

Doorkeeper: "Attention Members of the House of Representatives, the House will convene in fifteen minutes."

Doorkeeper: "Attention Members of the House of Representatives, the House will convene in five minutes. All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order, the Members please be in their seats. We will be led in prayer by the Reverend Krueger, the House chaplain."

Reverend Krueger: "In the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. It is written in the 9th verse of the 28th Chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy: The Lord shall establish Thee as a holy temple unto Himself, as he has sworn unto Thee, if Thou shalt keep the commandments of the Lord Thy God, and walk in His ways. Let us pray. Eternal Heavenly Father, in Whom our service brings perfect peace and all the blessings of this earth, we yield to Thee these moments in love and admiration. Direct our paths this day as we serve the people of the State of Illinois in this House of Representatives that we may in all ways, walk in Thy paths and be in perfect obedience to Thy will for all mankind; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Pledge of allegiance. I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all. Roll Call for attendance, your switch only. Take the record. Why don't you turn me on here. John...open it up. Yeah, but I wanted to kid Simms. Roll Call for attendance. Your switch only. I guess so, yeah. Did you mark the ones where.....your switch only. Take the record. Let the records show that Representative Walsh is here. Agreed Resolutions. Wait a minute, Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Matijevich, Chairman on the Committee on Appropriations I, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 10, 1980. Reported the same back with the following recommendations, do pass Senate Bills 1621, 1684 and 1793. Do pass as amended, Senate Bills 1618, 1628, 1633 and 1635. Representative Leon, Chairman of the Committee of Financial Institutions. To which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 11, 1980. Reported the same back with the following recommendations. Do pass Consent Calendar, Senate Bill 1821. Representative Emil Jones, Chairman of the Committee on Insurance to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 11, 1980. Reported the same back with the following recommendations, do pass as amended, Senate Bill 2001. Representative Williams, Chairman on the Committee on Cities and Villages. To which the following Bill was referred, action taken June 11, 1980. Reported the same back with the following recommendations, do pass as amended Short Debate Calendar, Senate Bill 1998."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: Senate Joint Resolution 108, Bullock. Senate Joint Resolution 109, Wikoff. House Resolution 853, Ryan - McBroom. 854, DiPrima. 855 Macdonald. 856, Macdonald."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Agreed Resolutions? Did he read them? House Resolution 853 by Ryan, honors Miss Kankakee County, Jennifer Brown. House Resolution 854 by DiPrima, honors Lawrence Bongiovanni. 855 by Macdonald, tells us about the Mt. Prospect Park District Board of Commissioners. 856 by Macdonald, also honors Don Totten on his 25th Wedding Anniversary. And Senate Joint 108 by Bullock, tells some nice things about Dr. Boyd of the Scholarship Commission. And 109 by Wikoff, honors the Police Institute and I move

for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question, I think is on the Gentleman's motion...is that what you did? You moved the adoption. On the Gentleman's motion of the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried, the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Representative Matijevich, you want to come up here?"

Speaker Matijevich: "House Joins Resolution Constitutional Amendment #1. The Sponsor is not on the floor. Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bill 934."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 934, a Bill for an Act in relation to cigarette tax stamps. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1506."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1506, a Bill for an Act extending Corporate limits for the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Hold still one minute. Senate Bill 1585."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1585, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to Fire Protection Districts. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1597."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1597, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to effect certain compacts between the State of Missouri and Illinois relating to the BiState Metropolitan Development District. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1613."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1613, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Labor. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1616."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1616, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Local Government Law Enforcement Officers' Training Board. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Hold still again. Senate Bill 1619...is a hold. 1623."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1623, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Military and Naval Department. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1629, its got a hold. 1639."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1639, a Bill for an Act to provide for appropriations for certain agencies. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4, were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Any motions? Any motion...oh. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate if we could hold this for awhile."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. Would we hold 1639? Out of the record. 1844...oh, hold 1844. We'll hold all the rest. On the Order of Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day, Senate Bill 1598. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1598, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Tri-City Regional Port District Act. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, page 2, Senate Bill 673. Out of the record, I don't see the Sponsor. Senate Bill 1378, Penny Pullen. Is she ready? Out of the record? Out of the record. 1441, out of the record. 1614, Vinson. I don't see him around. 1620, David Jones...I don't see Dave around. 1651, Ryan. I don't see, Ryan around. 2824, Reilly....are you ready, Jim? All right. We might as well do something. No. Out of the record. Punt formation. Lechowicz says, call ERA. We all ready called it. You can only call it once a day. Does anybody have a Resolution on the Speaker's Table that they would like to call or table? Nobody rushed forward. Does Jane Barnes, want to proceed

with her motion? I didn't think so. You...you want to make....Jim Reilly has an announcement, as long as he's here, he might as well make it from here. Jim Reilly."

Reilly: "Anyone who didn't get their County Fair pass last week when the Fair Queen was here, who wants one. I have some so just see me and I'll get you one. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The coach of the Senate team is taking all bets. Any House Member that wants to bet Pete Miller, he's right here. He's taking all bets and the Senate has never won a game yet in history. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich for an announcement."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Personnel and Pensions Committee which is scheduled to meet at 4 o'clock. We will be moving that meeting up to 12 o'clock this afternoon. We only have two Bills, so the Members of the Personnel and Pensions Committee will be meeting at 12 noon in room 122B."

Speaker Matijevich: "Roll Call for attendance. Roll Call for attendance. Would somebody push the Giorgi role. Take the record. On the Order of Third Reading, Senate Bill, Third Reading is Senate Bill 673. The Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Rea."

Rea: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would like to move House (sic) Bill 673 from Third back to Second for an Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman asks leave to move Senate Bill 673 back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Leave. The Bill is now on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Rea, amends Senate Bill 673 on page 1, line 1, by changing 3 and 10, to 39.2 and 10 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Representative

Rea."

Rea: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Under legislation adopted last year, EPA is doing a study of air pollution standards in the Chicago, Peoria and East St. Louis areas. This Amendment requires a...if this study shows it is possible to relax those standards in the metropolitan areas without violating any federal requirements, then EPA will propose such a rule change to the Pollution Control Board. This is an Amendment that has been worked by the Illinois coal operators, UMWA and is also agreeable with EPA. I would ask for the adoption."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Rae has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates, he will."

Schlickman: "Would you mind repeating the contents of this Amendment and in doing so, would you comment as to whether or not this Amendment would constitute...that's okay, Pete...a relaxation of present standards with respect to air pollution?"

Rea: "Under this Amendment, because there is a study that's been done now, and this Amendment would require that if the study shows that it is possible to relax those standards in the metropolitan areas without violating any federal requirements, then EPA will propose such a rule change to the pollution Control Board."

Schlickman: "Whose or which studies are you referring to?"

Rea: "The studies...was enacted by House Bill 226 in the last Session as to the study on whether or not the standards are more stringent...the state stringent more stringent than the federal. With the report to be forth coming back to this General Assembly."

Schlickman: "And you say this Amendment applies to the Chicago, East St. Louis and Peoria areas?"

Rea: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you for the noise."

Schlickman: "Did you say this Amendment applies....."

Speaker Matijevich: "Could we have some order here. Proceed Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Does this Amendment apply to three metropolitan areas, Chicago, Peoria and East St. Louis?"

Rea: "Yes. Because it....generally accepted by the....by the cooperators, EPA, by the miners.....by the existing air pollution standards, for the rural areas of the state may already allow for possibly the maximum use of Illinois coal as is consistent with the federal law. And this Amendment would however, codifies certain basis principles with respect to these rules. And that is, that the standards may not be more stringent than required under the Federal Clean Air Act, that maximum use be made of actual monitoring data. That mechanism as is for studying different standards for different facilities, to allow for varied conditions. That any federally approved alternate for meeting the standards be allowed in Illinois. And this, as was pointed out earlier, it states that if it is possible to relax those standards, a recommendation or a proposal would be made to the Pollution Control Board."

Schlickman: "Was this Amendment requested by the EPA or the coal industry?"

Rea: "Both. It was...has been requested by cooperators and agreeable with the...EPA and also with the miners."

Schlickman: "EPA does support this Amendment?"

Rea: "They are...yes."

Schlickman: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Meyer. Do you still want attention of the floor? The

Gentleman from Cook, Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Representative Rea, could you hold this Bill for a couple of minutes, please?"

Rea: "I...yes."

Meyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kornowicz, did you want the floor? No. All right. Representative Rea, to close. Oh."

Rea: "Representative Meyers has asked that I hold a minute..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Oh..."

Rea: "...the Bill for a couple of minutes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Oh, I'm sorry. We'll take the Bill out of the record then. Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "I got my question answered, proceed Representative Rea."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. Now, we can put it back on track. Proceed, Representative Rea to close."

Rea: "I would just move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Rea, moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 673. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay' and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Rea...."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Rea asks that this Amendment be withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, due to a change of schedule which I was not aware of. The Personnel and Pensions Committee will now meet right after adjournment rather than 12 o'clock. So right after adjournment we will have the Personnel and Pensions Committee meeting in room 122B, immediately after

adjournment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Personnel and Pensions after adjournment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The Counties and Townships meeting which is scheduled for 4 o'clock, will be moved up to 3 o'clock and it will be changed and it will be in room 122A. We only have two Bills scheduled, I would ask that the Members would make every effort to be there. At 3 o'clock for the Counties and Township meeting."

Speaker Matijevich: "Counties and Townships at 3 P.M. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Elections Committee will meet at 2 o'clock in room D1 of the Stratton Building."

Speaker Matijevich: "Elections at 2 P.M. Will the Membership be at ease for a few moments. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leon."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Members of the Financial Institutions Committee meet in the Speaker's Office for just a few minutes, immediately. We wish to adopt a motion. I would appreciate attendance."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. While we're at ease, would the Members of John Leon's Committee meet in the Speaker's Office immediately. He said, it should take only about five minutes. John Leon's Financial Institutions Committee, in the Speaker's Office immediately. So that the Membership is aware of where we're going, we have a slight break while John Leon's Committee is meeting in the Speaker's Office. And in about five minutes we're going to go the House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #32. Otherwise, known as the Right to Life Constitutional Convention Amendment. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Chuck Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask leave to table Senate Bill 1933. I am the House sponsor."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman asks leave to table 1933, is it?"

Campbell: "Yes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Which he's the Chief Sponsor. Does he have leave? He does have leave and the Bill is tabled. The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I ask leave to postpone the appropriate posting rule so that Appropriations II Committee meet tomorrow, hear Senate Bill 2000 and Senate Bill 1638. We do have agreement on this."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady asks leave....the Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand that Representative Chapman was here and had talked to somebody. I wonder if you could hold for a couple of minutes on 1638, Representative?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady..."

Chapman: "Mr. Ryan, I would then change my motion so that it would include only Senate Bill 2000."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. The Lady asks leave to suspend the appropriate posting rule, so that Senate Bill 2000, can be heard in Appropriations II Committee at 9 A.M. tomorrow. Does she have leave?"

Ryan: "Leave."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave. And we'll use the Attendance Roll Call for that."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, possibly this would be time for another announcement.."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Chapman: "Appropriations II, will meet at 9 A.M. tomorrow

morning. Democrats will meet at 8:30."

Speaker Matijevich: "Appropriations II, 9 A.M. tomorrow morning. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Harry Leinenweber, for what purpose do you arise?"

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask that either the Attendance Roll Call or unanimous consent to waive the posting rule for House Resolution 797, which I am the Sponsor of. I've checked with the Chairman of the Committee, Representative Capparelli and he has no objection to it. I forgot to ask him to post it, that's what happened."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman asks leave to suspend the appropriate posting notice, so that House Resolution 797 be heard in Exec. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman asks, what is it all about? Is that true? Could you tell us what the Resolution is all about."

Leinenweber: "He's on the telephone but if he will hang-up briefly. Establishes special Committee to investigate the question of whether the initiative process for direct citizen law making would be beneficial for Illinois."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. Does he have leave? Leave and the Bill...just one moment. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Would you....could you hold that for just a second, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "All right, we'll hold it for a second until, Leinenweber and Ryan get together. Did we work that out? While we're working out on that, the Lady from Cook, Representative Currie for an announcement. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is just to announce that there be a second annual Mr. Wonderful Contest, sponsored by the Conference of Women Legislators. The money we raise will go to some of the groups that are involved in our

favorite service, Teenage Pregnancy Programs, Salvation Army, Catholic Charities, some of the good groups around the state that are providing important services to those women. All male Legislators are invited to compete for the Mr. Wonderful title, all except John Cullerton, last years, Mr. Wonderful. He will, however, crown the new Mr. Wonderful. The date of the party is last night of Session at the State House Inn, seven till ten. Women Legislators are wondering about the aisles asking you to buy your tickets. We hope you will. Twenty-five dollars gives you food, drink and all the good things of the Mr. Wonderful evening. See you all there."

Speaker Matijevich: "Thank you. Leinenweber, did you work that out? All right. Do we have leave that House Resolution 797, be heard in the Executive Committee? Leave. And it so, shall be done. Now, for an introduction. The Gentleman from McLain, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it's my pleasure this morning to introduce to you the state 4-H team comprised of 4-H members throughout the State of Illinois, who have come to Springfield for three days to express their appreciation, and to learn about state government, and to tell you a little bit about the 4-H program. I'm delighted to introduce to the Members of the House of Representatives the following outstanding 4-Hers from the State of Illinois: Cheryl 'Hoffbauer', from McLean County. Cheryl, would you stand up there? Gene Krueger, from Will County. Gene. Lynn Lewis, from Madison County. Lynn. Terry 'Pouser', from Lee County. Bruce Rosendale, from Hancock County. Julia Stewart from Jefferson County, and Vivian Yancy, from Cook County. Vivian. Good, we're delighted to have all of you here, and I'd like to call on Cheryl 'Hoffbauer' for just a word or two to you. Cheryl."

Cheryl 'Hoifbauer': "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, on behalf of the Illinois 4-H Report to State Team and the 130,000 4-Hers in Illinois, we're just here to tell you that 4-H is alive and well in Illinois, and we'd like to thank you for all the support you've given us. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Good luck to all the 4-Hers. The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman. Are you seeking recognition? No? All right. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Schneider, Chairman from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 11, 1980. Reported the same back with the following recommendations. Do pass Senate Bill 569. Do pass as amended Senate Bills 1480 and 1729."

Speaker Matijevich: "Constitutional Amendment, Third Reading. Constitutional Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #32. The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #32. This Resolution has been read a third time previously."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wonder if we might have some order, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Could we have some order? I think all of us are aware of this Constitutional Amendment. Give the Gentlemen your attention."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment #32 was passed in the Executive Committee. It passed out of the Executive Committee last spring."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment, Representative Bradley. Would the doormen...all unauthorized people off the floor. All unauthorized people off the floor, and those who...have the

privilege of the floor, but not on this matter, off the floor. I hope those people heard me. There are some who have privilege of the floor, but not on this issue right now. All right, the Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, to continue, Mr. Speaker, the Resolution was passed out of the Executive Committee last spring, and we left it on the Calendar so that we could call it in this particular Session of the General Assembly. To remind the Members of what this Resolution calls for, I read, 'pursuant to the authority of Article V of the Constitution of the United States, make application to the Congress of the United States for the calling of a convention for proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that every human being subject to the jurisdiction of the United States or any state shall deem to be a person from the moment of conception or fertilization.' Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I point this out to show that states representing a wide cross section of our nation's people have come to the conclusion that the framers of the Constitution of the United States were not just cluttering up the Constitution with meaningless words when they adopted Article V, but it was put there to be used by the people in a time of need. The result of the Supreme Court's decision of 1973 to bring about a need by the people of the states to ask for a convention. The fact that convention applications have already passed by a wide margin in now, 19 states and are being introduced and considered in many other states across this nation is certainly eloquent testimony that once State Legislators give the issue serious review, the overwhelming Majority discovers that a Constitutional Convention is a legitimate and proper procedure placed in the Constitution

to protect the people from an apathetic and unresponsive Congress. Abraham Lincoln, addressing himself, and I know that there's a great deal of concern regarding Article V in the calling of a Constitutional Convention and what might happen in opening up that convention. I quote Abraham Lincoln, who said, 'That I will venture to add that, to me, the convention mode seems preferable in that it allows Amendments to originate with the people themselves instead of only permitting them to take or reject propositions originated by others.' By others, and he was referring to Congress, not especially chosen for the purpose which might not be precisely such as they would wish to either accept or refuse. Our study...the American Bar Association completed a study in 1974. This results said, and I quote, 'Our two-year study of the subject had led us to conclude that a National Constitutional Convention be con...can be channelled, no...so as not to unleash a radical force in our system, but rather an orderly mechanism of effecting Constitutional change when circumstances require its use'. The circumstances are here today that they require that we use Article V. The Congress has been very reluctant and very slow in trying to move out the various Constitutional Amendments that are before them that would send it out for ratification by the states, so it leaves us no alternative but to use the provisions in Article V and call Congress to call a Constitutional Convention. And, there are those who oppose this proposal to allow the states to apply to Congress to call a Constitutional Convention. These few do not trust the people. We, who are supporting and moving for the adoption to this Resolution, we trust the people. We know of no legitimate reason why the people, through their State Legislatures should not exercise a very clearly-defined Constitutional power lodged in them by

virtue of Article V. To further expand on the question on Article V and the ability to limit, I think if we look at the Federalist papers...people who were there and writing our Constitution...Hamilton in Federalist paper #75, and I quote, 'Every Amendment to the Constitution, if once established, would be a single proposition and might be brought forward singly. There would then be no necessity for management or compromise in any relation to any other point nor giving nor taking.' The will of the required number would at once bring the matter to a decisive issue and, consequently, whenever nine or, at that time, nine or rather ten states...we need 34 states now were united in the desire of a particular Amendment that that Amendment must infallibly take place. As I said, we need 34 states. There are 19 states that have adopted this particular Amendment, and I'm hoping that the State of Illinois follows suit. To continue with the question of the limiting the call, Senator Sam...former Senator Sam Irvin of North Carolina, and I quote Senator Sam, 'You've got a safeguard in this method, since such a convention could not submit part of a Constitutional proposal that would become effective as a part of the Constitution unless it was ratified by three-quarters of the States.'

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Could I interrupt? The TV has permission to film, so that the Membership is aware of that. Proceed, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "I personally don't think three-quarters of the states would ratify any absurd proposal that would be a result of a Constitutional Convention. I think sometimes these are scare tactics that are used by some who simply are opposed to this particular Resolution. In conclusion, let me say there is nothing new or startling in a call for a Constitutional Convention. There have been nearly 400 in

our nation's history and at least 14 have originated in the State of Illinois in this Legislature in other issues. I respectfully ask an 'aye' vote on the...on this particular issue so that the people in the...of the state will have an opportunity to address itself to the Supreme Court's decision of 1973 that does not affect Federal Government at all, but affects only state government and State Legislatures. We are the ones who deal with the abortion issue and make the state laws that the people must comply with and not the Federal Government. I think it's time that we use Article V, and what generally happens, and all of you sitting here know and you realize, as soon as we get close to having the necessary 34 numbers to call that convention, you can bet that Congress will send out to us for ratification one of those Amendments that Senator 'Birch By' has been sitting on in his Committee. So, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask for your support in House Joint Constitutional Amendment #32. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bradley has moved for the adoption of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #32. On that, the Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think probably most of the Members of this House are aware that I am very strongly a pro-life Legislator. I support the ratification of the human life Amendment if the Congress ever gives it to us, and I have supported the pro-life legislation in this House. However, I cannot support this Resolution here today. I believe that the calling of a National Constitutional Convention is a very grave matter, and I believe that it is a very grave mistake for any purpose. I do not support 'Con-Con' for a balanced budget Amendment. I do not support 'Con Con' for this Amendment.

I do not support 'Con-Con' for any purpose whatsoever. I believe there are many risks involved in calling a National Constitutional Convention. Despite the assurances of many who support this proposition that it can be limited, there is nothing in the law that says that it can be limited. The United States' Constitutional provision concerning 'Con-Con' is very open. It is not at all precise. It is probably the only flaw that I know of in the United States' Constitution other than the lack of a tax limitation Amendment. There is no legislation on the books governing the calling of a Constitutional Convention, and the same Congress that we are being asked to trust to set up a convention in a responsible manner, is the one that we're so frustrated about not having passed the Constitutional Amendment for pro-life. I think if we're so frustrated about their irresponsibility on the human life issue, we should be equally concerned about how responsible they will be or irresponsible they will be in structuring a Constitutional Convention. There's not even anything in the law, Ladies and Gentlemen, that says how the delegates would be chosen. Congress could conceivably set up a convention where they appoint themselves as delegates. They could set up a convention with...very easily, with Congressional District lines making up the delegation, and there wouldn't be any greater likelihood of good people being elected to that than there is of good people being elected to the Congress as it's currently stands. I don't think that we can depend on the assurances of Sponsors, Bar Associations, or anyone else when there is no legislation on the books governing the calling of a convention. It might interest you to know that there is already a new Constitution proposed for the United States that has been drafted and proposed by the Center for the Study of

Democratic Institutions, which would eliminate by the federal...It would truly eliminate the states. And, although it would take ratifications by the states of such a Constitution if it were to be proposed, I hate to subject this nation to the kind of disjunction and the kind of emotional, and philosophical, and political upheaval that a National Constitutional Convention would cause. The only precedent in history for a Constitutional Convention in this country is the convention that gave us our current Constitution, which resulted in a very beneficial product, but it might interest you to know that when that convention was called, it was for a limited purpose of amending the Articles of Confederation and produced a whole new Constitution. How can we be assured this will be limited? How can we be assured that it will give us anything decent, anything that the American people want and that we will not have wasted millions of taxpayers' dollars and tremendous political upheaval in this country for the sake of a convention that ends up not even working. I would call to your memories what happened in Illinois when we had a Constitutional Convention, and I will ask you to ask yourselves, in deepest conscience, whether you want to subject the United States of America to what happened in Illinois only a decade ago. Although, I am strongly pro-life and strongly support the adoption of a human life Amendment, I cannot support the calling of a National Constitutional Convention for any purpose, and I hope that you will concur with that opinion that this is too risky and vote 'no' or 'present' on this Resolution. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane."

Kane: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Kane: "Representative Bradley, are you familiar with birth control devices?"

Bradley: "What's that got to do with this Resolution?"

Kane: "Well, a considerable amount, I think, because what this Amendment would ask is that that the fertilized egg be protected from the point of fertilization, and if a birth control device would affect a fertilized egg rather than prevent fertilization, that would be outlawed by this Constitutional Amendment that you're asking for. Is that not correct?"

Bradley: "No, I don't think that's even pertinent to this issue."

Kane: "Doesn't what you're asking for protect from the moment of conception?"

Bradley: "That's the way it reads."

Kane: "Would that not then put a Constitutional prohibition on any birth control device that acted after fertilization?"

Bradley: "We're not binding the convention, and whatever language they want to send back to the states for ratification is up to the convention. We're not putting any language in their mouth."

Kane: "But, isn't this what you'r...?"

Bradley: "Sometimes they have to be specific to this issue."

Kane: "Isn't this what you're asking for, though? You're asking the Congress for a Constitutional Convention to protect from the point of conception."

Bradley: "That's absolutely what the..."

Kane: "Well, if that's what..."

Bradley: "...Resolution calls for."

Kane: "Okay. Then we..."

Bradley: "It's to address themselves to that issue to...for a Constitutional Convention to send back to the states some language for the ratification by the states, and you, at that time, may agree or may not agree with that when it

comes back, and I would be in the same position."

Kane: "You are asking, though, for a Constitutional prohibition against any birth control device that acts subsequent to fertilization. Is that not correct?"

Bradley: "No."

Kane: "What are you asking for then?"

Bradley: "We're asking for a Constitutional convention to address itself to this particular issue."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed, Representative Kane."

Kane: "I think that the Gentlemen who is sponsoring this Joint Constitutional Amendment #32 is engaging in a considerable amount of double talk. What this Resolution ask for is a protection for the fertilized egg from the moment of conception, which would have the effect of outlawing, Constitutionally, any birth control device that acts after fertilization rather than prior to fertilization, and I would submit to consideration of the General Assembly or the House of Representatives here that that would put a Constitutional prohibition on any intrauterine devices which act to prevent implantation of the fertilized egg in the uterus and would also outlaw, Constitutionally, the pill. Because, the pill does not prevent conception. It does not prevent fertilization, but, again, prevents implantation in the uterus of the fertilized egg, and I would think that if that is the case, we ought to keep that in mind as we vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Stearney: "Mr. Bradley, my questions are directed to the formation, structure, and the operation of that proposed

Constitutional Convention. Are there any...what rules will govern the number of topics or the areas that may be considered within the proposed Constitutional Convention?"

Bradley: "The traditional call of the convention."

Stearney: "Well, who will...who will formulate the rules?"

Bradley: "We're asking Congress to call the convention, and Congress will formulate the rules, and, as you well know, we have not had Article V used for the call of the convention before, so we're assuming that Congress, and I don't know who else would formulate those rules, and we would abide by those rules."

Stearney: "That goes onto my next question, and that is, by what authority could Congress enact statutory measures that could preclude a Constitutional Convention from considering any and all topics or any and all proposed Constitutional Amendments that they so desire?"

Bradley: "I...I..."

Stearney: "How could Congress do such a thing?"

Bradley: "I quoted, in my opening remarks, from Hamilton, from Abraham Lincoln, Sam Irvin, who, in their opinion and I respect those opinions greatly, and I'm sure you do, Sir, that it could be limited. Specifically, to a single call of Congress."

Stearney: "What I'm fearful of, though, is that Hamilton and Madison have met their demise some 200 year ago, and there's a number of other people that will be interpreting."

Bradley: "Yeah, but I thought you'd be impressed, Mr. Stearney, because they were there when the...or when the Constitution was written, and we researched it and went back to that point..."

Stearney: "However, they could never visualize, Mr. Bradley, what has been done to the Constitution that they wrote 200 years

ago and the meanings that it has been interpreted. My next question is this, how will the...?"

Bradley: "That's why...that's why maybe it's a good idea to try the convention route one time and let the people as for..."

Stearney: "How will the...? My third question is, how will these delegates be elected or selected? I mean, is...what is the means of doing that?"

Bradley: "As I said, the Congress would be establishing the rules for the call of the convention and that would include selection of delegates."

Stearney: "Well, then Congress then would have the....the power then to decide whether the delegates would be selected or elected."

Bradley: "I think you're...when you stop in the first five words, Congress would have the power, true, as provided for in Article V as to delegates."

Stearney: "Well..."

Bradley: "And to the rules of the convention."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to the question, I'd like to..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Stearney: "...preface my remarks by saying, first of all, that I have voted pro-life and have supported the right to life measures. However, this here proposed Constitutional Convention somewhat frightens me, because we don't know what, if anything, will occur at the end of that convention. We don't know if these delegates will have repealed the entire Bill of Rights, the Fifth Amendment, the Sixth Amendment, the right to council, the First Amendment regarding freedom of speech, and in today...the tenor of the times being as it is today, they will probably repeal the provision that the individual shall have the right to keep and bear arms in his own home. And, let me

say one other thing. And, we know...we see it right here on this House floor in the matter of negotiation and in compromising on matters. Who knows what monstrous proposal may come out of that Constitutional Convention just as a matter of compromise and negotiation. What we're doing is buying a pig in a poke here. We don't know what we'll get, but we may very well repeal certain pertinent matters in that...in our U. S. Constitution and wind up with things that we are very fearful of. Now, the Gentleman mentioned that...well, who could believe that three-quarters of the states would ratify such a measure. Well, let me say this here, we've seen a lot of proposed Constitutional Amendments, no matter how absurd they are, become ratified by a great number of states in this Union. Furthermore, Murphy's Law applies here, and that is whatever can go wrong, will go wrong. And, this is just too dangerous for us...too dangerous of an area for us to tread upon in the hopes of inserting a human life Amendment into the U. S. Constitution that we should chance, repealing and changing many of the provisions of our Constitution. Now, I would think that the appropriate thing in this matter, even for the right to lifers, the pro-lifers, is to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I hope that the Membership took the time, whether they're pro-life or pro-abortion, to look at the arguments made and some documents that Representative Pullen placed in the Members' mailboxes on the Republican side and I on the Democratic side sometime ago. Those arguments, I think, are well taken in opposition to the call for a 'Con-Con' on this issue or any other, because I believe that if you look at

those, you will see that Constitutional experts throughout the country today, conservative and liberal ones, pro- and anti-abortion ones, have argued together that there can be no limit on a 'Con-Con' once it's called. I think if you look at the arguments made today as well by Representative Pullen and others, the states rights issue does arise in a strange and peculiar way, and there's a question here to be addressed as well...as well as that, too. Representative Pullen well made the argument that once you start one of these, even well-intentioned, as was the case in '70 when, as I recall, the argument was that we had too complicated an 1870 Constitution and that we needed a new revenue structure. It wasn't limited then, and I don't think the situation would be limited now. If we have a situation where Representative Stearney pointed to or alluded to, where we have another wave of something like McCarthyism that we had in the fifties, a fear, a hysteria, whatever. It may well be the situation that other Amendments may come into question, if not the whole Constitution. I think he's absolutely right when he says the issue of the First Amendment, the freedom of speech, the right to keep and bear arms, equal protection, due process, would all be in jeopardy. It's too bad, but I think this Amendment and this situation pits pro-lifer against pro-lifer. It puts us in a situation of where some people will believe that we are now against pro-life when we aren't, but I would urge everyone who's looked at the issue, who has taken the time to consider the Constitutional points, and I've looked at this for many years, having a background in Constitutional law, and I think that Representative Pullen and Stearney are absolutely right. And, with all due respect to Representative Bradley, who, as I and others who are pro-life, I believe that this Amendment should be soundly

defeated for the arguments made here today, which I think were stated correctly and this piece of Resolution...this piece of legislation should go down to a quick and sound defeat."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I personally am very proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with Representative Bradley, Representative Leinenweber in supporting House Joint Constitutional Amendment 32. There have been, since 1973, approximately one million abortions every year. That adds up to about seven million plus abortions. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a number of different options which we have available if you want to provide for protection of the unborn. I would, like many others who are pro-life in persuasion, would prefer to have a human life Amendment adopted by Congress. So far, Congress has not acted, and the words from people like Henry Hyde and others in Congress is that it isn't going to occur, and if it does, it's going to take a great many years to happen and, at the same time, these millions of abortions are going to continue to persist. Now, I know that there is a split with the pro-life Legislators in this House and there is a split with the pro-life individuals throughout the State of Illinois because of the fear that the convention may be an open-door convention where other issues may enter the picture and possibly the entire Constitution would be rewritten. Ladies and Gentlemen, you know as well as I that when the time comes and Congress has that opportunity to act, they will take prompt and sure action to make sure that guidelines are not only provided for the United States, but certainly for their own interests. Now Ladies and Gentlemen, if I thought that

this convention would open up the door to all issues, I would still support the issue. I'm not sure what my other colleagues would do, but I would support it, and the reason is that the U. S. Supreme Court and the bureaucrats in Washington have been constantly interpreting the Constitution of the United States for their own personal views...their own personal intentions. I think it's about time that the country had an opportunity to be represented in the Constitution and the majority voice heard, which it has not been for many, many years to come. Now, there's going to be a clear-cut decision to make on this issue, and I feel very strongly that if you're favorable to the...the rights and the interests of the unborn, if that's more important than the issues of other legislation, to me, it happens to be more important. It's...I'm willing to take a, what I consider, not even a chance, but a positive action, and I will say this, Ladies and Gentlemen, and I have never led you wrong on this before, every organization that is pro-life in the State of Illinois has endorsed this proposal. So, it's a...it's going to be a rated vote by those of the pro-life organizations. You're going to be measured as being favorable to pro-life if you vote for it and against life if you vote against it. Now, I want to, also, remind you of one final point and that is many of us who are candidates this year were sent a position paper by the Coalition for Pro-life, and we signed that we would support this convention call. I ask you to keep your word, join together, and provide the...the three-fifths Majority vote, which I understand that we need to pass this important pro-life measure, and even more importantly, please remember and do everything you can to stop the needless onslaught and slaughter of human life that is occurring even at this moment right now."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

June 11, 1980.

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not fond of the fact that the pro-life people are rating people on this vote. I...I don't think it should be, because it's a question upon which reasonable people can differ. I have resolved the question in my mind, and it has tormented me for a couple of years by the fact, and I'm totally convinced, as Representative Kelly has pointed out, that the Congress is not going to, in the foreseeable future, act on a right to life Amendment. This then is the only way that we can reasonably approach the subject. I have resolved, too, that the fears that many people have expressed here, probably most eloquently by Representative Pullen, that we will open up the Constitution to complete revision. I don't know of anybody who is fond of repealing the provisions referred to by Representative Stuffle. I don't think that's at issue, and the thing that is at issue is the corruption of the present Constitution by the Supreme Court in 1973 when they threw out all of the state abortion laws. They have done that with the present Constitution. It was never intended that that would be done, but it was done. We must address ourselves to correcting that and correcting it at the earliest possible time. I read that there are some 53,000 abortions in Illinois. If we can do something...per year. If we can do something about that soon, we will reduce that number and the fact of reducing it, by even one, is certainly worth our consideration. I submit to you that this convention will not open up the Constitution, and if it did, if a document was presented to the several states that would do what some of you fear, the states certainly wouldn't ratify it. I honestly feel that this is the only course that can

possibly be taken. I would urge that you not consider how one group or another group is going to rate you on this vote, but I would equally urge that you, in conscience, recognize that this is the only way we're going to stop this horrible killing and would hope that you'd vote 'yes'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ray Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, we must ask ourselves, is history destined to repeat itself over and over again? When we call for an Assembly to meet on what, ostensibly, would be a right to life, there might be other issues which might be equally as important. If the national unemployment figure has stoo...or has risen from 18 percent to, let's say, 28 percent, we might find that we have an Assembly more concerned about a right to a job. If we have reached the stage at that time that our pension funds are not paying off, we might try to guarantee every other thing in life. Ladies and Gentlemen, perhaps we are going to repeat the mistake that the French, perhaps, made and must we...must...must we now say that we are going to have an Assembly with no guidelines, with no rules, that will then call for the hearing, the quick punishment of the people who, let's say, transgressed what the Assembly might want? Must we now go through the 'mirat', the guillotine, the days of Inquisition, and must we finally try to find a little corporal who might help us out of our problems and lead us from despair? Gentlemen, perhaps we are only taking the first step from what might end up in being Waterloo and Alba. I suggest that we ought to consider the lessons of history and that we ought to leave well enough alone. This issue can properly be aired by the Congress, heard by the Congress, and responded...and responded

thereto. Gentlemen, let us not repeat the mistakes of history over and over. This indeed, is a bad idea."

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

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, I believe everyone knows how they're going to vote on this issue. I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ebbesen has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed, 'no', and the main question is put. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber, to close."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as a joint Cosponsor with the Gentleman from McLean County, Representative Bradley, of this most important measure, I, of course, am standing here urging you...urging you about as hard as I've ever urged this Membership to vote for anything to vote for this extremely important Resolution, which, of course, is only one minor cog in the way towards realizing what many of us, at least, have said publicly that we support, and that is a human life Amendment to do something about the disastrous Supreme Court ruling of 1973. Now, many people have decried that this is not the proper route to go, and I would ask them that what is the proper route to go? They say it will go to Congress, and the Congress will hear this, and Congress is representative of the people, and they'll pass this thing out if it's good, and if it's worthy and so forth. Well, I would suggest to you that if you take this position, you don't know how Congress is set up. You don't know the structural immobility of Congress and how a few willful men can hold up actions which mem...members of the public have said over and over again that they...they want heard. Now, we aren't saying here today that to vote for this is going to mean

that tomorrow you're going to have the Constitution amended. Of course, there's a long, torturous route to go. Nineteen states, as Representative Bradley, has pointed out have already submitted their petitions to Congress to call this important convention. Illinois would become 20th if we act within the next few weeks. However, I point out the structure of Congress has been such that all human life Amendments have been bottled up in Subcommittee and have not even been heard. There has been no hearing. This is the problem. If Congress had a chance to vote, they'd probably vote like you and I would if we get a chance to ratify a proposed human life Amendment. They would support it. They've supported pro-life measures everytime they get a chance to vote for them, but they haven't had a chance. They haven't even had a Committee hearing in Congress. I would suggest to you if...if you do as Representative Bradley suggested, if you look at the history of the Constitution, you go back and read the Constitutional debate, you will find out that initially the only provision for amending the Constitution was the one giving the states the right to petition for a convention to adopt Amendments. It was through negotiations and compromise that Congress was allowed an equal right to amend the Constitution. There are two different problems addressed in Section V of the Constitution that Congress...that the Constitutional Convention thought of. One was whether the states are operating in a manner that Congress and the national government feels is bad. It gave Congress the right to consider appropriate remedies in the form of Constitutional Amendments to deal with this. The other equal...way to amend the Constitution was to deal with the situation where Congress itself is recalcitrant...will not move in the way that the states desire, so they gave the states the right

to petition Congress to set up a convention. Now, much has been said, what will the rules be like? Well, I would suggest to you that if there's going to be a convention, they will not bottle up the rules like they have the human life Amendments and all different types that they have for so many years since 1973. They will...the Congress itself will establish the rules, and Congress itself is much more representative than the small, willful groups that control the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments. Congress will come up with some responsible rules. I feel certain of that, probably along the lines that passed the Senate several years when it looked like we were going to have a convention to deal with a number of different issues including the direct...the reapportionment and the prayer decision. The Senate adopted, by a unanimous vote, rules which provided for an orderly process of dealing with these calls of the states. However, the House refused to consider the matter, and it died, and it has died ever since. Congress will not act because of these people who do not want this provision to come into place. They want to give an argument to you people who oppose this, so that you can say, 'Well, they don't have any rules.' Well, we can wait probably till hell freezes over. It's a classic catch-22 situation. We won't get rules until we get close to calling a convention. Now, in the past, as Representative Bradley has pointed out, this route has been used 400 times by the states...different states of this Union. Reapportionment, actually 33 states petitioned for a Constitutional Convention. Direct election of Senators, 31 states petitioned before the Senate...United States Senate was convinced that they ought to vote out a proposed Amendment for ratification. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the House, there are a lot of red herrings

before you. The main issue, however, is shall something be done about the 1973 Supreme Court decision? Shall something be done about amending the Constitution? If you vote 'no' on the Constitutional Convention route, then you're saying that nothing can be done because of the way Congress has historically dealt with this particular issue. Of course, it would be better if Congress would release one of these petitions...one of these proposed Amendments for a vote, so we could see what the Congressmen of the United States feel on this delicate issue. I think that if they did...Congress did vote on one, that it would vote out, and then the states could consider it for ratification. We haven't been able to get any movement in seven years. Are we going to wait seven more, as Representative Kelly pointed out? Seven more years of all of these abortions which we've had, as Representative Walsh pointed out? I say 'no'. We've got to act. We've got to prod Congress into motion. Let them hear...let them hold hearings, find out whether the people actually want this Amendment, vote one out so that the states can either consider it for ratification, but the only way we're going to do it is by pressuring them, and if it...if it needs to, then let's actually call a convention and deal with this subject. I am not afraid of it. The Constitutional authorities previously cited have not been afraid of it, and I urge you not to be afraid of it either and vote 'aye' on House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 32."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representatives Bradley and Leinenweber have moved for the adoption of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #32. The question is, shall House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #32 be adopted? Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative

Brummer, to explain his vote. One minute."

Brummer: "Yes, in explanation of my 'aye' vote, I do not think there is any more important issue that we're going to vote on on this House floor this Session. Everyone has their own priority with regard to issues. I find it ironic that, at a time when we have considered for 250 some days or longer the hostage situation in Iran and at a time we have a President who professes to run on a platform of protection of human rights, that we are daily or annually slaughtering hundreds of thousands of unborn children. We have operated in a country where we have always felt that it was our obligation...our social obligation to protect those who are least able to protect themselves. Now, no one is more vulnerable than the unborn child. We are the only ones who can bring meaningful significance to protection to those unborn children. We have all voted on right to life legislation here, but it is very apparent that there is little we can do in light of the 1973 U. S. decision with regard to the right to life issue short of a Constitutional Convention or a Constitutional Amendment guaranteeing the protection of right to life to those unborn who are least able to protect themselves. Now, I think we ought to examine the process. It has been indicated that 19 of 34 states that are needed have called for a Constitutional Convention. I, quite personally, do not feel that we will ever arrive at 34, because as we approach that number, Congress will then reverse the process and send the Resolution..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman bring his remarks to a close."

Brummer: "...to the Congress...to the states for ratification. I guess it all depends on how strongly you feel about this issue. If you feel strongly about this issue, the only way...the only effective way that you can deal with that

issue is to vote 'yes' on this call for a Constitutional Convention. I would urge 'aye' votes."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer, to explain is one...vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to explain my vote, essentially for the same reason..."

Speaker Matijevich: "By the way, this takes 107 votes. Proceed, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you...for essentially the same reasons a number of the other speakers have. Having voted consistently as a strong right to life Legislator, I feel the incongruity between all of the factors involved in this as many right to life Legislators oppose this and many of them do support it. I think the reason that they oppose it is that they don't trust Congress. As a matter of fact, there is adequate reason not to trust Congress. They have not proven themselves ever to be a trustworthy Body, and I'm sure they would abuse this...this right just as they've done any other one, but nonetheless, we are faced with the problem today of trying to correct the problem created by the Supreme Court, which, on this issue, has probably been one of the most immoral Bodies in government that we know. I am hopefully looking forward to the time when we have a new President. We can replace some of the old codgers who ultra-liberal..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder. One minute to explain his vote."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Timer's on."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there's been a lot of things thrown back and forth, but I think one of the most important things was the provision in the Constitution

by the Founding Fathers that the states, individually and collectively, had a right to propose changes in the Constitution, and that meant going the Constitutional Convention route, and this issue is so important...so important that I dare say that it's probably more important than ERA for those who are...indicated their support for that. It seems to me that we, in the State of Illinois, have an obligation to instigate the calling of a convention and let Congress set the rules. That's no problem, because the ultimate Resolutions have got to come back to the states for ratification. And, if they pass some Resolution that's not acceptable, the states will not pass them, and I dare say that the pro-life movement certainly should support this. We need 107 votes to give the states a..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, ten years ago I was more naive than I am today. At least, I hope so. At that point, I was active in the call for the Constitution for the Illinois State, and I am not confident...confident that the Illinois 'Con-Con' delegates presented us with a better Constitution than we had previous to that time. I have less confidence that a National Constitutional Convention would give us a better Constitution than we have at the present time. To those who say Congress cannot be moved on a right to life Amendment, I would suggest that the supporters follow the example of Martha Griffin, who found that the Committee could not be moved on the Equal Rights Amendment and so what she did was go around and get enough votes to discharge the Committee from consideration of that Constitutional Amendment. Now, if the supporters of ERA can do it, I believe the supporters of the right to life movement can do it."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton. One minute to explain his vote."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In reading the Resolution, it seems to me that they try to limit the purpose of the Constitution...or the purpose of the convention to propose an Amendment to the Constitution to provide a right to life guarantee. However, it seems to me that that convention would also have to consider the issue of capital punishment. Either one way or the other, they would have to decide whether or not capital punishment would be allowed or would not be allowed; and, therefore, I think that this convention would, of necessity, have to consider issues broader than that of the abortion issue. And, therefore, I think it is somewhat of a dangerous proposal and, therefore, would vote 'present'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich. One minute to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have a lot of respect for Mr. Leinenweber, and Mr. Bradley, and the other Sponsors, but, in all fairness, even though they stand up here with confidence and say, 'We know nothing else is going to happen, because Sam Irvin said so.', I don't have the same respect for Sam Irvin. The truth of the matter is there's no precedent for what you're trying to do. There are no laws which set the guidelines for it. There are no laws which set the guidelines for it. There are no Constitutional provisions, so the real truth about it is that there are authorities on both sides who say they really don't know what would happen. God help us if we ever have a National Constitutional Convention. It would be the end of this country as you know it. I was opposed to the calling of the Illinois Constitutional Convention."

I ran as a delegate, hopefully, to slow it down, and then I went out and worked against it. But, God help us if we ever have a National Constitutional Convention, because you don't know where it's going to go. You don't know what the Congress is going to do. You know the kinds of things that the Supreme Court does if it's ever taken to the court. So, all I can say for those of you who are voting 'aye', Father forgive you for you know not what you do.,"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins. One minute to explain his vote."

Robbins: "I think this Amendment is inconsequential due to the fact that we have the ERA Amendment coming up. The...it states that a woman has the right to decide this, and we have no right to even vote on it, so I will vote 'present'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Peoria, Representative Sumner. One minute to explain her vote."

Sumner" "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, have been a pro-life supporter. Let's let this U. S. Constitution alone. Our forefathers knew what they were doing, and I'm not sure when we redid the Illinois Constitution, they did. Look what we got. I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Beatty. One minute to explain his vote. Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in explaining my vote, I'm not going to repeat what's been said although I agree with much of the speeches that have been said in behalf of this Amendment. But, one of the Members said that this Amendment, if accepted, will open up many issues and might...actually bring an end to our way of life. Well, hell, I don't think we've got much of a life when we agree with the murder of unborn children. With the scale

that it's going on in this country, I think any change might be an improvement, and I don't get the...that people have here...the people that are so concerned about rights for women. Certainly, it's difficult. How could anyone be against rights for women? Tell me how someone could be against the rights of an unborn child and go along with killing unborn children. I think that the future of our country is really at stake in an issue like this. If you don't care about unborn children, I don't think you've got the moral fiber, or I should say the Americans have to sustain the government...to fight for your country, and that's the kind of..."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten. One minute to explain his vote."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I do not share the same fears of others regarding what a Constitutional Convention may do, because I feel that the delegates will be elected according to the issue. And, there may be some very good changes that come about because of that. Amendment 16 to the Constitution gave the Federal Government the ability to lay and collect taxes. That could be abolished. Secondly, the Amendment that limits the term of a President to only two years (sic) could be abolished, and Governor Reagan could serve at his pleasure forever. Those are two important changes that a convention that elects delegates on this issue could accomplish, and I think the measure deserves our support for those reasons."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson. One minute to explain his vote."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to say that this is probably one of the hardest votes that I have ever cast, but I have been a

strong pro-lifer, and I still am. I do not feel the issue, however, here today is the protection of the unborn. Many of us want to see the unborn protected, and they should be unprotect...they should be protected. I agree with this 100% and with all my heart, but I feel in calling a Constitutional Convention at this time in our country's history, we are playing Russian roulette with a very dangerous set of dice. I think that we are...we are returning something here to the very people that we are complaining about. We are leaving it up to Congress to make the rules. We're leaving it up to Congress to formulate a way of selecting delegates. We are leaving it up to those very feckless and irresponsible leaders in Congress to do what they haven't done. We complain about them, because they haven't moved the Constitutional Convention..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 90 'ayes', 67 'noes', and 7 answering 'present'. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Would you poll the absentees, please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees. Will the Clerk poll the absentees?"

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Bullock. Deuster. Emil Jones. Laurino. Neff. Patrick. Pouncey. Schoeberlein. Taylor. VonBoeckman. Williams. Williamson. And, Younge."

Speaker Matijevich: "Poll the absentees. You had...you had a poll of the absentees. All right. The Gentleman from Will, Rep...Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Place this on the Order of Postponed Consideration, please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave for Postponed Consideration. He has leave, and this issue will be placed on Postponed Consideration. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that this is on Postponed Consideration. There is no record of the vote. However, if there is a record, I did want the record to reflect that..."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right."

Deuster: "...I arrived late, and I wanted to be voted 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "There's no journalized record. However, if there is a record that somebody gets ahold of, Representative Deuster is on it. Leave. You know that never happens around here, Don. All right. Let's go through Third Readings again just in case Members want their Bills called. On page 2, Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bill 673. There's been an Amendment adopted, so we'll skip that one. Senate Bill 1378. Representative Pullen, do you want to proceed with that? No. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1614, Vinson. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1620, Dave Jones. Do you...do you want to go, Dave? The Gentleman from Sangamon on 1620. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1620, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Employees Retirement System. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Jones."

Jones, D.: Turn me on. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an appropriation for the State....ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Employees Retirement System and I move its passage at this

time."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Jones has moved the passage of Senate Bill 1620. There is no discussion? The question is shall Senate Bill 1620 pass? Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 136 'ayes', 5 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present' and Senate Bill 1620, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1651. Ryan...out of the record. Senate Bill 2024, Reilly...out of the record. On the Order of Motions, on page 5, House Bill 1010. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1010 is the Bill of Judiciary II Committee that tried to tighten up the problems created with crimes are committed by the insane. It passed the House overwhelmingly, by substantial vote and is over in the Senate. While it was in the Senate there was a technical action of the House, under the House rules that tabled the Bill. The Bill is still in the Senate and is still being considered and Representative Getty and Mr. Kosinski and I, would like to suspend Rule 68. So, that the Bill may continue to acted on in the Senate without any argument about its viability or life. So, I would move then to suspend Rule 68, regarding House Bill 1010."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved pursuant to Rule 63 (sic), to take from the table, House bill 1010. Is there any discussion? The question is shall the Gentleman's motion prevail? Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This takes 107 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The

Clerk....have all voted? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there're 123 'ayes', 4 voting 'no', 8 voting 'present' and the motion prevails. Senate Bill 1292 on motions. Representative Ewing. Does he wish to proceed? No. Senate Bill 1812, the Lady from Cook, Representative Jane Barnes. On motions."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to discharge the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education on Senate Bill 1812."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are you through, Jane? No. All right. The Lady from Cook, Representative Jane Barnes has moved to take from the table, Senate Bill 1292...oh, no...."

Barnes: "1812."

Speaker Matijevich: "I'm sorry. To discharge Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education from further consideration, advance to the Order of Second Reading, Senate Bill 1812. On that, the Gentleman...the Chairman of the Committee, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider. We got it all out too, Glen."

Schneider: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Now, if you were in the Senate, you would have to put a tie on. You know that."

Schneider: "I've got a white shirt today and I think you ought to notice that and I also got a haircut this week."

Speaker Matijevich: "Beautiful."

Schneider: "Believe it or not."

Speaker Matijevich: "You look great."

Schneider: "On that matter, besides the good grooming part. I would like to take a little bit about the question as to why we do....Senate Bill 1812. Was a Bill assigned appropriately to our Committee, Committee on Education.

It's a Committee of course made up of people who have experienced and understand, I think, educational matters. Ironically enough, 1812 is a Bill that...although assigned to our Committee, it was not heard. I kind of wonder why we even have a Committee system and why a person would seek to discharge a Committee that would give it the opportunity to have people a chance to express their views. Not just Legislators but those groups that represent educational interest, whether they are for or against the Bill and just see citizenry who may have desire to have input in the Committee. So, the question that comes to my mind is, why do you discharge Committee? Was it because the Committee was unfair? And I think in this case the answer is 'no'. Is it because the Committee would not evaluate the information. And I think in this case the answer is 'no'. Is it a matter of the Committee being unfair? And again I would answer 'no', because last time the Sponsor of the Bill commended the Committee for its fairness and its forthrightness on the matter. I see it purely as a way to avoid facing an issue that is going to cost the State of Illinois a lot of money. It's going to be a special treatment to a special group that I think is, again a matter of not serving all the children of the State of Illinois. It's a very selective issue. That's the reason why it didn't go to Committee and we who believe in the Committee process, and I think that most of us, at least will take the Bill to a Committee for a proper hearing. If they feel at that point that the Committee has been unfair, if they have been treated improperly, that all the public input has not been made into that legislative proposal. Then, I think a discharge motion is in order but the Sponsor who has been given the courtesy last week or two weeks ago, again avoids the Committee this time totally on the assumption that they

can go to the floor and make the motion to discharge and consider that a fair way to evaluate that kind of proposition. The answer of course, is very clear as to why it was done. The Committee would not have passed the Bill....so, expensive, so clearly unconstitutional, so clearly at odds with the educational language in our Constitution. That's a fair Committee in the House, it's a Committee that has served for the most part, to be objective in most of the issues. I'm regretting to say that, 1812 did not get the proper hearing. Because of that, because of the bypass motion, I would ask that you not support a motion to discharge this Committee today."

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

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and Fellow Members of the House. I've been a member of the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee for ten years. And I want to concur heartily with what our Chairman, Representative Schneider has said. I will not repeat the arguments he has presented because there's no need to do so. All I want to add is, I support what has to say and I want to point out that I personally heard the Sponsor of this Bill say, that she was going to bypass Committee. I believe in the Committee structure, I think we all should believe in the Committee structure. Therefore, I think that we should not support the Sponsor's motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Would the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "She indicates that she will."

Leverenz: "Representative Barnes, for what reason do you want to bypass Committee this time."

Barnes: "Well, Representative I....last week I discussed with the

generous Chairman, Representative Schneider and also several other Members of the Committee, this particular Bill. It was a concensus of opinion that there was no way that I could get that Bill out of that Committee. I did feel that the Committee had heard, House Bill 3580, which addresses the same topic. After talking to them and reaching a decision that there was no way that I could possibly get the Bill out of Committee because the votes just aren't there for this particular subject. I filed a motion to bypass Committee. I also, yesterday morning, I think around 9 o'clock, called the Chairman to advise him that I would not be in Committee, because I certainly have a respect for the Members of the Committee and did not want them to be seated waiting for me to appear. I feel that this is a subject that is very very close to my heart. I feel the same for the Senate Bill as I did for my own House Bill. I have the responsibility to get that Bill passed and this is the only way that I feel that I can get it to the floor, get it passed and get it to the Governor's desk. And that's why I chose that parliamentary procedure."

Leverenz: "Well, I appreciate your response there. Do you still have time to have it heard in Committee?"

Barnes: "No."

Leverenz: "I understand that there is still an opportunity to be heard in Committee. And certainly the day that it could have been called, there was a full compliments of that Committee to hear it. Unlike the situation that you proposed a few weeks ago, when you bypassed even a Committee vote and brought 3580 directly to the floor. You were able to say, that there were not enough Members in Committee to have the Bill heard."

Barnes: "Representative, I would like to correct that...."

Leverenz: "Ma'ma, I didn't interrupt you."

Barnes: "I'm sorry. Go ahead."

Leverenz: "So, I would suggest to you that you...have a hearing in Committee and let the proponent and opponents have their opportunity to be heard which is the normal course of business here in Springfield. And if you do not get fairly treated there, you can remake your motion and try to bring it directly to the floor. But simply...to completely reject the Committee system because you talked to a couple of people and it's your personal feeling that you would not get a fair hearing. Certainly, doesn't speak well of the Committee or the Members of the Committee or the Committee system. I would oppose your motion."

Barnes: "Well, Representative..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, wait. You will be able to close, Jane. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I sat here and listened to the Chairman of the Committee say how fairly this Committee would act. And I would imagine that's true. It's very easy to be true when you've got the votes stacked in your favor. And then this Chairman stood up and fairly said, it was a bad Bill, it was an unconstitutional Bill and that it couldn't get out of this Committee. I think that sums it up fairly. But this Bill is too important to summarily dispatched in this Committee. This Bill is very important to a whole segment of our educational society....systems of the education of the children of this state. I think this is too important of a Bill just to bury it in a Committee and hope it will go away. Well, it's not going to go away, it's going to keep coming back. The original Bill, I think was a better Bill and we came within a vote of passing that Bill. This is a watered down version and it has been watered down to meet every objection that was raised in the

Senate and in the House. I think in all fairness, we ought to vote this Bill out. Debate it on its merits, give it a chance. The Sponsors of this Bill, both in the Senate and the House have accepted Amendments that I don't think many of us would have accepted, in the hope of getting the Bill in some form. Providing relief for the school children of this state, for providing for relief for vast educational systems. It's a very important Bill and I would urge every Member of this House to put an affirmative vote upon the board."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. Regardless of the merits or the demerits of the Bill, there are some situations in which this sort of motion should prevail. Those situations do not occur at this time, regardless of whether you favor or oppose the Bill. There's a lack of time or a lack of bodies in the Committee to which a Bill is assigned or lack of fair consideration or at the utmost no hearing at all. That a motion of this sort ought to be entertained so the Sponsor can have a Bill heard on its merits and on its demerit. The situation now does not apply in any of those cases. There was time to hear the Bill in Committee, it was a full compliment of Members, just as there was in the last situation where the Sponsor did a similar thing. It was a time for consideration in that Committee, which I serve on, would have given consideration to this particular Bill. Absolutely, there was an effort to have a hearing on this particular Bill. We go too far if we bring this Bill out on the floor, regardless of what's in it or any other Bill where the Sponsors simply wants to go around the Committee structure. There is too a difference between this and a situation where a proposal has reached the floor

before, by Committee action. The Committee was ready to meet, the time was there, I reiterate, the people were there, consideration would have been given. The motion should be defeated."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "She indicates she will."

Anderson: "Representative Barnes, if this Bill had been heard in Committee and defeated, how many votes would it take to discharge the Committee?"

Barnes: "107, Representative."

Anderson: "If it was not heard in Committee and you filed your motion like you had, how many votes does it take to discharge?"

Barnes: "89."

Anderson: "It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong with our Committee system when it takes more votes to discharge a Committee after the Bill has been heard in Committee than when it is not heard at all. And I think we should take note of that and perhaps do something about it before the next Session. I can see that Representative Barnes is in a dilemma, she can probably put together 89 votes but maybe not 107. Although, I can't vote for the discharge because I serve as a spokesman on the Committee, I see the dilemma you're in, Representative Barnes."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker. I just move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow moves the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put. Those in favor

signify by saying 'aye', opposed by saying 'no'. The main question is put. The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes to close."

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker, five of the..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman on a point of order."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I'm sorry, I don't like to interrupt the Sponsor of a Bill. I just going to suggest to the Assembly that I will be asking for a verification and so please don't push anybody elses switch, it will make it easier."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes to close."

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that you are all familiar with this particular topic. I am just as sincere in asking for your vote, of an 'aye' vote for Senate Bill 1812 as I was when I approached just about all of you on House Bill 3580. This is a very very important concept that I think should be brought to the floor for consideration. There were six Members of the Committee that stood up and spoke against the Bill. I'm a gambler but I'm practical. I just cannot get that Bill out of that Committee. I would like your consideration for a Bill that I consider extremely important. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes has moved to discharge the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education from further consideration of Senate Bill 1812 and advance it to the Order of Second Reading. Those in favor of that motion signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Vote your own switch, there is going to be a verification. On the explanation of vote, the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster. One

minute to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Every Member of this House abides by the same rules. We have rule 66, which gives everybody, including the Lady whose offering this motion, the right under our rules to discharge Committees. There's nothing wrong with discharging a Committee, particularly when you know that the Chairman of the Committee is a public school teacher, who is lying in ambush...our good friend is lying in ambush, he's a little anguished and concerned because he was not given the opportunity to shoot holes in the Ladies Bill and ambush her in Committee. He's a little outraged, but we've heard this, we know what the subject is and also, I might say even though we may support the public schools, we also have a dual system in Illinois of private schools. This is a Bill that will help those private school, will help them to be competitive and the end result will be better quality education for the children of Illinois. And I urge more 'aye' votes so we can get this good Bill out on the floor again. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider...out of ambush."

Schneider: "On the question of being ambushed. My name was used in debate, it's a personal privilege thing, I believe."

Speaker Matijevich: "Let...let...let him go, we don't have anything else to do today."

Schneider: "Thank you. Yeah. It's right, he got 89 votes. Why don't you give me a chance."

Speaker Matijevich: "No, we want to hear...."

Schneider: "Stearney, sit down, we saw the empire strike back, you're going to get it. I just would like to say that the Committee process, evaluates those concepts within the Bill. If the Sponsor or any Sponsor begins to think that you go around the Committee because it's not sensitive to

your concern, that would be more appropriately served if you placed the Bill in the Committee. I think we understand that but to prejudge the Membership, even as Representative Collins has indicated, that the Bill has been "watered down", which is not true. To meet all the objections, then if we met the objections why not bring it to the Committee. That's all we ask for and I think a fair appraisal of the watered down Bill would have been in order, rather than thinking of me lying in ambush with my little bow and arrow."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels. One minute to explain his vote. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Jane Barnes is an excellent Legislator and a fine Member of this House. And Jane supports the motion to discharge the merit selection Bill and normally in cases, I would like to do all I could to help you in this case, Jane. But, you know, I also did the same thing that you're doing right now and Jane, my fear is, that with Majority Leader Madigan so opposed to discharging Committee, you just don't stand a chance. Now, I know when I look up on that Roll Call that Madigan is going to defend the integrity of the Committee system. And he's going to stand up and he's going to tear you apart and every Member of this House, he's going to chastise for offending the Committee system. So, let's look. Majority Leader Madigan, you're voting....oh, my gosh...he's changed his mind again."

Speaker Matijevich: "Not bad. Anybody else? Have all voted. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk...oh. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane, way in the back, I didn't see you, Jim. To explain his vote. One minute."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that it's just a matter

of common sense. The Committee system may be inviolet to some and they may use it as inviolet when it's to their benefits. But the Bill has been heard before, it's been out...it's been out on the floor, it's been voted on a number of times. Those...anyone with any sense can count the ways...or just take a look at the voting record of the Members on the Education Committee. And it would be absolutely insane for the Sponsor of this Bill to take it in the Committee and have to achieve 107 votes in order to pass it to discharge Committee. So, I think that no one is saying that the Committee system is wrong, I think what it is, is a matter of common sense and the person wisely bypassed this Committee. And I would ask...I think she's right and that we ought to support her in her bypass motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 89 voting 'aye', 65 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present' and the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman has asked for a verification. And the Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes is requesting a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees. One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dawson, for what purpose do you arise?"

Dawson: "May I be verified, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "It's all ready been requested. Oh, you want leave to be verified. All right, Glen."

Dawson: "Yes."

Speaker Matijevich: "You have leave. Representative Farley also requests leave to be verified. Representative Farley and Dawson have leave."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Bullock. Burnidge. Conti. Donovan. Ewell. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich.

Gaines. Garmisa. Harris. Emil Jones. Kosinski.
Laurino. Mautino..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Lechowicz, leave to be verified and show him voting 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Richmond. Schoeberlein. Vinson. VonBoeckman.
Willer. Williamson and Sam Wolf."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to verify Laz Murphy, 'aye'. Leave.
Laz Murphy. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm
voting to discharge Committee only. I'll vote 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Conti, 'aye'. Do you want leave to be
verified, Elmer? No. All right. 'Aye' for Conti.
The....we've had the poll of the absentees. The Clerk will
call the affirmative vote."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Gentleman from DuPage,
Representative Hoffman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Hoffman: "What number are we starting at, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "What number? 90 'aye', 65 'no'."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed with the affirmative vote."

Clerk Leone: "Abramson. Barnes. Beatty...."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Tim Simms, leave to be
verified. Tim Simms. Leave. Piel. Robert Piel, leave to
be verified. Leave. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Bianco. Birchler. Bower. Bradley. Brummer.
Campbell. Capparelli. Capuzi. Casey. Chapman.
Christensen. Collins. Conti. Cullerton. Darrow. Davis.
Dawson. Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. John Dunn.
Dyer. Farley. Flinn. Getty. Giorgi. Griesheimer..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Garmisa asks leave to be verified 'aye'."

Show him 'aye' on the Roll Call. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: Continuing with the poll of the affirmative.
Grossi. Hallock. Hanahan. Hannig. Henry. Huff. Dave
Jones. Kane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Krska. Kucharski.
Kulas. Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Leon. Macdonald.
Madigan. Mahar...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leon, leave to be verified. Leave.
Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Margalus. Marovitz..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Hold on. Giorgi, leave to be verified.
Leave. Got to go to a Senate meeting. Good luck.
Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Matijevich. McAuliffe. McBroom. McClain.
McCourt. Meyer. Molloy. Mulcahey. Murphy. Oblinger.
O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Peters. Piel. Pouncey.
Preston. Ronan. Ryan. Schlickman. Schraeder. Simms.
Skinner. Slape. Stanley. Stearney. Taylor. Telcser.
Terzich. Tuerk. Van Duyne. Vitek. Walsh. Watson.
White. J. J. Wolf. Younge and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Williamson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Williamson: "Speaker. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded on this
vote, please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Not recorded."

Williamson: "I would like to be recorded as 'no', please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record him as 'no'. The questions of the
affirmative vote. The Gentleman from DuPage,
Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, very much. Representative Davis."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Domico, leave to be verified.
Leave. Domico. Was that Jack Davis?"

Hoffman: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Jack Davis. Up in the gallery with his friends and constituents."

Hoffman: "Representative Griesheimer."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer. Is he...not in his seat. Is Representative Griesheimer in the Assembly? I don't see him. Take him off the record. Proceed. Leave. Leinenweber, leave to be verified. Leave."

Hoffman: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Representative Taylor, leave to be verified. And Doug Huff. I hope you work it out Gentlemen. Proceed."

Hoffman: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Matijevich: "Hanahan. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off. Proceed."

Hoffman: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative O'Brien. Dan O'Brien. Jack O'Brien is up here. Oh, there's Dan also. Continue."

Hoffman: "Representative Ronan."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Al Ronan. I don't see him in his seat. Al Ronan. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off. Proceed."

Hoffman: "Representative Schraeder."

Speaker Matijevich: "Who?"

Hoffman: "Schraeder."

Speaker Matijevich: "Schraeder. Representative Schraeder. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Lee Preston, leave to be verified. Leave. Schraeder. Al...put Al Ronan back on

the Roll Call and remove Fred Schraeder. Bill Henry, liked to have leave to be verified. Henry, leave to be verified. Proceed."

Hoffman: "Representative Younge."

Speaker Matijevich: "Wyvetter Younge. Wyvetter Younge. How is she recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "I don't see her in the Assembly. Remove her and put Fred Schraeder back on the Roll Call. Proceed."

Hoffman: "Representative Dunn, John."

Speaker Matijevich: "Who? John Dunn."

Hoffman: "Okay, I see him."

Speaker Matijevich: "Yeh, he's in the middle. Continue."

Hoffman: "Representative Bradley."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bradley. He's over on your side. Continue."

Hoffman: "No other questions."

Speaker Matijevich: "No other questions....all right. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Klosak, for what purpose do you rise...or seek recognition? Henry Klosak. Henry, are you seeking recognition? No. Somebody said you were. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Epton: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Matijevich: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentlman's..."

Epton: "Change me to 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Change him to 'aye'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question? On this question there are 89 'ayes' and 60...what? 65 'noes' and the motion prevails. 89 - 65. And the Committee is discharged on Senate Bill 1812 and the Bill will be placed on the Order of Second

Reading. Announcements. Announcements. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly, for an announcement."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to remind the Members of the Counties and Township Committee, apparently there were a couple of Members that weren't on the floor. That our meeting has been moved up to 3 o'clock. 3 o'clock in room 122A. So, I would appreciate your early attendance for the two Bills. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "I...Counties and Townships at 3 o'clock. The announcement was made on Elections, it's 2 P.M. Representative Terzich. On Pensions Committee."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Again the Personnel and Pensions Committee will meet immediately after adjournment in room 122B. Please be there, we have two Bills and we'll be out momentarily."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right."

Terzich: "So, right after adjournment, room 122B for Personnel and Pensions."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce, Chairman of Revenue Committee."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, the House Revenue Committee will meet promptly at 2. We have a heavy schedule today of Bills and because of certain events, being held later in the day, we want to get on the way with a fast start and try to complete our work by 5 o'clock if we can. So, the House Revenue Committee will meet at promptly at 2, in room 118. If you're there on time, we can get going and get our work done."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The House Human Resources Committee will meet at 2 o'clock today and...downstairs on the first floor in room 114. We have about eight Bills and

I would hope that everybody would get there on time so we could get in and out. Also, a reminder that the House - Senate softball game is today. The game will begin at 5:30, all players should be at Isles Park at 5 o'clock. This is not at Chamberland Park as the tickets say, it's at Isles Park at 5:30, not 6 o'clock...that's game time and the Trial Lawyers are holding the food for those of us at the game. And so, please come to the game at 5:30, that's the time the game will start. Isles Park and we'll go to the Trial Lawyers after that."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Coach Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, it's your last chance to see Billy Marovitz play second base. Next year he will be in the Senate, so be sure and come out and root him on. Tomorrow morning, Executive Committee will be meeting at 9 o'clock in the morning. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Agreed Resolutions. The Clerk will read the Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 858, Gaines, et al. 859, Chapman, et al. 860, Macdonal, et al. 861, DiPrima, et al."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty on the Agreed Resolutions."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Resolution 858, by Gaines, Williamson and Ewell. Speaks about Mr. Arthur N. Turnbull of Chicago..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Speed it up a little bit. Do a Giorgi on it."

Getty: "...one of the 25 Senior Citizens of the Year. 859, by Chapman, et al. Talks about 1980 Illinois High School Association, Girls' Badminton Championship. 860, Macdonald, et al. Speaks of 13 year old Amy Koopman of Arlington Heights. 861, commends the 100th birthday of Mrs. Rose Raffetto of Chicago and that's by Representative

DiPrima, et al. And I would move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Getty...Giorgi, has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution....House Resolution 862, Bower - Harris."

Speaker Matijevich: "Committee on Assignments. Death Resolution."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Joint Resolution 110, Boucek, in honor of Francis Gurrie and House Resolution 857, Gaines - Goodwin, in honor of Jay Williams."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Getty has moved the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no' and the Death Resolution are adopted. If there's no further business...does the Clerk...oh, I'm sorry. Committee Report."

Clerk Leone: "Representative Katz, Chairman on Committee of Judiciary II, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken on June 11, 1980. Reported the same back with the following recommendation. Do pass Senate Bill 1705. Do pass as amended, Senate Bills 1505, 1524, 1707, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994. Do not pass as amended, Senate Bill 1706."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. Does the Clerk have any time for....no further business. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan has moved that the House stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow, Thursday. On that the...the House does now stand adjourned until 12 o'clock....12 o'clock noon tomorrow. Adjourned."

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 11, 1980

PAGE 1

HB-1010	MOTIONS	PAGE	43
SB-0673	2ND READING	PAGE	6
SB-0934	2ND READING	PAGE	3
SB-1506	2ND READING	PAGE	3
SB-1585	2ND READING	PAGE	3
SB-1597	2ND READING	PAGE	4
SB-1598	2ND READING	PAGE	5
SB-1613	2ND READING	PAGE	4
SB-1616	2ND READING	PAGE	4
SB-1620	3RD READING	PAGE	42
SB-1623	2ND READING	PAGE	4
SB-1812	MOTIONS	PAGE	44
SB-1933	MOTIONS	PAGE	11
HR-0862	1ST READING	PAGE	61
*HJR-0032	3RD READING	PAGE	14

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 11, 1980

PAGE 2

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REVEREND KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	2
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	6
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	60
COMMITTEE REPORT	PAGE	61
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	61