with respect to other Members trying to lobby their colleagues here. It's ridiculous and they ought to all be in their seats for the conclusion of this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Members please be in your seats. Representative Dyer, Representative Neff, Representative McAuliffe, please return to your seats. Representative Satterthwaite. Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate attention from this House. We have as it's been pointed out been voting on this issue since 1972 and every single time that either the House or the Senate has voted on this matter, a majority, a majority have voted 'yes'. It has been a small minority that has kept us from approval in Illinois because Illinois Legislators by voting in the majority



for this are representing the views of the State of Illinois and the whole nation because no matter how you cut the cake, the people of the state and the nation favor the Equal Rights Amendment. If you look at it by age groups, every single age group favors the Equal Rights Amendment. If you look at it by party, just as many Republicans... just... just as many Republicans as Democrats among the population favor the Equal Rights Amendment. But there is a group, our young, that have favored the Equal Rights Amendment..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman, bring your remarks to a close."

Chapman: "If I could have some attention from the courteous Members of this House, I would be very happy, Mr. Speaker, to bring my remarks to a close. I would like to ask you today, those of you who are not registered as 'yes' to reconsider and cast a vote for your children, for your grandchildren, for our future generations. They are the ones who will benefit the most, who will benefit the most by the passage of the E.R.A. I ask you to disregard the scare tactics of the opponents, tactics that are based on neither reason nor fact. The Equal Rights Amendment simply asks for equal treatment for all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman, your time has expired. Now has... have all voted who wished? It's perfectly obvious... it's perfectly obvious that everyone that's voted, that the explanation of votes are not changing anybody. It seems to me, it seems to the Chair that it's dilatory. Now have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Robinson, for what do you rise?"

Robinson: "To explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "No, it's too late. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will... Representative Greiman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "A parliamentary inquiry, a parliamentary inquiry."

Greiman: "Is that the courtesy that we talked about at the beginning of this debate?"



Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's all right. Make your inquiry."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that there was some litigation some years back as to the necessary number of votes necessary to pass this and that the Illinois Constitution was held not to be binding on this Body. How many votes, Mr. Speaker, will it take for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Under our rules, 107."

Greiman: "And is that... well, Mr. Speaker, I would, therefore, like to dissent from that ruling and have it registered in the Journal please."

Speaker Redmond: "It will be... it will be noted. Now have all voted who wished? The record is... the Clerk will take the record. What's the score? On this question there's 105 'aye' and 70 'no', 71 'no'. 105 'aye' and 71 'no'. And this Bill having failed, Resolution having failed to receive... For what purpose do you rise, Representative Breslin? Representative Breslin is recognized. Time is..."

Breslin: "For a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Breslin: "I do not intend to explain my vote. I think most of the people here know it."

Speaker Redmond: "Please extend the courtesy that the rules provide. Proceed."

Breslin: "I wish to inform the Speaker of the House that many... that myself and many Members of this House today have received a number of anti-E.R.A. phone calls. It has come to my attention that those people were using the Illinois state WATS line. That that WATS number was given out by some state employee or employer. I ask the Speaker to take note of this and to monitor those phone calls and future phone calls. Is that appropriate?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it's pretty difficult, Representative Breslin. Pretty difficult, there's no way that we can do that that I know. On this question there's 105... now we're not going to keep this going forever. Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise?"



Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when somebody here wanted to explain that vote, as far as I'm concerned, he has that right under the rules of the House. And I think that anybody, I don't care who they are, on an issue as important as this, if there's 177 Members, I mean if it gets up to 107 and those of you who are opposed to it want to change somebody, you have that right. Nobody can take that right away from you. Mr. Speaker, you're going... you won't have a Chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I will not meet tomorrow. What are you going to do with the budget? What are you going to do with it? You know what you can do with it? Now you can't take that right away from anybody."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Corneal Davis. Give the Gentleman order. Representative Corneal Davis. Representative Corneal Davis."

C. Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you give me a minute. I'm looking at the board up there..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Corneal Davis."

C. Davis: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "For what purpose do you rise, Representative Davis? For what purpose do you rise?"

C. Davis: "Mr. Speaker, I ask... I ask that I be given a little courtesy so you could hear my motion. I don't think you can hear my motion. I move, Sir, that we postpone consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's within the rights to postpone consideration. Representative... Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we now recess until seven o'clock to allow the Members to have some dinner and then we will return for Session at seven o'clock. And we plan to work until ten o'clock tonight."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. Adjourned till seven o'clock."

House recessed.



Speaker Redmond: "The House will be in order, Members please be in their seats. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Matijevich, Chairman from the Committee on Appropriations 1, to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken June 22, 1978, reported the same back with the following recommendations. Do pass House Bill 3409. Senate Bills 1531, 1558 and 1611. Do pass as amended, Senate Bill 1535, 1556 and 1587. Do not pass as amended, Senate Bill 1478."

Speaker Redmond: "Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills with the following title to-wit: Senate Bills #2428, 2436, 2628, 2642, 2663, 2745, 2749, 2763, 2447, 2486, 2714, 2867 and 3228. Passed by the Senate June 22, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of Bill of the following title to-wit: Senate Bills 157, 158, 1417, 2549, 2605, 2648, 2775, 2790 and 2745, together with Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended June 22, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolutions. The adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence with the House of Representatives to-wit: Senate Joint Resolution #95, adopted by the Senate, June 22, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "On the Order of Concurrence on page 8, House Bill 2597, Representative Williams. Representative Williams."

Williams: "I hope we have enough troops here. Thank you, Mr.



Speaker, I don't think there is any problem with this. This is a Bill that we passed out of the House and out of the Senate....the Senate with my endorsement added two Amendments. Amendment #1 made it clear that it would be all right for the high school districts to transport the grammar school district. In other words, you could have the mix of the high school and the grammar school students. And Amendment #2 was really a technical Amendment that clarifies the intent that this is permissible, that the route is safer and more economical and more efficient. I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "We would like to request that the Sponsor takes this out of the record at this time, until we have an opportunity here to review the Amendments and then determine on the concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "That's all right, I'll take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. Representative Chapman here? How about....House Bill 2671, Representative Williams? Out of the record. 2685, Representative Pullen. Pullen-McCourt. Out of the record. 2839, Representative DiPrima. Out of the record. 2912, Representative McMaster...out of the record. 2912, Representative, I don't quite understand the signal....that looked like, Lieutenant Governor Menard down here. Representative McMaster on concurrence 2912."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. At this time I would move that the House concur in the Senate Amendment to House Bill 2912. The Amendment is this, it was put on by a group of people from various parts of the state. It really does not have any harmful effects of the Bill, the main effect is, it will delay for approximately thirty days the amount of time required





between application of a mining permit and the final issuance of that permit. In which time we would allow for hearings back in counties. I would move that we concur in the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't hear what the Conference Committee is doing. Would you run it by us again. There is a thirty day delay but what else?"

McMaster: "Well, that is essentially all of it. I think that the other Amendments that we put on in the House took care of the things that you wanted, Sam. These were Amendments that were agreed on by the various people from Catlin Township and other places."

McGrew: "Now this Amendment primarily came from...as a result of a meeting down in Danville, did it not?"

McMaster: "Well, I don't know where the meeting was, we met in one of the offices here in the Capital the morning of the Senate hearing."

McGrew: "Okay, I have no opposition, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Tom, are the House Amendments still on? Or have they been taken off."

McMaster: "Yes, there is one House Amendment put on and it is still on."

Schneider: "Which...the one according to the Digest, which one is that that still remains?"

McMaster: "Oh, heavens, it is the only one that we adopted, Glenn. I can't tell you specifically what it was...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan, what purpose do you arise?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, if we have we given permission for the television cameras to be operating?"

Speaker Redmond: "No...it is not operating."

Madigan: "Oh, is that Peter Nolin? I remove my objection."

Speaker Redmond: "A fine Irish broth of a bit. Representative



Joe Mudd....pardon me, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "There are two on in the Digest. You say they are both on or just one is on, or what?"

McMaster: "Yes, we did put two on, I'm sorry, Glenn."

Schneider: "All right, so they are both on yet?"

McMaster: "Yes."

Schneider: "And the only addition is the thirty-day waiting period, is that what it sounds like?"

McMaster: "Yes. To allow for further hearings and....is by agreement between the Department of Mines and Minerals, Department of Agriculture, Conservation. Everyone is in agreement with this. The coal industry, Illinois coal is in favor of it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill came before the House and it was amended. It went over to the Senate and I think that the Amendments that they put on cleared up some of the objections that the people in the House had. And I think that it answers pretty well everyone's objections and is in proper order for concurrence at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"

McMaster: "I would move for concurrence and solicit an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative McMaster's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2912. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 'aye' and no 'nay' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2912. Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it isn't very often that an old broken down coach gets to introduce one of these ace right handers. I used



to pitch for him years ago. But I would like to introduce Mr. and Mrs. Frank Head from my hometown, who are the parents of one of our Pages down here. Mary Kay Head, Mary Kay and Frank and Mrs. Head."

Speaker Redmond: "3351, Representative Cissy Stiehl, 3372, is Representative Friedrich here? Take that out of the record. On the Supplemental Calendar #1, on the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1470. Representative Tipsword. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering, you're having trouble finding Sponsors for these Bills here. Do we really have a quorum?"

Speaker Redmond: "There is 116 on the last Roll Call."

Tipsword: "I know."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "On the Bill on the board; House Bill 1470, that's just came out as we understand it. We don't have that file down here yet, I see that the House Sponsor is not here and I would ask that you take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. 2790, Representative Tipsword. Out of the record. 865, is Representative Chapman here? Out of the record. 974, Representative Murphy. Out of the record. House Resolution 974...oh, pardon me, pardon me. 2671, Representative Gene Schlickman. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. 2671 is a Bill that was passed by a overwhelming vote here in the House. It went to Senate and at the suggestion of the Chairman of the Senate Education Committee, a technical Amendment was put on striking some of the language relative to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I'm sorry to interrupt the Sponsor but, we haven't gotten our files back as yet on this one and would ask the courtesy....if you would give the courtesy of taking



it out of the record."

Schlickman: "No problem."

Houlihan: "Thank you."

Schlickman: "Out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. House Bills, Third Reading.

House Bills, Third Reading 1089. Is Representative

Younge on the floor? Out of the record. 2585, Representative

Robinson. Representative Robinson, 2585."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2585, a Bill for an Act making

appropriations to the Capital Development Board. Third

Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Yes, this Bill is a Bill that I've worked with with

the administration, with the Committee...Appropriations

Committee, the Capital Development Board and the Department

of Corrections. It provides one million, eight hundred

thousand dollars for solar hot water at the prison in

Hillsboro and Centralia. There is no opposition that

I know of, the Capital Development Board came up with

the figure and with the study that showed it was feasible

economically and that it will save the state money. I

would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear your explanation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "The Bill was an appropriation that I've worked on

with the administration and with a Subcommittee of the

Appropriations Committee for solar energy at the two

new prisons in Hillsboro and Centralia. The figure was

arrived at by the Capital Development Board through an

engineering study, one million, eight hundred thousand

dollar for solar energy for the hot water at those prisons.

I know of no opposition on the part of anyone."

Houlihan: "Thank you, very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."



Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Does the Bill as amended specifically refer to the site of Hillsboro and Centralia?"

Robinson: "Well, I can't answer that but it is the intention..."

Schlickman: "Would you look at it and see whether or not it does."

Robinson: "It does not, I'm told."

Schlickman: "It does not refer to those two sites specifically?"

Robinson: "State prisons and correctional centers constructed after January 1, 1978."

Schlickman: "Thank you. I have no opposition."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 131 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2739...did the Sponsor take a walk with President Ford? Out of the record. 2885."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2885, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Supreme Court for pay of certain officers of the Judicial System. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2885 is the annual appropriation to the Illinois Supreme Court for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Judicial System of the State of Illinois. And I ask your favorable consideration of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "How does this appropriation compare with the current



appropriation."

Houlihan: "It is approximately, Representative Schlickman, it is approximately a million to a million and a half dollars in excess of what the appropriation was for last year. Now the reasons for that excess comes about in substantial part because of the House Bill 2703, which passed the Legislature and is now in the Senate. That appropriation... that particular Bill is a Bill that provides an increase in the subsidy for juvenile probation officers in the counties. An increase in their subsidy from three hundred to five hundred dollars and to make a comparable subsidy for the adult probation officers in the respective counties across the state. The total amount of that item, as far as the subsidy appropriation part is approximately 3.8 or 3.9 million dollars. There have been certain reductions and cuts in the Supreme Court budget itself so that the net effect of what the totality of the budget appropriation here is, is approximately slightly over a million dollars from what it was the year prior."

Schlickman: "If I understand you correctly. The increase is on account of a Bill that we passed and that is pending in the Senate?"

Houlihan: "That is correct."

Schlickman: "Okay. Now if that Bill in the Senate doesn't pass, is this Bill so structured that the additional amount of money would lapse, would not be expended?"

Houlihan: "In and of itself, but it could be taken off. It was put on here by way of an Amendment. It could be taken off by way of a similar Amendment. We have for the first time and I would like to point this out. For the first time, taking the Supreme Court budget and have eliminated what are anticipated to be lapsed funds. There is an elimination here of approximately a half a million dollars from it as it was originally introduced."

Schlickman: "Okay. Since this is a House Bill following another



House Bill, another Senate Bill, I have no objection."

Houlihan: "No corrections."

Schlickman: "Okay, thanks."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Would the Sponsor yield? Are there any Judges' increases in salaries in this?"

Houlihan: "No, a Judge's salary is set by statutes and we have not changed any of the appropriate statutes relating to judicial salary. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 122 'aye', 9 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3067, Representative Youngue."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3067, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Depressed Areas Land Use and Community Development Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Youngue."

Youngue: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill would establish the Community Development Land Use Authority. The substantive Bill is in the Senate on Second Reading, the authority would have the responsibility for a long term economic growth plan in depressed areas. And I would ask for your continued support of this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "She will." Representative Youngue, a question from Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "What is the number of the Bill creating Depressed Areas Land Use and Community Development Authority?"

Youngue: "1533."



Schlickman: "I'm sorry, what is that?"

Younge: "1533."

Schlickman: "15 what?"

Younge: "33."

Schlickman: "One second please. And you say that Bill has been passed by the House?"

Younge: "That's right, it is on Second Reading in the Senate."

Schlickman: "What would be the function of the Depressed Areas Land Use and Community Development Act."

Younge: "The function would be, to come up with a long term economic growth area...a long term economic growth plan for the depressed areas of Illinois. The function would be, to sit down with the municipalities and the people of those areas that are tax drain areas and come up with a plan to make stable the tax bases of those areas."

Schlickman: "What is your definition of depressed areas?"

Younge: "A depressed area is an area that has had an out-migration of population that has had a declining tax base and had a deterioration of its housing stock that has a very high unemployment area that has a very low educational attainment standard."

Schlickman: "Is this the authority that would have....the authority to acquire property by eminent domain?"

Younge: "It would after declaring an area to be blighted and coming up with a plan for redevelopment with the people of that area."

Schlickman: "And is this the authority that would have the authority to borrow money and issue revenue bonds?"

Younge: "It would have the authority to issue revenue bonds in order to implement the plan that it had devised with the people of the particular depressed area that it was attempting to improve."

Schlickman: "And is this the Bill that would give to this authority the authority to mortgage property?"

Younge: "It would have the authority to mortgage property that





it owned. Its own property."

Schlickman: "Is this also the authority who's authority or function duplicates that of the Illinois Housing Development Authority, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Illinois Capital Development Board, the Illinois Department of Local Governmental Affairs and the State Planning Clearing House as well as municipalities, counties, townships, park districts and other special used districts?"

Younge: "This authority would have similar powers to those particular state entities which have been totally non effective in the depressed areas. Those authorities that you named do not build houses in the areas that you named. In order to execute its powers in depressed areas it would have to have the agreement of the county authority, the county council or the city that it would operate in. So there would be a cooperative agreement, a relationship with those particular municipalities or counties that would ask for the help of this state authority."

Schlickman: "Is this also the authority which would be available.... which would have the authority to receive federal funds independent of legislative clearing or screening...."

Younge: "We are moving towards all federal funds being cleared and screened by the General Assembly. The plans that would be devised with the municipal authority would come to the General Assembly first...."

Speaker Redmond: "Please come to order. Representative Leverenz can't hear."

Younge: "So therefore, any federal funds would have to be approved by this General Assembly. This has been very carefully written into this Bill."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, may I address myself to the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, now comes the time of truth. When House Bill 1533 was first presented



to us, it had no fiscal impact. There was no appropriation at that time and by the passage of that Bill, we didn't do anything except put something on paper. Assuming the Governor were to approve it. Now we're asking, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, to put our money where are votes were. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we're being asked to appropriate one hundred and fifty thousand dollars to fund another unit of local government. A unit of local government that would be given authority that is duplicative of the authority presently vested in a number of state agencies as well as units of local government. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if there was ever a time in the history of this state when efficiency in government was the order of the day, it's today. June 21, 1978. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there is ample...ample authority today vested in existing agencies...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce, for what purpose do you arise?"

Pierce: "Point of parliamentary inquiry. The Gentleman is misleading the House. He said today, June 21, 1978. It is June 22, now we always knew he didn't know what day of the week it was. Now he is proving it. Please don't mislead the House anymore, we're mixed up enough. The Gentleman may proceed if he wishes."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I should like to compliment and thank the Gentleman from Cook for knowing what day of the year it is. And I apologize for my slip, but that doesn't go, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, to the substance of my comments. As I was saying before I was interrupted, there is ample authority today with existing state agencies and with units of local government to accomplish the ends that are being sought from the Lady from St. Clair County. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, Members



of the House that this is not an Appropriation Bill that should be passed. This one hundred and fifty thousand dollars and the amount of money she'll want subsequently could well be better spent on other matters. And I respectfully suggest that she go to her own County Board, she go to existing state agencies to seek what she wants. Let's not establish another agency of government giving to it the awesome, the very awesome authority to condemn land, to issue bonds, to borrow money by appointed officials not subject to any degree of accountability. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. I can't hear Representative Huff, will you please come to order. Proceed."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, that might be due to the fact that I haven't said anything yet. But...to the Sponsor, Representative Younge, it is my understanding that when we deliberated this Bill, 1533, wasn't it established that any funds that were expanded by the state under the HUD provision of HUD, could be recoverable by the state?"

Younge: "This Bill has been amended to require that the funds to establish this new authority would come from Federal Funds is available. There are two sources of Federal Funds that the funds could come from. First of all, 701 Urban Planning Funds which the Bill has been written to...for the Bill to fall within the purview of and secondly, EDA funds. I have checked with the Department of Business and Economic Development and the State of Illinois has Federal Planning Funds from the EDA which could be used for this purpose. There is an Amendment to this Bill which says that if these Federal Funds are available then they ought to be used for these purposes rather than using state money. And the intent here would be the Federal Funds would be used. When I



came here we were spending seventeen cents of every state dollar for aid to dependent children. Now we're in the process of spending twenty-five cents on every dollar and the situation is growing worse. What this General Assembly needs more than anything else, is a plan of action for those areas that are taxed-drained areas. If we are reading the newspapers and we must know that President Carter has as of today, sponsored a Bill in Congress for a development bank that would...develop plans for these depressed areas would be gathered together by entities like this, like this Depressed Areas Authority, the General Assembly is not going to come up with a plan of action as to how to correct these areas that are tax drained. The people who are there don't have the expertise to do so and what we need is a state-wide authority that will come up with a plan of action as to how we change these tax-drained areas into tax revenue-producing areas. Nobody else is going to do that or can do that for the State of Illinois and it becomes our responsibility to get down and help the people who are in serious trouble. Because there isn't the local expertise. Now I have amended this Bill, I've changed this Bill, this authority would go nowhere that it is not specifically invited by the people of that county or by the people of that city. If there is any concept that this is an authority that would superimpose it's powers on anybody is certainly not true. It has been amended so...only by invitation would it go to a particular city in trouble. And I say to you, that the only way that we can turn the situation around here in Illinois is...we can't sit down and do the planning because we do not have the expertise we do not have the time. We've got to have an independent authority to do this. Now the best evidence that this is not duplicative is, that these areas are growing in serious...more serious trouble every day. The established



departments of government are not correcting the situations that plague the depressed areas of this state. When we first came here there was two hundred and twenty-five thousand people out of work and now there are three hundred and twenty-five thousand people out of work. And there are more people out of work and it is growing every day. We need some expert staff and that's all this Bill is about. Some staff to come up with a long term economic growth plan for the depressed areas of this state. And I submit to you that this is a valid concept and one which the Federal Government is moving to accommodate and I ask for your support of this Bill because this is valid concept and one which will help to increase the state revenues by making those areas, tax paying areas and by putting people to work and we ought to do that."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"

Huff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I...."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, Representative Huff."

Huff: "I would like to respond to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Huff: "Thank you. I rise to support this Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. In my opinion there is nothing precedent setting in what Representative Younge is trying to do. I will remind you that in Chicago many of the collar county communities were created by federal insured funds under the 1968 Housing Act, the 236 program. Which brought into existence many of the fine communities that we see outside in the suburbs of Chicago. I submit that what Mrs. Younge is attempting to do is no more than what was done...quite successfully in these communities. And that is, provide the planning to set the stage for the federal assistant housing program that are available now. I would urge you to make the consideration along these lines and the only extraordinary thing is..about this issue



have an attempt now to put houses back on the tax role of East St. Louis, raise the per capita earnings which will in turn bring tax revenue for the State of Illinois. I think this is an exciting concept and is deserving of your most close consideration. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Deavers. Representative Youngue to close."

Youngue: "I ask for your support of this Bill. The substantive Bill is on Second Reading in the Senate, the funds that would pay for the staff to do the study and to set up the authority can come and should come and are available to this state from Federal Funds. And therefore, I think that is the way it will be funded. There is a need for a plan in this state as to what we're going to do with those areas that consistantly throw our budget out of balance, consistantly drain the state of its resources. It is just so primary and so basic that what we need is a plan of action. Clearly the established agencies of government up to this date are not going to do that. They do not do that, there is not the expertise there to do that. And since we can have this from Federal Funds, I ask you to support me by sending this Bill to the Senate to match the substantive Bill which is already over there on Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Will Lee Schwartz please come to the podium. Representative Vinson, do you seek recognition?"

Vinson: "If this gets enough votes, Mr. Speaker, I would like a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne, are you seeking recognition? Have all voted who wished? Representative Ray Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. It is very easy to listen to the critics of Mrs. Youngue, talk, pick and pick



away at her particular Bills and projects. She has come up with an imaginative, an operation that would indeed help the people by their boot straps to lift themselves up. There are those of you critics who will light no light, who will give no aid, who will render no assistance. You talk about the awesomeness of the power, but are you aware of the awesomeness of the problem. The problem will not go away because we in a negative tone simply refuse to look at it. It will become worse, it will fester and it will spread to the other parts of the state. And I ask you, do we not hear your every plea, a hundred and fifty thousand dollars isn't even one roof on a fair. It is not even a hundred feet of highway, we spend more money on this for Commissions to study creeks that aren't four feet wide. And I suggest to you, of all the money and of all the waste that we create up and down the state, with all the airplanes that we can buy, with all the tremendous expenditures that we have. What is a hundred and fifty thousand dollars to attempt to solve one of the basic hard core problems of the State of Illinois. Turn a deaf ear if you will, but I say to you, the problem will not go away. It will spread like a malignancy, like a cancer. And when it creeps upon your community then you become concerned. When dope was in the black community we could not get a whimper, a cry or a holler. But as soon as the angel dust and the dope hit the suburbs, we now find out that this is the most crucial issue that has ever faced the state. Ladies and Gentlemen, the economic decay in this area is a serious problem. Turn your ears if you will, but you will live to regret it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 84 'aye' and 49 'no'...Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mrs. Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge."



Young: "Poll the absentees please."

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady...will you take the record, Mr. Clerk?  
On this question there 84 'aye' and 49 'no'. Representative  
Young has requested a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk  
will you poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych, Bartulis, Breslin, Byers, Campbell,  
Christensen, Collins, Dawson, Deuster, Domico, John  
Dunn, Ebbesen, Flinn, Friedland, Friedrich, Garmisa,  
Hoxsey, Kane, Klosak, Kucharski, Leinenweber, Mautino,  
McAuliffe, McGrew, Meyer, Miller, Molloy, Peters, Reed,  
Schlickman, Schuneman..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino, 'aye'. Representative  
Schlickman, 'no'. Representative Friedrich, 'aye'.  
Representative Stiehl, 'aye'. Representative Tipword,  
'aye'. Representative Dawson, 'aye'. Representative  
Vinson...I know what you asked but....Representative  
Kane, 'aye'. I don't know whether that's 'aye' or 'no'.  
Representative Kane, 'aye'. On this question there is  
90 'aye' and 49 'no'. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Did you say 90 'ayes'."

Speaker Redmond: "90 'ayes'."

Schlickman: "Request a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "You can't do that. Representative Vinson has  
already requested it. Can't on the same thing, one after  
another like that."

Schlickman: "That's right but I wish you would be consistant  
though."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoxsey, 'aye'. Representative  
Reed, 'aye'. Representative....anyone else? That's  
92 or 93? 92. Representative Vinson has requested a  
verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Mr. Clerk  
will you...."

Clerk O'Brien: "I have a few more absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, pardon me. A few more absentees, will  
continue with the poll of the absentees."





Clerk O'Brien: "Schuneman, Sharp, Stearney, E.G. Steele, R.V. Walsh, Willer, Winchester and Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Call the Affirmative...."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "A request, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson has withdrawn the request for verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. 92 'aye', 50 'nays' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3071."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3071, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Department of Business and Economic Development. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge. Out of the record, is that what that signal means? Out of the record. 3128... Representative John Dunn...out of the record. 3197, Representative Kane. 3197."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3197, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent distributive expenses of the State Comptroller. Third Reading of the Bill."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3197 is the Appropriation Bill for the Comptroller's Office. This is a reduction of 2.7% of last year and I would urge the favorable consideration of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Totten."

Totten: "Wonder if the...Mr. Speaker, thank you. I wonder if the Sponsor would indicate how much it is, how much it increased over last year,"

Kane: "This is a reduction from last year...surprising as that may seem. But the Comptroller has run a very good office in this last year in the operating expenses are at a reduction"

Totten: "And you have heard the Comptroller is up for election each year...we'd be glad to...on the Bureau."

Kane: "If we put him in charge of all of the Departments then they would all be reduced."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Kane: "I would be happy to for the distinguished Minority...  
Assistant Minority Leader."

Telcser: "What did the Gentleman say?"

Kane: "The Comptroller is Michael Bakalis."

Telcser: "Who?"

Kane: "The next Governor of our state."

Telcser: "Of which state? What state? Who?"

Kane: "I always realized you didn't know where you were but  
this is Illinois. And our next Governor is Michael  
Bakalis."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield for a question  
about the Comptroller's budget?"

Speaker Redmond: "Will the Members standing between the Chair  
and the... Representative Telcser, please sit down?  
Representative Peters, will you please sit down? Rep-  
resentative Ryan. Proceed."

Telcser: "Representative, could you tell us why the budget for  
the Comptroller is not contained in one of your omnibus  
Bills."

Kane: "I was fortunate enough to have the Committee vote favorably  
on the Bill when it came out. Because the appropriation  
was so much lower than last year that there was unanimous  
consent by the Committee to put it out."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I couldn't  
quite hear everything the Gentleman said, but it seems  
to me that if Members of the other side of the aisle like  
the idea of omnibus Bills. I find it strange that the  
architect of this scheme, Mr. Bakalis's surrogate, not the  
Sponsor of this Bill, hadn't decided to put Mr. Bakalis's  
budget in an omnibus Bill. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker,  
that if Mr. Bakalis is ordering his followers to take  
the budget Bills of the State of Illinois and group them  
into one omnibus Bill, he has very cutely and conveniently



left his Bill alone. Now that doesn't seem fair to me, Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, to ask the distinguish Assistant Minority Leader, his Party having killed the Equal Rights Amendment, please don't kill this Appropriation Bill."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Gentleman from the other side of the aisle knows full well that when he gives orders, his Members take them and simply because there were two votes short on the Equal Rights Amendment...which I supported. I think if one looks down the Roll Call, they will find a number of Democratic Members who are well entrenched in the Democratic patronage machine who not only voted against the ERA, but I wonder if they were even asked to vote for it by the Leaders from the other side of the aisle. But, Mr. Speaker and Members of the aisle....Members of the House, it seems to me that the Gentleman has begged a question. I would like to know why he won't take this Bill out of the record...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Telcser: "Take it back to Second and let us put it in an omnibus Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Bowman: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman is not addressing himself to this Bill, he addressing the very abstract concept of an omnibus Bill and I think we ought to get on with business. He was not even talking about the Equal Rights Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "He terminated his remarks. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in response to Representative Telcser and in support of Representative



Kane. I do not believe that the Appropriations Committee has taken any state officers Bill....appropriation and put it in the omnibus Bill. I was handling the Attorney General's Bill and there was no effort made to do it in that case and I don't know of any other case where state officers Bill is put in the omnibus Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Will you call the House down please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well...yes. Please come to order."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have a number of appropriations for various departments of the State of Illinois that are being held up from any action of this House. I think it would only be fair and just...of the Sponsor of this Bill to put it back, bring it back and hold it until we are ready to act on all Appropriation Bills. I don't say he has to take it back to Second and put it in the Omnibus Bill but I think he should hold it here until we have the opportunity to get our other Bills on Third Reading and work on them. I think it would be the only fair thing to do and certainly, that side of the aisle has been purporting for the last six months about their fairness, their justness everything like that. I really think that in all fairness, Mr. Kane, you will hold this Bill until we get the other Bills on Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Representative Kane to close. Motion carries."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I mentioned earlier, this is one of the few offices in state government in which the operating expenses have been reduced over the last year. The appropriation request is



2.7% below last year, the reduction over the last two years has been 5% in current dollars which would translate into 15% in real dollars and I would ask for a favorable consideration of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Madigan. Representative Madigan is recognized."

Madigan: "Thank you for recognizing me, Mr. Speaker. I had forgot that I had sought recognition. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the support of the House for the annual appropriation for the Comptroller's office. It's a 6.5 decrease over last year's appropriation. I for one think that it is an injustice to ask another state constitutional officer to hold his budget. I think that the time of this House and especially in the last nine or ten days of the Session, we should be working on the issues as they come up. I believe that the Comptroller of this state is, not only in this year but in previous years to an exemplary officer in conducting his office and trying to maintain current state spending. And I for one strongly encourage an 'aye' vote, not based upon that this man is also candidate for the highest office of this state. But based upon the previous track record of being an excellent public servant. I would hope that this House in all justice would vote upon the budget as they come up and vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that everyone knows this budget is more than what was expended last year, I'm going to ask for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich, for what....."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order. He spoke in debate and he cannot now, in the rules explain his vote."



Speaker Redmond: "He didn't rise to explain his vote. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 93 'aye' and 2 'no', Representative Telcser has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Lechowicz has requested a poll of the absentees. The next Bill will be 3374. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill only has 93 votes. I would be delighted to go through a verification, I know a number of Members have been detained with their long dinner. They are probably still on their dessert and they are not here. It seems to me a verification won't hold up, if you want to persist, fine...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to personally object to the conduct of the Assistant Minority Leader this evening. Mr. Speaker, he fully knows well that many of our Members were physically exhausted after the travail caused by Governor Thompson. In light of that, he now attempts to hold up and delay the actions of this Legislature as we move toward an orderly adjournment at the end of this month. And as part of this usual duplicity, I wish to point out that he just stated that he voted and he supported the Equal Rights Amendment. Yet only thirty-one of his colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle joined him in that support. While seventy-three Democrats supported the adoption of the Amendment. And at the same time, the usual duplicity of this administration showed us Governor Thompson working on the behalf of the Amendment and his Lieutenant Governor, McNeal, working against it. Where is McNeal?"

Speaker Redmond: "93 'aye' and 2 'no'. Representative Telcser has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Lechowicz has requested a poll of the absentees. Representative McMaster, for what purpose do



you arise?"

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I really think that the Majority Leader should learn what the Lieutenant Governor's name is.

Mike, it is O'Neal, not McNeal."

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Collins, Deuster...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the Republicans want a verification they don't have to send their people over here checking seats. Let them verify it the right way. They don't have to send their staff people over here to check who's here and who's isn't here. Tell them to go in the back to the over side of his aisle."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich. Looks like you all went to dinner with Brian Duff."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, in behalf of Tim Johnson, I object to the Governor's aides working on the floor and lobbying on this vote. Mr. Tim Johnson has proved to me that the Governor's aides can't lobby on the floor of the House. The Governor is lobbying against a Bill that is bare-boned....a barebones budget. And everybody here knows according to Tim Johnson, that you can't lobby on the floor of the House. Why we ought to be ashamed of ourselves."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman...proceed with the poll of the absentees. Representative Abramson. Representative Abramson. Representative Abramson, I recognized him."

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

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

Abramson: "Vote me 'present' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote Representative Abramson, 'present'. Proceed. Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a point of personal privilege. Representative Madigan and Representative



Matijevich said, that there....we're, on this side of the aisle, the leaders against ERA. I want to remind both of them that they were in the forefront of disenfranchising thousands of voters here in Illinois. They did not approve the seven o'clock voting hours Bill. And Representative Madigan...Representative Madigan, led the charge, he led the charge against disenfranchising thousands of voters in Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Huff...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff, 'aye'. Representative Ewell, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, for a point of parliamentary information or inquiry. It seems to me that we waste a great deal of time verifying the vote and perhaps the Chair could in conjunction with the Leadership, allow those who might want to perhaps verify the votes to do it from the podium where the lights are. We wouldn't have but five or six names called and we could probably save an awful lot of time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn, for what purpose do you arise?"

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my 'present' vote to 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn, desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, would you record me as voting 'aye' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Leinenweber, Meyer, Molloy, no further."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Proceed with the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bowman, Bradley."

Speaker Redmond: "According to Hanahan's Rules, you have to rise





your hand when you're called."

Clerk O'Brien: "Brady..."

Speaker Redmond: "Brady...rise your hand Brady. The good looking man there is Representative Brady."

Clerk O'Brien: "Brandt..."

Speaker Redmond: "Who? Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand that this is Mr. Bakalis's budget, I wish to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet..."

Speaker Redmond; "Please rise your hand so that the verifiers can identify you. Representative Daniels, for what purpose do you arise? You may be excused."

Clerk O'Brien: "Byers..."

Speaker Redmond: "Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I might point out to those who suggested that the Comptroller Bill be put into an Omnibus Bill... that Rule 27 (e), of our rules requires separate Bills for the separate Constitutional Officers. And I would suggest that a 'present' vote trying to force an Omnibus Bill would not be in effect and I think it is a dilatory action. And those persons might want to change their vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to change my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Lady to 'aye'. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Caldwell, Capparelli, Catania, Chapman, Christensen, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Dyer, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Friedrich, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hanahan, Harris, Hart, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, J.M. Houlihan, Huff, Jaffe, Emil Jones..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Dúyne."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kane, Katz, Kelly, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski,



Laurino, Lechowicz, LeVerenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Macdonald, Madigan, Madison, Mann, Marovitz, Peggy Smith Martin, Matejek, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McPike, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, Pechous, Pierce, Pouncey, Richmond, Robinson, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schlickman, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, Van Duyne, Vitek, Von Boeckman, R.V. Walsh, Willer, Williams, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call? Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, what is the count at the present time?"

Speaker Redmond: "98 'ayes'."

Telcser: "Okay. Representative Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Beatty on the floor? Here he is."

Telcser: "Representative Brandt."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Brandt on the floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Don Brummet."

Speaker Redmond: "Brandt...where is Brandt? We put Beatty back."

Telcser: "You took Brandt off, correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, we took Brandt off."

Telcser: "Representative Don Brummet."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Don Brummet...how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Did you take him off, Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Telcser: "Representative Byers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."



Telcser: "Representative Caldwell."

Speaker Redmond: "He's in the center aisle."

Telcser: "Representative Chapman."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Telcser: "Representative...there she is. Representative Christensen."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Christensen on the floor? Christensen. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Telcser: "Representative DiPrima."

Speaker Redmond: "Pass him over for a moment, he's in with Roscoe Cunningham."

Telcser: "Is he here? Representative John Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative John Dunn. He's over here."

Telcser: "Representative Getty."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Getty on the floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Redmond: "Right here."

Telcser: "All right. Representative Hart."

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Hart recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Holewinski."

Speaker Redmond: "Holewinski...how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Jim Houlihan."

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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



Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Katz."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Telcser: "Representative Kornowicz still here?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Kornowicz here?"

Telcser: "If he is in the nurses station, I will excuse him  
but if he's not...."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know whether he is or not. Representative  
Madigan, is Representative Kornowicz in the...."

Telcser: "All right then, give him a pass. Representative  
Luft."

Speaker Redmond: "He was right here."

Telcser: "Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Marovitz here? Representative Marovitz.  
How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Mudd."

Speaker Redmond: "Mudd is here."

Telcser: "Representative Mulcahey."

Speaker Redmond: "Mulcahey is here. Jane Barnes is sitting there."

Telcser: "Representative Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell...how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Has Representative DiPrima come on the floor..."

Speaker Redmond: "There he is, right along side of the...."

Telcser: "All right. What is the count, Mr. Speaker? Rep-  
resentative Doyle."

Speaker Redmond: "Doyle is here."

Telcser: "Representative Schneider."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Schneider here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Greiman."



Speaker Redmond: "Greiman. Schneider is here, put him back on the Roll Call."

Telcser: "Representative Greiman."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Greiman here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Matejek."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand he just stepped in the hall. See if that's right. Yourell is back, put him back on. Representative Matejek...if you are in the corridor come back out in the chambers."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, we understand that Representative Kornowicz is not in the nurses station."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know...put Matejek back on."

Telcser: "I'm going to ask for Representative Kornowicz to be verified since he is not in the nurses station."

Speaker Redmond: "Does anyone know if he is in the nurses' station?"

Telcser: "We just went over there and looked, Mr. Speaker. He's not there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "I would ask of the Minority Whip if he looked in the nurses station in the State Office Building?"

Telcser: "I'm asking for Representative Kornowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, what is your pleasure? Do you want him removed from the...."

Telcser: "Well we just went over to the nurses station and he's not there."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, remove him from the Roll Call."

Telcser: "That's all I have, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count, Mr....87 'aye'....how many 'no'? 87 'aye' and 2 'no'. Representative Kane. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I was trying to listen to the verification,



how am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Lechowicz recorded?"

Talcser: "Mr. Speaker, you've got the Roll Call why don't you announce it. The Gentleman... Representative Kane is seeking recognition. How often can we do this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "We're going to do it all night, Art, I'm going to verify every Roll Call. Especially every Republican Appropriation Bill from now until June the 30th, my friend. So stick around."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask leave to take this Bill out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration."

Kane: "Is anybody objecting? I would ask leave of the House to take the Bill out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Objection has been raised."

Kane: "I ask leave to put it on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. Representative Jane Barnes, 'aye'. What's the score now? 88. Representative Jacobs, for what purpose do you arise? How is Representative Jacobs recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Tipsword, 'aye'. What's the score now? 90 'aye' and 2 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3374. Representative Kelly, 'aye'. Representative Kelly, seeks recognition."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave of the House to table House Bill 2631."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections...what was the number."

Kelly: "Yes, House Bill 2631, it pertains to the toll way authority on motorcycles and there was an agreement reached between the industry and the toll way on the motorcycles



and I've agreed to table it and I think it should be tabled."

Speaker Redmond: "Where is it?"

Kelly: "I just introduced it and I would like to have it off the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Well where is it, is it on the Calendar... rules..."

Kelly: "All it was was introduced and I want to have it officially tabled as of today."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman tables...what's the number of it?"

Kelly: "2631."

Speaker Redmond: "2631. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Does that have anything to do with putting, Mr. Kelly?"

Kelly: "If it did, I wouldn't have any problem with you."

Speaker Redmond: "3374, Representative Edgar."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3374, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Public Health. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "Moving right along in a bipartisan spirit. Did..... Representative Madison didn't want to call the cost of living for public aid first? That might be... This Bill is a supplemental for public health for fiscal year '78. There is no Omnibus Bill for '78, supplemental that we know of. That is probably why it is not in one. This appropriates three million, nine hundred and five thousand dollars. Three and a half million is in Federal Funds for the women and infant care grant. These are monies that go to local public health agencies, these are for bills that have already been turned in to the department and have not been able to be paid. So these local agencies are doing without. Also there is four hundred thousand dollars on this Bill from General Revenue which is for



health service grants for medical care for individuals, for persons suffering from chronic renal dialysis. This Bill is needed now...to be passed, it has been waiting for about four weeks. I realize we're in the middle of some give and take but I would suggest, this is an emergency piece of legislation. There are Bills not being paid to local agencies and also to individuals who are suffering from severe kidney problems. And I think we should appropriate this money so these people can receive their funds."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to speak very briefly in behalf of House Bill 3374. It provides for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Public Health by increasing the original appropriation by 1.8 million dollars from the United States Department of Agriculture, Women and Infants Funds. This is federal money and it turn, I believe it can be used for a very good cause. It is not my intention to stymie the work of this House and I ask for the support of the Membership on this side of the aisle in behalf of House Bill 3374."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', oppoed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 156 'aye' and 4 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3319...out of the record. 3384."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3384..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "May I have leave of the House to change my vote on the last Bill, 3374. From 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Objection has been raised. Does the Gentleman





have leave to change his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. Leave. No objection and leave is granted. Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bill, Third Reading appears. Senate Bill 82."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 82, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 82 by simple low number that it is, indicates that it has been here in the House for some time. Early in the game we made a small Amendment changing this to say that the penalty in relation to carrying a weapon aboard a university campus would not... would be no penalty if it was for a police officer. I think there was another Amendment that was added on after that that had some consequence. But I would appreciate an 'aye' vote and get this Bill back over to the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Unless I'm mistaken, Mr. Speaker, I think the Bill is much more substantial than what Representative Polk has described it as. It is a relatively innocuous Bill as it was before Representative Kosinski's Amendment was placed on the Bill. But this is a three time loser Bill. This doesn't refer simply to unlawful use of weapons, this refers to a Bill... now on this Bill by way of Amendment, a Bill that has already been rejected by the Senate. I suggest quite predictably it will be rejected again. I think that if we are going to describe the Bill and have in a perspective before the Membership of what we're voting on. What we are really voting upon here is a three time loser Bill. Now it has been rejected in the past Session of the Legislature and it has been rejected in this Session of the Legislature and quite predictably, it is going to be rejected again. I think that what Representative Polk has done, as respect to the Bill, is to insure its



defeat once it goes back over to the Senate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti. Conti."

Conti: "What is it?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, your light was on, I'm sorry. I just recognized you, your light was on."

Conti: "Who put it on?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Houlihan is perfectly right. The Legislative intent of this Body when we originally passed Habitual Criminal Act was as incorporated in this Senate Bill. It is the only way to get it back for the Senate to review, it is the only opportunity we'll have possibly this Session to attempt to prevent...I repeat, to attempt to prevent habitual criminals from roaming in our districts. A hundred and fifteen of you Sponsored the original legislation, this is our effort to get it back to the Senate for further consideration. And I ask for your affirmative vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk to close."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, the two previous speakers couldn't be more than right. This Bill no longer... although it has a low number and wasn't the intent of the Senate Sponsor and myself to make this a controversial piece of legislation. But when you consider that now that you have...what we call the three time loser Amendment on this Bill, it does indeed make it a Bill of some major significance. I think it is important that it has one more shot back in the Senate, it got caught and as we well know what happens when Bills sometimes get caught up in the Senate and not get...what I understand, did not get a proper hearing. If you voted for it before, it was 115 'aye' votes on it previously. I would like to see this Bill back in the Senate, give it a Conference



Committee and see what we can do on a three time loser Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 82 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Would you kindly vote Mr. Totten as 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 117 'ayes', 26 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 238, Mr. Porter. Out of the record. Senate Bill 252, Miss Pullen."



Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 252. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I indicated the other day when this was on Second Reading that I would bring it back to Second Reading if certain people had Amendments to the Bill, they have filed Amendments and I move to bring the Bill back to Second Reading, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Lady have leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading? Any objections? Hearing none, the Bill is back on Second Reading. Clerk, do you want to put the Bill back on Second Reading, please? Let's go. Any Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #3, Willer, amends Senate Bill 252 on page 12, line 15 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen, on Amendment #3. I'm sorry, Ms. Willer."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table Amendment #3 and move on to Amendment #4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady withdraws Amendment #3. Amendment #4, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #4, Willer, amends Senate Bill 252 as amended on page 7 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Willer."

Willer: "Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 252 makes technical corrections. It permits the court to waive court appearance upon good cause shown with a physicians statement. It also authorizes the court to take action that it considers appropriate in receiving annual guardian report to the court. These changes were proposed by Judge Dahl and have been reviewed and approved by affected parties. There is no known opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #4 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', aye, all opposed...Amendment #4 is adopted."



Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #5, Pullen, amends Senate Bill 252 as amended on page 10 by deleting lines 28 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, first I ask leave to amend the Amendment on its face to add underlining in line 5-10 between the quotation marks."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady asks leave, is there any objections? The Clerk will amend the Amendment on its face. Now, on the Amendment the Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "This adds a Section to the Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Ma'am. Please, proceed."

Pullen: "This adds a Section to the Bill which addresses limited guardianship...the Bill does. The Section being added was inadvertently left out and it relates to venue and it conforms this Bill to existing statutes. It's a necessary Amendment and I move its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #5 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', aye, all opposed...Amendment #5 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 253. Mr. Beatty. Out of the record. Excuse me, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Marovitz: "As principal Co-sponsor of Senate Bill 253, I'd like to bring it back to Second Reading, if that's where it is, for purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to bring Senate Bill 253 back to Second Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing none, Senate Bill 253, Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 253. A Bill for an Act to create the Guardianship and Mental Health Advocacy Commission."



## Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Good enough. Any Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1, Marovitz, amends Senate Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Presently, Senate Bill 253 calls for the Commission to have 12 members, 4 appointed by the Governor, 4 appointed by the Supreme Court, 4 appointed by the Leadership of the General Assembly. Amendment #2 changes that to the Commission shall have nine members..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, is this Amendment #1 or 2? How about Amendment #1, Mr. Marovitz?"

Marovitz: "This is...I'm speaking to Amendment #1, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right, fine. You said Amendment #2."

Marovitz: "Amendment #1 says that the Commission shall have nine members appointed by the Governor with advice and consent of the Senate. I would ask the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #1...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney, on the Amendment."

Stearney: "May I ask the Gentleman a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he'll yield."

Stearney: "What is this Amendment to?"

Marovitz: "This is to Senate Bill 253, which sets up the Human Rights Authority, the Legal Advocacy Service and the Office of State Guardianship."

Stearney: "The Human Rights Authority?"

Marovitz: "That's right."

Stearney: "And this Amendment does what now? You spoke a little too fast."

Marovitz: "This has to do with the selection of the Commission members and the original office was to be chosen 4 by the Governor, 4 by the Supreme Court, 4 by the Leadership of the General Assembly. We are now changing this to give



all appointments to the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, on the Amendment."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to support the Amendment. This is an agency of the executive branch of government. This Bill, as it was originally introduced, provided for the Supreme Court and the Legislative Leaders to appoint members. Previously, there was a Supreme Court decision regarding the State Board of Elections relative to the constitutionality of the appointment of members. While I am opposed to the Bill, I think this Amendment makes a bad Bill a little bit better, certainly constitutional and I would encourage its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Peoria, Ms. Sumner, on the Amendment."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Sumner: "Are these members paid?"

Marovitz: "There is no salary for these members, they are paid a per diem I believe."

Sumner: "They are paid a per diem. What is the per diem per day?"

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

Sumner: "What is the per diem? What is the overall cost to this additional..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty, can answer the question. Mr. Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, the Amendment has nothing to do with per diem. The Amendment merely changes who does the appointing so the questions are not pertinent to the Amendment, they're pertinent to the Bill and I think that the questions should be pertinent to the Amendment and not to the Bill. And this Amendment...that's all I have to say



on that point. Per diem is not in the Amendment, it's the question who does the appointing. And the question should be ruled out of order on that score."

Sumner: "It is increasing it, isn't it? Isn't it increasing it?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any further discussion, Ms. Sumner?"

Sumner: "Is it increasing the members?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Marovitz, please."

Marovitz: "It is not increasing the memberships. As a matter of fact, it is decreasing it. It was 12 members, it is now 9 members, all appointed by the Governor."

Sumner: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', aye, all those opposed...Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #2, Marovitz, amends Senate Bill 253 on page 2 and so forth."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to table Amendment #2?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #2. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Mr. Beatty, do you want 253? O.K. Take Senate Bill 253 out of the record. Senate Bill 255, Mr. Mugalian."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 255. A Bill for an Act to protect the confidentiality of records and communications of recipients of mental health or developmental..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 309. Dan Houlihan, do you want to call that one? Out of the record. Senate Bill...was 386 called, Clerk? 386, was that called before? Senate Bill 386, Mr. Hoffman."





Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like leave to pull Senate Bill 386 back to Second Reading for the purpose of Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, Gene, what was your request?"

Hoffman: "I would like to unanimously pull it back to Second Reading for the purpose of Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Asks unanimous re....ask leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading for....Amendment?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are there any objections? Bring the Bill back to Second Reading. Hearing none, bring the Bill back to Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #8, Levin. Amends Senate Bill 386 on page 7, line 24 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to withdraw Amendment #8. There will be a subsequent Amendment #10, which is a corrected version."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #8. Any objections? Hearing none, the Amendment is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #9, Keats. Amends Senate Bill 386 on page 9, line 3 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who's the Sponsor? Mr. Keats, is he in the chamber? Withdraw the Amendment. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #10, Levin. Amends Senate Bill 386 on page 7, line 24 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin on Amendment #...9 or 10, you've #9 on the board, Mr. Clerk. #10."

Levin: "Can we take it out of the record for a moment, if you want copies."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to explain the Amendment."

Levin: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Amendment #10 makes several technical corrections in Senate Bill 386. The most important which



is to correct an inadvertence in the Bill as it is currently drafted. As the Bill is currently drafted, it prevents employees of special education districts under any circumstances from being hearing officers on appeals of the special handicapped cases. This Amendment corrects that inadvertence it was drafted by the Office of Education."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Ellis, I didn't hear...that employees are now what?"

Levin: "If you look on line 16 and 21, it provides that employees of a special education district...other than that where the....contesting the child's placement...may be hearing officers and appeals. A large number of the current hearing officers of the Office of Education come from special education co-op districts and as the Bill is currently constituted, would not be able to continue as hearing officers."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does that answer your question? Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, on the Amendment."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Levin, I was just trying to figure out....is there any possibility of a conflict of interest? Is that why that was put in? With regard to an appeal, someone who may have an interest."

Levin: "Representative Katz, the provision provides that a employee of the particular special education co-op district cannot be hearing officers. But what the Bill in its present form does, it says, under no circumstances can an employee associated with the special ed. co-op whether or not there is a conflict of interest or not...be a hearing officer. In other words, there can't be a hearing officer on a case that has nothing whatsoever to do with that co-op district. This simply provides that where there is no conflict of interest, they can be a hearing officer. This is current policy."



Katz: "Well, is this Amendment an Amendment of the Illinois Office of Education?"

Levin: "Yes, this is drafted by the Office of Education and is... been agreed to by all the various parties including the School Board Association."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman on the Amendment."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to clarify any questions, I've worked with the Sponsor of this Amendment as have the interested parties and I accept this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall this Amendment #10 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed. Amendment #10 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #11, Hoffman. Amends Senate Bill 386 as amended in Section 14...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman on Amendment #11. Gene."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #11 clarifies through other Sections of the Bill, material that we adopted in Amendment #1. Where we provide that supervision between the agencies and the IOE will be jointly developed. The material in Amendment #11 clarifies that throughout the Section of the statutes. And I move its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Hoffman, as I read these Amendments it appears that we would then be saying that the Office of Education can really not require any standards for the educational programs within state institutional care."

Hoffman: "No, that is not correct. If you look at Amendment #1, which you probably don't have before you. Amendment #1



incorporates the language of the interagency agreement that exists now between the IOE and the other agencies that they have recently agreed on, to say that the standards for the programs and standards will be jointly developed and agreed to by both the Illinois Office of Education and the Operating State Agency now including the standards of educational personnel. That was in the first Amendment that we adopted in Committee and that just clarifies that through the rest of the Bill."

Satterthwaite: "So, this Amendment in no way negates the agreement that would be enforced between the agencies."

Hoffman: "That is correct. In fact, the Amendment that we'll be dealing with merely clarifies what we have already agreed to. Correct."

Satterthwaite: "But in fact then, if that joint agency agreement included a stipulation that the standards would be equal to the standards for the public school system...that would be the way that it would be enforced."

Hoffman: "As usual, you are absolutely correct."

Satterthwaite: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #11 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed. Amendment #11 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 388."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 388, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take it out of the record, Gene? Out of the record. Senate Bill 389, Mr. Greiman. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 389, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the



House. Senate Bill 389, which is the same Bill as House Bill 2105 that passed out of this House by huge number. Gives school districts the option...at their option only, of providing...special education facilities for children from two through....to zero. That would be for children that are profoundly handicapped and identifiable. The testimony taken was compelling on this Bill, compelling in the sense that we found that almost all of the... not almost, all of the professionals in the field said, the earlier that you get to a young person who is profoundly handicapped the more you will save for...the treatment of that young person as years go on. The more you will be able to deal and make that person a whole human being and allow that person to function in society. At this point we are unable to provide from locally raised funds for children zero through two. This Bill gives an option permissive only, to do that...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion?"

Greimen: "It is an important Special Education Bill and I ask that you pass it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Yes, would Representative Hoffman yield on this particular point."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman... his light was seeking recognition. Mr. Hoffman."

Waddell: "Do we not have provision in the law right now where we provide rooms at the request of the schools themselves, special rooms for this?"

Hoffman: "Let me just respond to the question and indicate to you that, this Bill is basically the same Bill that we passed out of the House which clarifies the authority for local school districts to do what they are doing now at no cost to the state. And that is to provide early education for handicapped children. There is no money involved...what local school districts are doing now,



in some cases they are doing without specified authority in the statute."

Waddell: "In my district, they are putting them in right now at the cost of the state."

Hoffman: "This does not deal with buildings, this deals with the operation....are you talking about rooms...buildings? I don't believe as I understand it, it has nothing to do with buildings."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I just had a question, when Mr. Waddell's question has been answered. My question is, this provides for a state reimbursement...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Why don't you ask the Sponsor."

Friedrich: "All right. My Digest indicates this provides for state reimbursement for this additional program."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Greiman, please."

Greiman: "No, it would not at all. It provides solely for localized...locally raised funds. That is what the Bill provides and it is a very limited Bill, Dwight, and only would apply..."

Friedrich: "My Digest is in error, thank you."

Greiman: "And just gives that option to the school districts."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco."

Lucco: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to reiterate something that has been said. And I want to rise in support of this Bill. First of all, this is only permissive legislation, second it is no cost to the state. Third, the students are not to be considered accounted when it comes to reimbursement of state aid."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 389 pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. Marco, 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record."



On this question there is 143 'ayes', 1 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Kindly record the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald as 'aye'. Yes, George. George Ryan as 'aye'. Vince Birchler as 'aye'. Mr. Levin as 'aye'. Mr. Murphy as 'aye'. Mr. Hanahan as 'aye'. Senate Bill 393. Stick with me, Alan. 393."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 393, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to take Senate Bill 393 back to Second Reading for the purpose of a clarifying Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave of the House to bring the Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment. Any objections? Hearing none, Second Reading on 393."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #2, Hoffman. Amends Senate Bill 393 on page 1, line 8 and 9, by inserting 'and services' and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, Amendment #2."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. At this time I would like to table Amendment #1 because Amendment #2 clarifies, that when we're talking about a physican we're talking about a physican who is license to practice medicine in all of its branches. And that is not clear in Amendment #1. So for that purpose, I would like to table Amendment #1 and adopt Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to table Amendment #1. Any objections? Hearing none, Amendment #1 is tabled. Amendment #2. He read the Amendment, you explained the Amendment: Any discussion? All those in favor of adopting Amendment #2, signify by saying 'aye', all opposed. Amend-



ment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 395...out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 430, Mr. Bowman..are you ready? Clerk, read the Bill. 430."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 430..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Correct the board."

Clerk Hall: "A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at the present time we have kind of have an anomaly in the State of Illinois. Outside the City of Chicago tenured teachers, if they are dismissed for cause they are entitled to a hearing before a hearing examiner. Within the City of Chicago tenured teachers, if dismissed for cause, must be provided a hearing before the full Board of Education or a Subcommittee of the Board. This ties the Board up and prevents them from attending other duties. This Bill would provide for hearing officers in the case of Chicago. I would like to clarify some questions that came up once before, the synopsis, if anyone happens to have their synopsis open. The Bill in its original form provided for licensed attorneys as hearing officers, which is not done downstate. However, the Amendment, and I must admit, the synopsis of the Amendment is very lengthy. In fact almost as long as the Bill itself. If you were to read that, however, you would find in that particular provision is taken out. So the way the system would work is versely identical to the downstate system. The State Board would appoint or provide a list of qualified hearing examiners, none of which would have to be licensed attorneys but they would have to be approved by a nationally recognized arbitration association."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any disucssion? The question is, shall Senate





Bill 403 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Marco. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. Kindly record, Mr. Conti as 'aye'. 149 'ayes'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Also record Daniel O'Brien as 'aye'. Senate Bill 571, Mr. Yourell."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 571, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 571 is very similar to House Bill 2898 which passed out of this House with a very sizable majority just a few days ago. Senate Bill 571, the Bill itself provides that...timer system for employees who worked for the land clearance Commission, which is abolished and superseded by the city department of urban renewal. The Bill prohibits concurrent service credit for such service in any other public Pension Funds. Members wishing to establish such service credit are required to make payments in the contribution rates in effect at that time, together with interest at the effective rate. Now Senate Bill 571 is the same as Amendment #5, to House Bill 2898, which passed from the House on 526. Amendment #5 to 2898; however, did not require members to pay the employer a portion of such service credit. This does, so that those who wish to establish pension credit in this Department of Urban Renewal must pay not only the contributors' share but the employers' share and the interest as well. Now Amendment #1 and Amendment #4, was the CETA Amendment which was the original 2898. As you know, that Amendment dealt with problems created by the new regulation formulated by the United States Department of Labor concerning the



use of Comprehensive Employment Training Act. And so what we're saying, we put Amendment #1 and #4 on Senate Bill 571 which takes care of the CETA problem as well as the other problem originally cited. I ask for a favorable Roll Call on Senate Bill 571."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill....the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "Does this Bill, as it was introduced, or by any Amendment increase benefits without support of funding?"

Yourell: "No."

Schlickman: "Well, what about the Bill as it was originally introduced that provide...that there will not be a decrease in annuities..."

Yourell: "No, that's not on there, Gene."

Schlickman: "Has that been taken out?"

Yourell: "Yes."

Schlickman: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 571 pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I didn't have enough time to ask the Sponsor if this proposal had anything to do with free golf lessons for certain Legislators?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ask him in the morning when you need a little help. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 115 'ayes', 23 'nays', 12 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 771, Mr. Getty. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 825, Mr. McGrew. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1055, Mr. Hoffman. Gene, do you want to call that one? Out of the record."



Senate Bill 1395, Mr. Dave Jones. Out of the record. What's your point? Senate Bill 1419, Mr. Yourell...out of the record. Senate Bill 1483, Mr. Flinn. Clerk, read the Bill, 1483."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1483, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1483 poses to make an appropriation to the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University. To complete the purchase of the old Broadview Hotel down there. Presently, the building is being leased by the university and the problem exists because the Attorney General ruled that the university could not spend any of the hundred and forty-three thousand dollars we appropriated last year to repair and renovate the build because they did not have title to the building. Now in about seven years the university will own the building through the lease system they've got anyway and all this does is hurry up the purchase of the building. It does not come out of the General Fund, it comes out of the Income Fund and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1483 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 113 'ayes', 35 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1506, Mr. McPike."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1506, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Capital Development Board for the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1506 by Senator Vadalabene, in the Senate. Cosponsored by Representative Steele and myself in the House, appropriates the six hundred and forty-one thousand dollars from the Capital Development Fund to the...for planning and construction of a new gymnasium at SIU, Edwardsville. Many of you have seen pictures that we have of the present gymnasium, it is a vinyl bubble and it has the useful life of about two more years. It has inadequate heating in the winter and in the summer we have no facilities for cooling the air, the air in the gymnasium is anywhere from ten to fifteen degrees above outside temperature. I might note that we're the only university in Illinois that does not have a permanent facility. We have eleven thousand students and serve the second largest metropolitan area in the State of Illinois. This money, six hundred and forty-one thousand dollars is to continue the planning that was started last year by Senate Bill 314, that appropriated a hundred and ninety-one thousand for the initial planning. I would encourage an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Geo-Karis: "Representative, are you telling me that the six hundred and forty-one thousand dollars are for planning and separation of construction documents?"

McPike: "That is correct."

Geo-Karis: "What kind of documents are they? Are they lined with gold leaf or something and diamonds in the center? Tell me what kind of documents they are."

McPike: "Well, I'm not an engineer and...."

Geo-Karis: "You Sponsored the Bill...."



McFike: "It was told to us by the Capital Development Board that it would cost approximately six hundred thousand dollars to continue the planning and preparation of these documents. If that's the estimate that we received and that's approximately the cost and we have no alternative but to appropriate the amount of money that is estimated that it is going to cost. I don't think that you can plan the construction of any major facility in the state today for less than this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Steele."

Steele: "As Chief Sponsor...Joint Chief Sponsor, I would urge an 'aye' vote on this needed legislation. It is for planning money only and I would urge your support of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1506 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 'ayes', 26 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1530, Mr. Brady."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1530, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Community College Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. This is the appropriation Bill for the Community Colleges of Illinois. We have already passed out the rate Bill, over to the Senate for concurrence. This is the amount of appropriation that would 'pit' the five existing rates set forth in the Community College Bill and I urge your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1530 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted



who wished? Representative Mann, 'aye' please. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 'ayes', 4 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1562...take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1570, Mr. McAuliffe...out of the record. Senate Bill 1580, Mr. Stearney. 1580."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1580, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Medical Center Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1580 appropriates a hundred and ninety-seven thousand, two hundred dollars from the General Revenue Fund for the fiscal year '79; ordinary and contingent expenses of the Medical Center Commission."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1580 pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 'ayes', 18 'nays', 17 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill....Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Could I be recorded as 'yes' on 1530. I didn't hit my switch. It won't change the outcome."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be recorded as 'aye' on Senate Bill 1530. Hearing no objection, he will be so recorded. Senate Bill 1605...take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1630, Mr. Telcser."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1630, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."



Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, last year when we passed a series of Condominium Bills...in one of the Bills we provided that tenants who occupied buildings that are going to be converted should have one hundred and twenty days notice prior to the conversion. And in that legislation, we gave those tenants certain rights to remain in their apartment at the same rental for a hundred and twenty days. And also to have the first right of refusal if an outside offer came in for the apartment. This is a notice that was to be given to the tenants via registered mail or some other means so that they....it could be proven that they did receive their notice. In a Section of the legislation it erroneously stated that these notices have to be recorded. They do not have to be recorded, they are not being recorded now and all this Bill simply does is take out that erroneous language which somehow was left in the Bill. And I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "A question of the Sponsor if he will yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Houlihan: "As far as the ambiguity, I take it, is what you're referring to as to whether or not there was a requirement of recordings. But absent that, how do you indicate that there has been a service of the notice by the owner of the building?"

Telcser: "We're not changing that at all, Representative. It could be done by registered mail, by hand delivery or whatever. Just so the owner has some has some sort of record. But we are not changing that at all, it's just...."

Houlihan: "What you've seemed to have raised here is a question referring to....a confusion referring to the title, is that correct? As to whether or not there has been compliance with the notice provision set forth here in the Act."



Telcser: "Representative, would you repeat your question again? We've got a very small point here and there is really no problem with it."

Houlihan: "Small, I think a rather technical point but I think... what I'm trying to get at, if you don't record, and I can see the reason not to require the recording, how do you demonstrate that there has been a service of notice?"

Telcser: "You could demonstrate by certified mail. Sending out notices by certified mail with return receipts which you would then keep in your possession if you were the developer or the converter."

Houlihan: "Would you also have to, Art, submit that evidence of service to the title company as a practical matter. Is that what they are going to require?"

Telcser: "No, as far as I know, title companies never ask for that in any conversions that have taken place since the law came into effect. The burden, if there was a law suit or complaint on the part of a tenant, would then be upon the developer to prove that he had in fact given the hundred and twenty days notice and he could do that by using registered mail with return receipts."

Houlihan: "All right. One other question here. It appears that you do not have an effective date...."

Telcser: "There is also, when you file the declaration, Representative, there is attached to that declaration a certificate of compliance indicating that the one hundred twenty day notice was in fact given to the tenants occupying the building at the time. And that should be signed and notarized."

Houlihan: "All right, so the certificate of compliance then is an affidavit by the developer or the owners, is that correct?"

Telcser: "Right. That's why I say the burden of proof rests with them then...in the event there is a suit of some kind or complaint."





Houlihan: All right now, what about an effective date? It appears that you don't have an effective date for this change. And that could cause, we feel here, that could cause a real problem as far as the titles are concerned."

Telcser: "Well...Representative, you may have a good point and I'll be glad to discuss it with you. There is no problem in my mind because between the time between now and the time the Bill becomes law we would still be functioning the same way we have since, January 1, of this year when the law came into effect. It simply...the change wouldn't become effective perhaps until a couple of months later. And we would continue to do what we have been doing all this year."

Houlihan: "Art, can we let the two staff people...."

Telcser: "Sure."

Houlihan: "See if they can resolve that, if you want to take it out of the record at this time."

Telcser: "Sure."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take 1630 out of the record. Senate Bill 1667, Mr. Katz. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1667, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Park District Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "We previously gave park districts the power to decide to have terms of less than six years. The village of Willmette proceeded to do that, they increased the size of their board and they reduced the term. However, we did not provide a transition that would cover a board of that size. All 1667 does or did when it came over here, was to preside a...to provide a transition schedule. When it came over, however, an Amendment was added by Mr. Schneider, the Amendment simply permits the...will permit DuPage County to qualify for more than a half million dollars in Federal Funds. To purchase some open



land, it permits the Park District to condemn that land and permits it to be done within an area of two miles of existing property. This Amendment was worked out with Mr. Mahar, who had some questions and Mr. Schneider and as far as I know there is no opposition to the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1667 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Yes, Sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to have everybody take a good look at this Bill. The Amendment #1 raises the amount of territory a park district can annex from sixty to eighty acres. And then wherever a municipality overlaps another county with a minimum of four hundred thousand population and not a maximum...not to exceed a million population. It can make annexation...this is like the old stripe annexation law that we knocked out of here back in the sixties. I'm a little concerned about this Bill and some of you who were on the cities and villages, if you know a little bit more about it you better take a good look at this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think I was the one that questioned the Amendment #2, offered by Representative Schneider. And I think now we have an Amendment worked out which seems to make this particular situation about the only one that can be operable. The principle of allowing a park district to annex the honest territory is some question about the way the Amendment is worded. It narrows it down to just this particular one in DuPage County Because it is the only one that has part of its territory in a lesser county and not in a larger county like Cook County. So I think it does work out the problem where we're not hoping



this particular principle up to general acceptance by park districts and other local government of bodies. And I think it is a good Amendment, I think the Bill ought to be supported and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we understand this Bill that it gives park districts a lot of extra power and they can take land from people without a referendum or without any type of legal proceedings...just by the Board meeting a majority of small number of members. And I think this is a bad concept and I think some more people better watch what they are voting for here late on Thursday night and check their switches and maybe vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 100 'ayes', 16 'nays' and 37 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1680, Mr. Bradley. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1746, Miss Pullen...too late."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1746, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizen and Disabled Persons Property Tax and Relief Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill would extend the deadline for filing for 1976 circuit breaker grant to December 31, 1978, matching the date that is printed on the forms for 1976. It, also by Senate Amendment, would extend the deadline for the '73, '74 and '75, to September. I urge your favorable consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "She indicates that she will."

Leverenz: "Is there any type of increase estimated costs here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fiscal note has been filed."



Pullen: "It would of course depend on how many people took advantage of this and a vast majority of those eligible have already filed."

Leverenz: "Well, what does the fiscal note say?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Clerk, read the fiscal note."

Clerk O'Brien: "Fiscal note to Amendment #1, Senate Bill 1746. Amendment #1, Senate Bill 1746 has alternate financial impact upon the state, the same is set forth in the fiscal note to House Bill 3279."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's nice."

Leverenz: "Could the Sponsor give the actual dollar amount of estimated cost?"

Pullen: "That fiscal note was not what I filed, Sir. And I'm afraid I didn't keep a copy of it. But it would depend on the numbers of people who participate in this and it is a very limited extention. I'm sorry, I do not have the figure on the top of my head."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pardon me. Would you kindly read, Mrs. Pullen's fiscal note please. Briefly, it is a two-page document. Can you summarize it for us?"

Leverenz: "With a figure."

Clerk O'Brien: "Calendar year of cost per percentage point, 1973, 1.3. 1974, 1.0. 1975, 1.1. 1976, 1.1. Total, 3.6."

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, 3.6...what?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Million."

Leverenz: "Thank you. Could the Sponsor be advised that it is 3.6 million."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't usually agree with my friend on the other side of the aisle, but I must say this is a very important piece of legislation. Which was also addressed by the Minority Leader and it is a piece of legislation which attempts to correct an inequity that was printed on the forms where the forms were originally



printed, December 31, 1978. And many senior citizens throughout the state in reliance on this form, did not file for relief and subsequently were denied and this is to rectify that situation. It is an important piece of legislation and it passed the Senate by a vote of 57 to nothing. I would ask...I would encourage an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill in its original form is not objectionable and I would support it. But here the Amendment is about twenty times as significant as the original Bill. It was just last year that we passed a Bill increasing these awards on condition that we did not extend again the time to file for 1973, '74 and '75. That was the representation that was made in increasing the allowance. Now with this Senate Amendment #1, we've made what was a good Bill into something that was not intended. It was something that caused us to vote for another Bill last year and I think the Bill now is the Amendment and I can't vote for it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have any problems with the Bill but I just felt the need to comment that this Pullen-Marovitz alliance really bothers me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "She indicates that she will."

Levin: "According to my synopsis, Senate Amendment #1 sets a deadline for filing for '73, '74 and '75, and September 30, 1978. Is that accurate?"

Pullen: "I believe it is."

Levin: "You have....normally you take a few months for a Bill to be signed, like about the middle of September. Do you have any commitments from the Governor that he will sign this Bill immediately or is this simply going to be



something on the statutes that is not going to do any good?"

Pullen: "Well, Sir, I certainly think that we will be watching that very carefully and letting the people know who does what if someone does something."

Levin: "What does the fiscal note assume, in terms of pay outs, when this Bill is going to take effect?"

Pullen: "Do you want to restate that?"

Levin: "What the... we've heard the fiscal note read for all the various years and what is the assumption as far as calculating those figures on when this Bill is going to take effect?"

Pullen: "I don't think that was factored in."

Levin: "May I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I agree with one of the previous speakers of the importance of extending the date for 1976, to December 31, 1978. I've had constituent inquires on this particular point. I would also like to see the date extended as far as the previous year, to give the senior citizens an additional opportunity to apply...those that have not. I would suggest, however, that September 30, 1978, is simply an empty promise and that this Bill should be taken back to Second Reading and that date amended to at least the end of the year. Either that or take off the previous years all together. Therefore, I would urge a 'present' vote until that is done."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1746 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Lee...Schwartz. Have all voted who wished? Get the rest of them. Come on Duff. Good. You will be recognized for it. Okay. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think Representative Levin is absolutely right to pass this Bill and the Governor can



sign into law but it is not going to help very many old people that have forgotten to fill their tax reforms out for those years. And it is going to have a thirty days or so, so I think they should vote 'present' or 'no' on this Bill at the present time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd...to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Mudd: "I disagree with Representative Byers. I think it will help the Representatives who voted 'no' on every other tax relief Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 139 'ayes', 9 'nays', 50 recorded as 'present' This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1747, Mr. Telcser."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1747, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1747 clears up confusing language in a piece of legislation that we passed last year. It deals with liability insurance for condominium associations, the current law has language which implies that the condominium association must insure the developers and all unit owners. That obviously is not our intent and this Bill changes that language to make it clear that developers must provide their own individual insurance for the units which they may still own once the property is turned over to an association. And it would be the association's obligation to purchase liability insurance for their own action and again depending on the condominium by-laws for insurance in the common areas only. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we get enough votes to pass Senate Bill 1747."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr.



Levin."

Levin: "Art, would you yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Levin: "I noticed you strike the word on line 31, of the common element. What other parts of the condominium would..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Ellis. Give the Gentleman some attention please. Continue."

Levin: "What is the purpose of striking those words and what other parts of a condominium would the association want to insure for?"

Telcser: "What the parts of the association...what?"

Levin: "On line 31, on page 1, you strike the word, 'of the common element'. You insert the word 'of the property', what besides the common elements would they want liability insurance for?"

Telcser: "They would want liability insurance also for their own actions, Representative."

Levin: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear it."

Telcser: "They would want liability insurance for their own action for the decisions they may make. I'm not sure just what you are referring to."

Levin: "I'm just wondering why you strike 'common elements'."

Telcser: "Representative, I'm really not quite sure...I don't see that on my copy. Oh, of the property....on line 43, I've got it. I'm sorry, on line 31. Well, because I think the words, 'of the property' are more inclusive than would be common elements only. I'm trying to think of an example. It may perhaps be an area that the building has leased out to someone. Let us say that it is a swimming pool and they lease it out to an operator to run the pool and the operator may not have enough liability insurance and it may really not fall into the category of common elements. Whereas it would fall into...I think a more inclusive term of the property."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner,





on this? No. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Telcser, would you explain Senate Amendment #1 to me, please. Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "You mean the Amendment that we adopted already?"

Van Duyne: "Senate Amendment #1 is in the Digest, says it deletes the owners obligation from...requiring the manager, the Board of Managers to obtain such liability insurance. Now if the condominium has a swimming pool or a driveway or a parking lot, do you mean...does this Amendment...or am I laboring under some misapprehension that you would have to even though you own a condominium and get your own liability insurance against some type of injury or whatever in the parking lot or swimming pool, or whatever?"

Telcser: "No. That gets to the heart of the Bill, Representative. The way the Bill was passed last year, the language indicated that the association has to get these insurance for the entire building, including the developer. What we're doing in this Bill....."

Van Duyne: "And the grounds, right?"

Telcser: "That the board of managers of the association provides insurance liability only for their own responsibility. And that the developer will be treated as a unit owner. That is, once a building is taken over by an association the developer may still have some unsold units and that the insuring of those unsold units would not be the responsibility of the Board of Managers but would be the responsibility of the developer who in this instance is treated the same as would be the unit owners or buyers who have brought apartments. And that the responsibility of the board would be only for their own actions, for their own liability insurance and for the common elements of the building, if that is the way the board or the association wishes to handle the insurance in the common element."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does that answer your question, Mr. Van Duyne?"



Van Duyne: "Well, really I don't know, to tell you the truth. I'm still very apprehensive. It just says, of the insurance shall cover claims of one or more insured parties against other insured parties...all ready in the statutes. Add to the premium for such insurance shall be common expense. That would lead me to believe that the very people that you're talking about could levy this expense against the condominium owner which really...you know, isn't to my liking all that well. Is that true?"

Telcser: "I don't know, it seems to me, Representative, that the association is going to buy liability insurance of the common element...that that is an expense that is then shared equally. Depending on the percent of the ownership from all of the owners. Because it is common element."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, he will."

Byers: "Mr. Telcser, who does this Bill really help the most?"

Telcser: "The Bill helps really the people who are buying individual units because the way the language now reads it is confusing. It gives the impression that the Board of Managers, that is the individual buyers of units may have the obligation to insure the developer. And for a certain period of time a developer is really a unit owner because until the building is sold out a developer still owns a number of units. Now what we're doing now is trying to be sure that the developer and the unit owner have clearly delineated responsibilities and that buyers who come in to buy units are not obligated to continue to insure a developer who really ought to be paying his fair share of the insurance cost the same as an individual unit owner does."

Byers: "So, you're saying that the buyer if they buy parts of a condominium that it protects them for liability if something would happen on the property where...they could possibly



be sued for their share of the ownership they have. And you're making the developer pay that cost until he sells it."

Telcser: "Right."

Byers: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of this Bill. It is an emergency measure, as Representative Telcser stated, we have several condominiums in the City of Chicago who have been denied their insurance, their liability insurance because of some ambiguity in the present law that we passed which requires the Condominium Association to insure the developer long after he has divested himself from any interest in the condominium units or the condominium board. And this language just clarifies that and requires the Board of Managers to see to it that they have insurance, liability insurance on the common elements such as the garage, the swimming pool and the corridor. It's just clarifying language, Mr. Speaker. I urge everybody to support it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative, with this revision in the law would it mean that even if the Board of Managers determine that they wanted to be insured as unit owners individually, that they would have to have policies separate from that of the management as a whole?"

Telcser: "No, I don't think it would, Representative. I think that if an association wishes to take out an insurance policy for the entire property. If that is their wish they would still have that option. But they would have to vote on it on their board."

Satterthwaite: "But the sentence beginning in line 7, page 2, it says the unit owners shall be included as additional



insured but only with respect to that portion of the premises not reserved for their exclusive use. That seems to me to say that even if the board agrees that they would have policies covering the individual units as well as the common property that they could not do that as package."

Telcser: "I'm not sure of your question. But as individuals under this law, they may still buy their own insurance policy if they wished for their unit. Is that your question?"

Satterthwaite: "But that presumably could not be in a package along with the insurance of the common element. I think there are instances now where the insurance company will offer a better rate if the unit owner also insures as part of the same agreement for the insurance of the common element."

Telcser: "Well, I have no way of knowing how an insurance company or insurance agent would come in and give perhaps a lower rate if everybody wanted to get together and write a policy. I don't see that this Bill precludes that. It is certainly...."

Satterthwaite: "Excluded....that's my question."

Telcser: "No, I don't see any language where it would exclude it, Representative."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "One for George. The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed. The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser, to close."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1747 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'."



Lee. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?  
The Clerk will take the record. On this question there  
are 153 'ayes', 1 'nay', 4 recorded as 'present'. This  
Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby  
declared passed. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Now 10:15, Mr. Speaker. You said we could go home at  
10:00. And when we're voting for a half an hour on a  
Bill that gets 153 to 1 to 4, it is past time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It was a good Bill. Senate Bill 1777...it  
is the intent of the Chair...first of all I want to  
compliment the Membership for the decorum and the courtesy  
that has been extended to the Sponsors. It is the intent  
of the Chair to go to approximately four or five more  
Bills which will complete the work on page 5. And then  
we will go through the period of announcements and it  
is the intent of the Chair to adjourn until noon tomorrow.  
1777, Jack."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1777, a Bill for an Act to amend  
Sections of the Illinois Notary Public Act. Third Reading  
of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and  
Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1777 amends the  
Notary Public Act to provide that any notary public who  
is not an attorney and who advertises in a language other  
than English must include a statement with the advertisement  
that he or she is not an attorney and may not give legal  
advice or charge for fees. The problem being that in  
Mexico and other Latin American Countries a notary public is  
cloaked with substantial legal authority and as result  
unscrupulous notary publics are holding themselves out as  
attorneys and taking advantage of hispanics throughout the  
state. This Bill came through the Senate without a  
negative vote and I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Abramson."



Abramson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Abramson: "Does this require that it be printed in Spanish? If the advertisement is in Spanish."

Marovitz: "Would you repeat that question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does it require that it be printed in Spanish as well?"

Marovitz: "Certainly. It must accompany the advertisement. Si."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It is a very good Bill and I urge your favorable vote."

Marovitz: "Oh, my God."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It is late in the evening."

Marovitz: "Our secret is out."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will. Mr. Levin, please."

Levin: "Okay. If I can have order...I have trouble hearing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Get a little closer."

Levin: "Representative Marovitz, in your description of the Bill you indicated, you know, I know you are absolutely correct, that is a number of Hispanic countries, there is a tie-in between lawyers and notary publics. My understanding of your Bill is, that it applies not just to Spanish and Portuguese but to all language, Korean, Polish and so on. What is the reason for that?"

Marovitz: "Because those kinds of things happen in other countries as well. It is particularly...particularly happens in Latin American countries but rather than specify just Spanish, we thought we would take in other instances where that kind of unscrupulous tactics might occur."

Levin: "Are there other counties or other nationalities where the same association is made?"

Marovitz: "Can't tell you that for certain. I know it happens



in Latin America and Mexico."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1777 pass? All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Mardo. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 127 'ayes', 20 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Take 1785 out of the record. 1786, Mr. Matejek, take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1790. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1790, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Fellow Members. Senate Bill 1790 is now in the exact same shape as the Bill that Representative Levin, myself and Representative Walsh, submitted to the Senate. It changes around assessment practice on personal property taxes rather than putting a penalty on assessment. It draws the penalty to the tax instead. The assessment created an invalid assessment level by doing that with personal property, changing it around to the tax. It will still create the same effect and I urge your favorable support of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner on the Bill."

Skinner: "Would the Gentleman tell us how much extra state aid to education this will give the Cook County School District?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Brady, did you hear the question?"

Brady: "I heard the question and I don't have the figure, Representative Skinner on what state aid will be produced. But anytime you change an assessment level the state aid necessarily will change."

Skinner: "Well, personal property tax accounts for approximately



20% of the collections in Cook County and if you're cutting off 50% from the top, you're cutting the assessment base fairly sufficiently. I suspect this is the sneak Bill of the Session to increase state aid to education to Cook County School Districts and as long as everybody knows that, who cares. Right?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1790 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 97 'ayes', 42 'nays', 12 recorded 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Kindly recorded Mr. Mulcahey as 'aye'. Senate Bill 1847, Mr. Daniels. Take it out of the record. There is one Bill...two Bills on Second Reading. Senate Bill 250, page 6. Take it out of the record. 554, Terzich...he filed a fiscal note. Any further Amendments? Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill...554."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 554, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill, this Bill has been read a second time before. Amendments 4 and 5, were adopted and the Bill was held for a pension note to be filed."

Speaker Lechowicz; "And it has been filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Pension note has been filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Any announcements? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Appropriations I Committee will meet at 9:00 A.M. in room 114. Room 114, 9:00 A.M."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the





House, the Appropriations II Committee will meet promptly at 9:00 A.M. in room 118. 9:00 A.M., room 118."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further announcements? Jack, do you need any time for anything? Okay. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "I....Representative Peters has an...."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, if I might with your permission. To the Republican Members of the Appropriations II Committee, if they would meet in Mr. Ryan's office at 8:30."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is breakfast being served?"

Peters: "Coffee and bring your own sugar though."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We may be there. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "I move that we adjourn until 12:00 noon tomorrow."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House stand adjourned until 12:00 noon tomorrow. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed. The House stands adjourned until 12:00 noon tomorrow. Thank you and good night."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	1.
1	12:05	Speaker Redmond	House to order	
		Reverend Krueger	Prayer	
		Speaker Redmond	Roll call	
		Bradley	In chair	
		Clerk O'Brien	Committee reports	
2		Speaker Bradley	Agreed resolutions	
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Giorgi		
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	HR	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Schlickman	Question	
		Speaker Redmond		
3		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3276, #59	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Skinner		
		Speaker Bradley	Adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #60	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Skinner		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Madigan	Parliamentary inquiry	
		Speaker Bradley		
4	12:30	Robinson	Motion #57	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Schlickman		



2.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mudd	
5		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Bradley	
6-7		Reilly	Supports
		Speaker Bradley	Motion prevails
		Reilly	Withdraw, tables #57
		Speaker Bradley	Tabled
		Skinner	
8		Speaker Bradley	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schneider	
		Speaker Bradley	
9-10-11		Skinner	Amendment #60
		Speaker Bradley	
12-13		Madigan	Oppose
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman	Questions
14		Skinner	
		Speaker Bradley	
	12:54	McBroom	Opposed
		Speaker Bradley	
		Skinner	
15		Speaker Bradley	#60 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #61



3.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
		Skinner	
16		Speaker Bradley	
		Madigan	Oppose
		Speaker Bradley	
		McBroom	Oppose
		Speaker Bradley	
17		Skinner	To close
		Speaker Bradley	#61 lost
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #62
		Speaker Bradley	
18-19		Skinner	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Madigan	Oppose
		Speaker Bradley	
		McBroom	Oppose
		Speaker Bradley	
		Huff	
		Speaker Bradley	
20	1:05	Schlickman	Support
		Speaker Bradley	
21-22		Skinner	To close
		Speaker Bradley	
		Skinner	Poll absentees
		Speaker Bradley	
23		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Bradley	#62 fails



4.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #63
		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijeovich	Withdraw
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #64
		Speaker Bradley	
24-25		Yourell	
		Speaker Bradley	
		McBroom	Oppose
		Speaker Bradley	
		Skinner	Question
26		Speaker Bradley	
		Yourell	To close
	1:21	Speaker Bradley	Amendment #64
		Mugalian	
27		Speaker Bradley	Adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #65
		Speaker Bradley	
		Greiman	
		Speaker Bradley	
		McBroom	
28		Greiman	
		Speaker Bradley	#65
		Bianco	No
		Speaker Bradley	Poll absentees
		Schlickman	Possible verification
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	5.
		McBroom		
29		Speaker Bradley	80 ayes, 82 no's...83	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees	
		Speaker Bradley	#65 fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #66	
		Speaker Bradley		
30		Edgar		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Matijevidch		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Edgar	To close	
31		McBroom	Urge aye vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Matijevidch	Verification	
		Speaker Bradley		
		McBroom		
		Speaker Bradley	Dump roll call, 73 ayes, 85 no	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees	
32		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Verify negative roll	
		Speaker Bradley		
		McBroom	'Hanahan's rules'	
33		Speaker Bradley		
		Van Duyne		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Mulcahey	Leave to be verified	
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	6.
		McBroom	Fine	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Proceeds	
		Klosak		
34		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Proceeds	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Daniels	Leave to be verified	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Lechowicz		
		Edgar	What's count	
		Speaker Bradley	80 ayes, 85 nays	
		Edgar		
		Speaker Bradley		
		McMaster	Aye	
		Speaker Bradley		
35		Edgar	Questions affirmative roll	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Schuneman	Change to aye	
36		Speaker Bradley		
		Mudd	Record me no	
		Edgar	Futher questions	
		Speaker Bradley	87 ayes, 81 no's	
		McPike	Verify negative roll	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Macdonald	Leave to be verified	
37		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	7.
		Bennett	Leave to be verified	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Matijevich	Withdraws verification	
		Speaker Bradley	#66 adopted	
	2:03	Lucco	Introduction	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #67	
38		Speaker Bradley	Withdraws	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #68	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Abramson		
		Speaker Bradley		
39		Matijevich		
		Abramson		
		Speake Bradley		
40		Madison	Question	
		Abramson		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Telcser	Support?	
		Speaker Bradley		
41		Jaffe		
		Speaker Bradley		
42		McBroom		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Giglio		
		Speaker Bradley		
43		Leverenz	Yield	





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
44		Edgar	
		Speaker Bradley	
	2:15	Pierce	
45		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman	
		Pierce	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman	MPQ
		Speaker Bradley	
		Abramson	To close
		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #68
46		Peters	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Bradley	Amendment fails
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Hudson	Change vote #57
		Speaker Bradley	
		Lucco	Introduction
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #69
		Speaker Bradley	
47		Skinner	
48		Speaker Bradley	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	9.
49	2:26	McBroom	Oppose	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Darrow		
		Speaker Bradley		
50		Skinner	To close	
		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #69	
		Skinner	Poll absentees	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Madigan	Point of order	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Sumner	Change to yes	
51		Speaker Bradley	60 ayes, 89 nays, fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #70	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Skinner		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Madigan		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Skinner	To close	
52		Speaker Bradley	#70 fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #71	
		Speaker Bradley		
53	2:35	Skinner		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Madigan	Oppose	
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	10.
54		Byers	Question	
		Skinner		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Pullen	Urge aye vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
55		Skinner	Close	
		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #71 lost	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #72	
		Speaker Bradley		
56		Campbell		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Leverenz	Yield	
		Campbell		
		Speaker Bradley		
57		Johnson		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Campbell	To close	
	2:44	Speaker Bradley	Amendment #72 adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #73	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Ryan		
		Speaker Bradley		
58		Matijeovich	Point of order	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Ryan	Withdraw Amendment	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #74	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	11.
		Speaker Bradley		
		Keats		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Reed	Amendment distributed?	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Madigan	Question. Amendment printed?	
		Speaker Bradley		
		McBroom	Move to 3rd	
		Speaker Bradley	3rd	
59		Williams	Change order of business	
		Speaker Bradley	Not recognized	
60		Speaker Redmond	HJRCA #54	
		Tipsword	Question	
		Speaker Redmond		
61		Matijevich		
	2:55	Speaker Redmond		
		Deavers	Motion	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Bradley	Speaks to motion	
		Speaker Redmond		
62		Hudson		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Stuffle	MPQ	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Davis, J.		
		Speaker Redmond		
63		Creiman	Rule 55-F, 56-B asks division of motion	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	12.
		Speaker Redmond	Leave	
		Bowman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Deavers	Withdraws motion	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Walsh motion	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Tipsword	Inquiry of chair	
64		Speaker Redmond	Responds	
	3:05	Walsh, Wm	Point of order	
		Speaker Redmond		
65		Matijevich		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Walsh	Continues	
66		Speaker Redmond		
		Bowman	Parliamentary inquiry	
		Speaker Redmond		
67		Bradley	Sites HJCA #55	
68		Speaker Redmond		
69		Walsh	Move matter postponed, 6-26	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Matijevich		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ryan	Point of order	
		Speaker Redmond		
70		Van Duyne	MPO	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	13.
		Speaker Redmond	Discussion	
71		Collins		
		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries	
		Bowman		
		Speaker Redmond		
72		Walsh	To close	
	3:27	Speaker Redmond	Walsh's motion	
		Hanahan	Supports	
		Speaker Redmond		
73		Madison		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Caldwell		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Friedrich		
		Speaker Redmond		
74		Jones, J.D.		
		Speaker Redmond		
75		Deuster		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Byers		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Gaines		
76		Speaker Redmond	Motion fails	
		Walsh	Appeal ruling of chair	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madison		
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	14.
77		Bradley		
		Speaker Redmond		
78		Walsh		
		Speaker Redmond	Appeal fails	
		Kane		
		Speaker Redmond		
79	3:40	Schlickman		
80		Speaker Redmond		
		Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Redmond		
81		Schlickman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Collins		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Matijevich		
82		Speaker Redmond		
		Jones, J.D.	Motion HJRCA #54	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Walsh, Wm	Question	
83		Speaker Redmond		
		Greiman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mann		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Van Duyne	MPQ	
		Speaker Redmond		
84		Matijevich	Point of order	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	15.
		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries	
		Jones, J.D.	Re-states motion	
	3:55	Speaker Redmond		
		Brummer		
		Speaker Redmond		
85		Tipsword	Explain vote	
		Speaker Redmond	Motion fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	HJRCA #5	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Polk		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Huff		
		Speaker Redmond		
86		Madigan	Motion, debate be restricted	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Greisheimer	Inquiry	
		Madigan		
		Speaker Redmond		
87		Bradley	Oppose	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Walsh, Wm.	Oppose	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Dyer	PPP, introduction	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Geo-Karis	Support	





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	16.
		Speaker Redmond		
88		Matijevich	Introduction	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Van Duyne	MPQ	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Porter	Question	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schlickman	Point of order	
		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries	
		Collins		
89		Speaker Redmond		
90		Clerk O'Brien	HJRCA #54	
	4:05	Speaker Redmond		
		Greisheimer	Parliamentary inquiry	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Tipsword		
		Speaker Redmond		
91-92-93-94		Davis, C.	Proponent	
		Speaker Redmond		
95-96-97		Deuster	Opponent	
98-99		Speaker Redmond		
	4:30	Tipsword	No filming	
100		Speaker Redmond		
		Kent	Explain vote, no	
		Speaker Redmond		
101		Brady	Explain vote, aye	
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	17.
		Hudson	Oppose	
		Speaker Redmond		
102		Greiman	Support	
		Speaker Redmond		
		McAuliffe	No	
103		Speaker Redmond		
		Madison	Aye	
		Speaker Redmond		
104		Schlickman	Oppose	
		Speaker Redmond		
105		DiPrima	No	
		Speaker Redmond		
106		Geo-Karis	Support	
		Speaker Redmond		
197		Bartulis	No	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mulcahey	Yes	
		Speaker Redmond		
108	4:50	Brummer	Explain vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
109		Cunningham	No	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ewell	Yes	
		Speaker Redmond		
110		Greisheimer	No	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Bradley	Explain vote	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	18.
		Speaker Redmond		
111		Catania	Explain vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Kelly	Defeat	
		Speaker Redmond		
112		Steele, E.G.	Opposed	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Weller	Support	
		Speaker Redmond		
113		Dyer	Vote yes	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Johnson	Objects	
		Speaker Redmond		
	5:05	Miller		
		Speaker Redmond		
114		Matijevich		
		Speaker Redmond		
		McCourt	Yes	
		Speaker Redmond		
115		Byers	Aye	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Stuffle		
		Speaker Redmond		
116		Martin, P.	Support	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Sumner	Oppose	
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
117		Levin	Support
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jones, E.	Vote green
		Speaker Redmond	
118		Gaines	Vote green
		Speaker Redmond	
		Pechous	Vote aye
		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	
119		Speaker Redmond	
120		Davis, C.	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hoxsey	Explains vote
		Speaekr Redmond	
		Sandquist	Explains vote
121		Speaker Redmond	
		Lucco	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
122		Younge	Explains vote
	5:25	Speaker Redmond	
		Taylor	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
123		Huff	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Greiman	Poll the absentees
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	20
		Speaker Redmond		
124		Houlihan, J.		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Matijevich		
		Speaker Redmond		
125		Houlihan, J.	Explains vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Holewinski	Explains vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Friedrich		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Collins		
126	5:35	Speaker Redmond		
		Shuneman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mahar	Press, of the floor	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Dyer		
		Speaker Redmond		
127		Bowman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Chapman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Johnson	Abide the rules	
		Speaker Redmond		
128		Chapman		
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	21.
		Robinson		
		Speaker Redmond		
129		Greiman	Parliamentary inquiry	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Breslin	Personal privilege	
	5:45	Speaker Redmond		
130		Matijevich		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Davis, C.	HJCA #54 postponed consideration	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan	Recess till 7:00 P.M.	
131	7:40	Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Committee reports, messages from Senate	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 2597, concurrence	
132		Williams	SA 1 & 2, concur in	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan, D.	Out of record	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Williams	TOOR	
		Speaker Redmond		
		McMaster	HB 2912	
		Speaker Redmond		
		McGrew		
		McMaster		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schneider		
		McMaster		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	22.
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schneider		
		McMaster		
134		Speaker Redmond		
		Mudd		
		Speaker Redmond		
		McMaster	Move concurrence	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
135		Lucco	Introduction	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Tipsword		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan, D.		
		Speaker Redmond		
	7:55	Schlickman		
		Speaker Redmond		
136		Houlihan, D.		
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR. HB, 3rd reading	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2585, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Robinson	Sponsor	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan, D.		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Robinson		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	23.
		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan, D.		
		Speaker Redmond		
137		Schlickman	Yield	
		Robinson	Discussion	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2885	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan, D.	Sponsor	
		Speaker Redmond		
138		Schlickman	Yield	
139		Houlihan, D.	Discussion	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Waddell	Yield	
		Houlihan, D.	Discussion	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3067	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Younge	Sponsor	
		Speaker Redmond		
140		Schlickman	Yield	
141		Younge	Discussion	
		Speaker Redmond		
142	8:10	Schlickman	Address the Bill	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Pierce	Parliamentary inquiry	
		Speaker Redmond		





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	24.
143		Schlickman	Continues	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Huff	Yield	
144-145-146		Younge	Discussion	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Younge	To close	
		Speaker Redmond		
147		Vinson	Verification	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ewell	Support	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mann		
		Speaker Redmond		
148		Younge	Polls absentees	
		Speaker Redmond		
	8:25	Schlickman	Verification	
		Speaker Redmond		
149		Clerk O'Brien	Continues absentees	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Starts affirmative vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Vinson	Withdraws request	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3197	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Kane	Sponsor	
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Totten	Question
		Kane	Discussion
150		Speaker Redmond	
151		Telcser	
		Kane	Discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	Point of order
		Speaker Redmond	
152		Friedrich	
		Speaker Redmond	
	8:33	McMaster	
		Speaker Redmond	
		McGrew	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
153		Kane	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	Aye
		Speaker Redmond	
		Telcser	Verification
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
154		Speaker Redmond	
		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
155		McMaster	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker Redmond	
		Terzich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Abramson	Present
		Speaker Redmond	
156		Stanley	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewell	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Flinn	Present to yes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Laurino	Aye
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
157		Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative roll
		Speaker Redmond	
		Catania	
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Macdonald	Aye
		Speaker Redmond	
158		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
		Speaker Redmond	
159	8:55	Telcser	Questions
160-161		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	
		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	87 ayes, 2 no
162		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	TOOR
		Speaker Redmond	
163		Kelly	HB 2631, table it
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Yourell	
		Kelly	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3374
		Speaker Redmond	
164		Edgar	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Daniels	Change vote
165		Speaker Redmond	SB, 3rd reading
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 82
		Speaker Redmond	
		Polk	
		Speaker Redmond	
166		Houlihan, D.	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kosinski	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
167		Polk	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
168		Clerk Hall	SB 252
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Pullen	Back to 2nd
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #3
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Willer	Table #3
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #4
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Weller	
169		Speaker Lechowicz	Adopted
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #5
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Pullen	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Adopted
	9:15	Speaker Lechowicz	3rd reading
		Marovitz	SB 253, back to 2nd
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #1
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Marovitz	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Stearney	Yield
170		Marovitz	Discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Sumner	Yield
		Marovitz	Discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	30.
171		Beatty		
		Sumner		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Marovitz		
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #1 adopted	
		Clerk Hall		
		Speaker Lechowicz	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall		
172		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 386	
		Hoffman	Back to 2nd	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #8	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Levin	Withdraws	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #9	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Withdraws	
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #10	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
173		Levin		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Schneider	Question	
		Levin	Discussion	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Katz	Question	
		Levin		
174		Katz		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	31.
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Hoffman		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #11	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Hoffman		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Satterthwaite		
175		Hoffman		
		Speaker Lechowicz	Adopted	
		Clerk Hall	SB 388	
		Speaker Lechowicz	TOOR	
		Clerk Hall	SB 389, 3rd	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
176		Greiman		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Hoffman	Question	
		Greiman	Discussion	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Waddell		
177		Hoffman		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Friedrich		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Lucco	Support	
178		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed	
		Clerk Hall	SB 393, 3rd	





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Hoffman	Back to 2nd
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #2
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Hoffman	Table #1, adopt #2
179		Speaker Lechowicz	#1 tabled, #2 adopted, 3rd
		Clerk Hall	SB 439, 3rd
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Bowman	
180		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
		Clerk Hall	SB 571, 3rd
		Speaker Lechowicz	
181	9:40	Yourell	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schlickman	Question
		Yourell	Discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kelly	
182		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
		Clerk Hall	SB 1483, 3rd
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Flinn	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1506
183		Speaker Lechowicz	
		McPike	Explains SB 1506



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Geo-Karis	Yield
184		McPike	Discussion
	9:45	Speaker Lechowicz	
		Steele	Supports
		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1506 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1530, 3rd
		Brady	Explains
185		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1530 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1580
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Stearney	Explains
		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1580 passed
		Johnson	Yes on 1530
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1630
		Speaker Lechowicz	
186		Telcser	Explains
		Speaker Lechowicz	
187-188		Houlihan, D.	Yield?
		Telcser	Discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1630 TOOR
	9:55	Clerk O'Brien	SB 1667
		Speaker Lechowicz	
189		Katz	Expalins
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Conti	Opposes
		Speaker Lechowicz	
190		Mahar	Supports
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Byers	
		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1667 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1746
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Pullen	Explains
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Leverenz	Yield?
191		Pullen	Discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	10:00	Clerk O'Brien	SB 1746, reads fiscal note
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
192		Marovitz	Supports
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mugalian	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madison	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
193		Levin	Yield?
		Pullen	Discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
194		Byers	Explains vote



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mudd	
		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1746 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1747
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Telcser	Explains
		Speaker Lechowicz	
195		Levin	Yield
		Telcser	Discussion
196	10:10	Speaker Lechowicz	
		Van Duynes	Yield
197		Telcser	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
198		Byers	Yield?
		Telcser	Discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		O'Brien	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
199		Satterthwaite	
		Telcser	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ryan	MPQ
200		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1747 passed
		Skinner	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1777, 3rd
		Speaker Lechowicz	





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	10:30	Speaker Lechowicz	House is adjourned

