

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

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Doorkeeper."

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, 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. Representative Wyvetter Young has requested that we remember Richard Pryor in our prayers this day. Watch over Thy servant, Richard and those who administer to him of Thy healing gifts that he may continue daily to grow in strength and health. Give him courage and confidence and peace, so that he can be restored to his former health. Amen. It is written in the 28th verse of the 7th Chapter of the 2nd Book of Samuel: O Lord God, Thou art God, and Thy words be true, and Thou hast promised goodness unto Thy servant. The prayer to be used this morning was written by Mr. Frederick G. Wacker, Jr., president of North Chicago-based AMCO Tools and was requested to be used by Representative Virginia Frederich of Lake Forrest: Let us pray. Dear Father in heaven, we offer humble thanks for the measureless bounty of Thy human talent and material welfare with which you have provided us and our nation. Yet despite your gifts, in this world today we see trouble the disarray of conflict, struggle, war. Help us, we pray to understand our brief while on earth.....excuse me. Help us, we pray....Help us, we pray to understand that our brief stay while on earth You offer the only answer: salvation through faith, not works, lest

man should boast. Help us to recognize that the case of trouble is man's failure, our failure, to follow Your teaching - heart, mind, and soul. Help us to do better, Lord; help us to again become "One Nation Under God" so that we may once more be an example to the world, of the blessing of individual freedom as "One Nation Under God" by Your Grace. Your Son said, according to Holy Scripture, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life; no man cometh unto the Father but by Me." In Jesus Name we pray. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Pledge of allegiance. I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United State of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all. Agreed Resolutions. Roll Call for attendance. Committee Reports. Your own switch only. Have all voted that are in attendance? Take the record."

Clerk O'Brien: "Committee Reports. Representative Chapman, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 18, 1980. Reported the same back with the following recommendations. Do pass Senate Bill 1579. Do pass as amended Senate Bills 1571, 1572, 1573, 1574, 1575, 1576 and 1578. Representative Matijevich, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 18, 1980. Reported the same back with the following recommendations. Do pass Senate Bills 1443 and 1630. Do pass as amended, Senate Bills 1632, 1636, 1663 and 1664. Representative Farley, Chairman of the Committee on Labor and Commerce to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 18, 1980. Reported the same back with following recommendation. Do pass as amended, Senate Bills 1739, 1740 and 2019."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 873...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Clerk O'Brien: "873, Pechous. 876, Emil Jones. 877, McClain. 879, Mulcahey. 880, Deuster. 881, Keane. 882, Keane. 883, Pullen. 884, Peters. 885, Campbell. 886, Henry. 887, Henry. 888, Speaker Redmond. And 889, Speaker Redmond."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, 873 by Pechous tells about the inflation rate. 876 by Jones, honors John H. Sengstacke. 877 by McClain, tells about the Colleges...Quincy College. 879 by Mulcahey, honors the Harlem, Loves Park, Girl Softball Team. 880 by Deuster, celebrates a Fire Chiefs accomplishments. 881 by Keane...Representative Keane, celebrates a marriage. 882 by Keane, a retirement. 883 by Pullen, a Library record. 884 by Peters, James M. Furman. 885 by Campbell, outstanding Realtor of the Year. 886 by Henry, some musical plays on Broadway. 887 by Henry, Reverend Clarence Stowers. 888 by Redmond, the Nigerian vistors. 889 by Redmond, the Nigerian again. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye'. opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carried, the Resolutions are adopted. Representative Cullerton, recorded as 'no'. Senate Bills, Second Reading on page 4. Senate Bill 1480."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1480, a Bill for an Act in relation to the transfer and leasing of real estate for school purposes. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2 was withdrawn. Floor Amendment #3, Anderson. Amends Senate Bill 1480 as amended in the introductory clause of Section 2 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #3 to House Bill....Senate Bill 1480, increases the rate for adult education from two dollar to three and a half dollars per student hour of instruction. Now, there will be no increase in state funds but this will allow us to capture more federal funds, if they are available. And I urge its passage."

Speaker Redmond: "I would like to call the Members attention to the rules which prohibits unauthorized persons on the floor. I want to ask the Members, please don't embarrass themselves and the Doorkeeper and your guests. We're not going to permit anyone...unauthorized to be on the floor. It's not a new rule but it's one that sometimes people disobey. You voted for it. I think a majority did. Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I did give my pitch for the Amendment, this is supported by the Illinois Office of Education, in fact it was at their request, I introduced this Amendment and I urge its passage."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion...oh, Representative Schlickman. Welcome."

Schlickman: "It's good to be here, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would call to your attention that Senate Bill 1480 is a Bill that amends the School Code with respect to the leasing of property. This Amendment effects the School Code with respect to an increase in a tax rate limitation. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we're at

that time of the Session, with only a couple of weeks left, where attempts will be made to place Amendments which....practically speaking, are not related to the subject matter and a device used to avoid three readings in each of the two Houses as a Bill ordinary is required to be subjected to by the Constitution. I don't speak to the merit of the Amendment, but I do, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, speak to this practice of offering an Amendment in the House at Second Reading to a Senate Bill with only a couple of weeks left, that is unrelated in terms of the subject matter. And I think we ought at this time, to raise the red flag and resist any of these efforts. I would urge a 'nay' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, responding to the previous speaker in regards to this particular Amendment. He is correct when he says that it deals with a different topic, because this deals with the funding level for adult education and the Bill which I'm handling deals with the leasing of....and sale of school property. The fact of the matter is, that a number of years ago this kind of Amendment would not have been germane. But since we changed the rules and the rules provide, as they stand now, that anything is germane if it's taken out of the same Section or the same Chapter of the law. One would have to say that the Sponsor of this Amendment is certainly in order in terms of proposing the Amendment. And I think the Amendment ought to be voted up or down on its particular merits. We have reasonable Membership here today and I think we can respond to it. The Sponsor of the Amendment has explained the Bill....or the Amendment adequately and I'm sure in his summation he will clarify it again and I think we ought to vote on it on

that basis."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman, what is your position with respect to the Amendment?"

Hoffman: "I didn't take one."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh. Anything further? Any further discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 3. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The motion carried, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1505. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't get your attention. I would like to leave it on Second Reading, another Member wishes take...."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll put it back to Second Reading. 1505."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1505, a Bill for an Act providing protection for the Public Health and Safety by prohibiting the possession delivery manufacture advertisement of drug paraphernalia. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Cullerton. Amends Senate Bill 1505 as...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stanley here? Representative Cullerton...out of the record. 1510."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1510, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to township organization. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any mot....any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1...."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of the Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Donovan."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Donovan here? Out of the record. 1518."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1518, a Bill for an Act...."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1631."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1631, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to Amendment 1? Representative Mahar....is Representative Mahar on the floor? Out of the record. 1635."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1635...we've got about 14 floor Amendments on this one."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative....Representative Robbins, are you aware of the floor Amendments on 1635?"

Robbins: "I would like to take it out of the record at the present time, there's some more to be offered."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1650."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1650, a Bill for an Act making certain....amending certain Public Acts. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to Amendments 1, 2 and 3?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1650, by Representative Reilly."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand that there's an Amendment just been filed....take this one out of the record. 1666."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1666, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Capitol Development Bond Act. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to Amendments

1.....Representative Getty. Getty."

Getty: "I wonder if we could take this Bill out of the record..."

Speaker Redmond: "I can't hear you."

Getty: "Could we take this Bill out of the record, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1712."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1712, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1726. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "You did not move 1712 to Third Reading, did you?"

Speaker Redmond: "I took it out of the record. Welcome. 1726."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1726, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Mautino on the floor? Out of the record. 1728. Is Representative Watson on the floor? You want to go ahead with this? There is five floor Amendments, I understand. 1728."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1728, a Bill for an Act in relation to exemption in bankruptcy proceedings. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Watson. Amends Senate Bill 1728 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof, the following, so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an agreed Amendment, one that I said I would put on the Bill on the House floor last week when we discharged this particular Bill out of Committee. The Amendment increases the personal property exemption for a bankrupt individual in Illinois from the current three hundred and seven hundred dollar limit,

depending on whether they are the head of the household or not, to two thousand dollars. I move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would....first I have Amendment #2 which has not been distributed yet and I assume that the Bill will be held on Second until that Bill has been distr....until that Amendment has been distributed. I would certainly quarrel with the suggestion that this is an agreed Amendment. I'm not sure I know who agreed to it. What the Amendment does, is to change one very....one of the component parts of exemptions. The federal exemptions which were passed last year in Congress...excuse me, are much different and much more comprehensive. All this changes is, one Section of the Illinois....the Illinois Act, frankly, I don't know if I oppose this change but I certainly would not want to characterize as agreed, since we do have a significant Amendment coming up as Amendment 2, that will comprehensively change the exemption statutes. To some extent...Mr. Speaker, could I have a little order?"

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order. Give the Gentleman order, please."

Greiman: "Now, the federal statute, bankruptcy Act...it changes a great many things...."

Speaker Redmond: "Let's everybody stand up and all yell at once and then sit down and be quiet. Everybody yell. Everybody yell. Okay, now. Now, give the Gentleman order. Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "The Act from which we are...the Act which now, Illinois debtors may take advantage of, is....provides for some small equity in a motor vehicle. That's not in Representative Watson's Amendment, it provides for...and a

way to save household furnishings and that's not in it. It protects social security benefits and unemployment compensation benefits, public assistant grants, disability insurance, all those things are protected now by Illinois....for Illinois debtors. All Representative Watson's Amendment does is, to change the amount of personal property that a debtor may select is exempt. It is by no means a significant or contribution to creditors rights in this state, in any way. As I said, I don't know that I oppose it, I'm probably going to vote 'present' on it. It's just...but, I certainly would characterize it as an agreed Amendment. It is, by the way, it is an example of a mistake that we made last Friday by discharging this Bill. There are many technical exemptions in our laws. We ask...the Committee asked that we have an opportunity to study it for a long period. To see what's fair, what's equitable, instead we've thrown it here on to this floor and we now find ourselves voting out...voting on an Amendment, which is kind of a piece meal change. And that's what we've done in this legislation. Again, probably not bad, not evil but hardly an agreed Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I was just going to suggest that he confine his remarks to the Amendment. He said, he didn't know whether he was for it or against it, he might vote 'present' and he's speaking about the Bill not the Amendment...but he's conclude. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just a little concerned, it is very difficult to hear back here and feel that maybe we could have some order, we might be able to hear what's going on. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Is it your intention to keep this Bill on Second, so that Representative Greiman can offer his Amendments, since they have not been distributed?"

Watson: "Yes, it is."

Darrow: "So, we can adopt this and then just hold it?"

Watson: "Pardon?"

Darrow: "We will....if we adopt this Amendment, you will hold it on Second?"

Watson: "That's right."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yeah, I wanted to ask the same question, Frank. I have a number of Amendments, as I told you. Are we going to keep this on Second, then, is that what we're going to do?"

Watson: "Yes."

Jaffe: "So, this thing will not be moved to Third, so...because I know I filed Amendments 3, 4 and 5, which I discussed with you. So, we'll hold this on Second until such time..."

Watson: "Yes, I think you have that right to have your Amendments heard and I agree to hold on Second Reading."

Jaffe: "Okay, fine. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion....Representative Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to...just add a comment to what has been said about the Amendment. I think the Amendment is...is helpful of course but it does appear to be thinly veiled attempt to make some very minor concession in the harshness of this Bill to ameliorate things just a little bit to entice people to vote for this legislation. This is a very difficult piece of legislation for those of us, on this side of the aisle to support in any manner or fashion,

because it takes away rights that were granted to the people by the United States Congress. Those unfortunate people who are forced to take bankruptcy in the State of Illinois, were granted quite a few new exemptions recently by the Federal Congress and this Bill would seek to take them all away. The Amendment only gives back one of those exemptions and increases the personal exemption from one thousand to two thousand dollars. The important point to remember, is why people take bankruptcy, and the reason they take bankruptcy is, they become too deeply indebted and the reason they get into debt is that the lenders own the money. Lenders have access to credit reports, lenders have access to financial statements. Lenders know what their doing when they take a risk and lend money to people who are in jeopardy of taking bankruptcy. If we kill this Bill, what will happen is that maybe there won't be so many loans but those that are made will be to genuine credit risk, the bankers will have to pay more attention to those to whom they lend money and everyone will be better off. And those who are unfortunate enough to have to take bankruptcy because of illness or because of some other serious family problem, will not find themselves in such desperate scrape that they can never recover. They will be able to get a new start which is what the bankruptcy law was meant to be."

Watson: "Mr. Speaker....Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Watson."

Watson: "I would appreciate it if he would speak to the Amendment and not to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you through, Mr. Dunn....he's through. Rep....is there anybody else? Anybody else? Representative Watson to close."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment increases the

state exemption in the area of personal property. We are actually trying to help the debtor in this particular case. We are increasing the exemption on personal property, whether it be a car or whatever an individual...personal property, home furnishings, whatever it might be, the individual will have an additional seventeen hundred dollars. If he is a single individual and if he is a head of the household, he will have an additional thousand dollars under this Amendment. I think it is a progressive Amendment, I believe that the...it is for the people and for the debtor and I would urge adoption of this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Representative Greiman. Amends Senate Bill 1728 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof, the following..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Hasn't been distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. Okay, we'll hold it. 1747."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1747, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of the Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Committee Amendment #1, adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Committee Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1773."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1773, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Workers' Compensation Act. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1810."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1810, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Retailers Occupation Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1812."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1812, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes....out of the record. 1815."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1815, a Bill for an Act in relation to regulation of hospice care. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1822. What's that, safe? Then I can't say, out of the record, can I? Safely remove it from the record. 1884."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1884, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning the disease of phenylketonuria. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you read that title again, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of a disease relating to phenylketonuria designated certain powers and duties in relation thereto, providing penalties for violation thereof."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, on Senate Bill 1639, which is the OCE for the Department of Public Health. I would ask leave of the House to be removed as Sponsor and have Representative Telcser added as Sponsor to 1639....as the Chief Sponsor of 1639."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 1957. What's....Representative Darrow, on 19...1893...out of the record. 1957."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1957, a Bill for an Act relating to taxes on farm land. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Motion with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Skinner. Amends Senate Bill 1957 as amended in Section 1, by deleting Section 20 F-1, and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, it's homeowner protection time again. The Representative has his Bill in the Senate, it's out on the floor to protect farmers. But, nevertheless, this Amendment will still protect farmers. It will keep the aggregate assessments from increasing more than 8% in any given county. But, in addition as an added bonus, it will

keep any taxpayers, any homeowners tax bill from going up more than 10%...excuse me, more than 8% next year. Now, I would suggest, unless the Gentleman is incredibly greedy and incredibly against the homeowners having his tax increases limited next year, then he should just concede, sit down, accept the Amendment and accept the glory that will flow from the passage of this good Bill after the Amendment is adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. That's a hard act to follow. We've discussed this Amendment or similar Amendment from Representative Skinner a number of times this Session. This piece of legislation before us deals with farm land tax assessments and only with farm land tax assessments. I would suggested to Representative Skinner, and he knows well as of others, that this Bill is vitally important to the community that it represents. I have no quarrel with his efforts, particularly to do what he's doing but I don't think it should be done on this Bill. I pointed that out before, we defeated this particular type of Amendment before. I don't believe it belongs on this Bill which deals with farm assessment, I rise in opposition to the Amendment. I would urge a 'no' vote on that Amendment because if you want this farm assessment Bill to pass this House, as the House Bill has already done and gone to the Senate. It's imperative, I believe, that we keep this Bill as clean as possible. We keep it within the context of farm assessment and we not try and load it up with some sort of demagoguery that Representative Skinner, once again throws our way and tells us that we're not for the taxpayer. We know better and he knows better and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Skinner

to close."

Skinner: "Well, if we want to talk about demagoguery. How many times do we have to pass tax relief for farmers. We've done it for the last six Sessions. We've done it one Session...one time this year already in this House. The Bill is in the Senate, it's out of Committee, it's on Third Reading, it's ready to pass and it's going to pass. Now, what about the homeowners in the state? Who is doing something for the homeowners? We don't see Representative Stuffle doing anything for the homeowners. He contends, he's passed a little Bill...well, that's right, Representative Pierce is doing something for the homeowners. But, one never can tell whether the Governor will sign his decent Bill. We can also not tell whether Rep....the Governor will sign, Representative Campbell's Bill. Which is Sponsored also by Representative Stuffle and we don't know what effect that will have. We do know what effect this Amendment will have, it will keep the taxes on every home in the State of Illinois from going up more than 8% next year. Now, if you want to help both homeowners and farmers, this is the Amendment to adopt. And I would certainly ask a Roll Call on this, if I may be so bold as to do so."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. We haven't done that yet. Roll Call for attendance. Representative Stuffle, were you seeking recognition?"

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. On a point of personal privilege. I think Representative Skinner has beaten his dead horse to the extent that he cannot revive it again in this Session. I think, you know, he's made a number of remarks about the people on this floor over and over again by name. He knows the kind of record we've got on tax relief, he knows Representative Campbell, Woodyard and Stuffle from the 53rd

District did send a tax relief Bill to the Senate. It's not our fault he can't get his own legislation out of Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you please stop naming each other in debate or we'll never get through with this personal privilege. Representative Skinner. Now, don't say anything about whoever it is that's on the other side."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman's nagging and treaties to the Legislature and you're taking attendance is ruining my momentum. I know how George Bush felt after New Hampshire now."

Speaker Redmond: "I couldn't give you a Roll Call, if I didn't take attendance before..."

Skinner: "Well, there's not enough people there to pass anything, so....why don't we take Representative Stuffle out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Take the record on the Attendance Roll Call. The question is on the Gentleman's motion....Representative VanDuyne. You've been added...you've been added to the Roll Call here. I don't know what they did with your switch. Is Christensen's do it? We're ready for the motion on Representative Skinners's motion to adopt Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1957. Those in favor vote 'yes', oppose vote 'no'. Daniels. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 73 'aye' and 61 'no'.....Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, I would like to poll the absentees on this particular Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "...he can be a hero. He can just sit down now and he can go home and all the homeowners will pat him on the back. And he might even get reelected."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle has requested a poll of the absentees. Representative Bower....wait until we get through on this. Poll the absent....poll the absentees. Will you read the title on 1884, Mr. Clerk. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Abramson. Bianco. Burnidge. Capuzi. Casey. Christensen. Dawson. Deuster. Domico. Doyle. John Dunn..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Frederick, 'aye'. Representative Doyle, 'no'. Representative Schraeder, 'aye'. Representative Henry, 'no'. Representative Van Dwyne, 'aye'. Representative Telcser, 'aye'. Representative Deuster, 'aye'. Representative Bower, desires to changed from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Sumner. Sumner, 'no'. Representative Stearney....Stearney, 'aye'. Wikoff, 'no'. Any other changes? Any other changes? What's the record? Representative Watson, 'aye'. Kane, 'no'. Continue with the poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "John Dunn. Ebbesen. Gaines. Harris. Huff. Johnson. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leverenz. Marovitz. McAuliffe. McAuliffe, 'aye'. Neff. Peters. Richmond. Rigney. Schuneman. Simms. Swanstrom. Vitek. Von Boeckman. Walsh. Willer. Williamson and Winchester."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Slape desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Simms, 'aye'. Swanstrom, 'no'. Bianco, 'aye'. Representative Boucek....or Pechous, 'aye'. Domico, 'no'. Christensen, 'aye'. Stuffle....Stuffle...Stuffle, turn Stuffle on."

Stuffle: "Yes, just to let Representative Skinner know we really mean business, I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino, 'aye'. Representative Bullock, 'aye'. Hoxsey....Representative Hoxsey, 'aye'. I

think maybe we better dump this one. All those in favor of the motion for the adoption of Amendment, indicate by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye' and 8 'no' and the motion carried and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Vinson. Amends Senate Bill 1957 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof, the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't believe there will be any controversy on this after the last one. What this does is to create an investment tax credit against the property taxes in those counties which classify for all taxpayers. It covers residential, commercial and farming. It's nondiscriminatory, it's a small credit, 5 tenths of a percent initially. And I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I question the germaneness of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Give him the Amendment. Parliamentarian advises that the point is well taken, that the Amendment is not germane."

Skinner: "You mean I won one."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further Amendments? Yes, you usually do."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1978...oh. Representative.....1978....out of the record. Representative Peters, for what purpose do you arise?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, if the Clerk would remove my name as Chief Sponsor of Senate Bill 2000 and

indicate that Representative Telcser will now be the Sponsor of Senate Bill 2000. If the Clerk would also remove my name as principal Chief Cosponsor of Senate Bill 1571, which is the appropriation for the Board of Higher Education, Representative Kane will remain as the Sponsor. And if my name will be removed as the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1662, which is the appropriation for the Department of Rehabilitation, Representative Telcser will be the Sponsor of that Amendment. So, please, Mr. Clerk, remove me from Senate Bill 2000, Senate Bill 1662 and Senate Bill 1571."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be removed as the Sponsor of Bills enumerated? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Leinenweber, are you seeking recognition?"

Leinenweber: "No, I'm making an order."

Speaker Redmond: "1979."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1979, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment#1, Representative Currie and Johnson. Amends Senate Bill 1979 on page 3, line 13 and 19 by...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Frederick from Lake Forrest, are you familiar with this Amendment? Who's the Sponsor of the Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Currie and Johnson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rea and McClain and Getty, will you please sit down. Representative Currie, Amendment....what's the Amendment number, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie on Amendment 1."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate

Bill 1979 deals with the problem of...who it is and how we would grant permits to permit new emission sources under the Federal Clean Air Act in the State of Illinois. The Bill itself gives authority to the Illinois...the Environmental Protection Agency to grant permits so that new source emissions would be possible as an effective variance from the Federal Clean Air Act Amendment when they are appropriate. All that this Amendment does is to make sure that the regulations under which the Environmental Protection Agency grants these permits are in fact sound and are clearly authorized by this Legislature. And the Amendment gives an opportunity for public participation in the question, whether or not a permit will be granted. The public may participate not only in the original hearing but in the event that the agency grants a permit, any individual who is affected by the regulation, by the permit grant would have an opportunity to appeal that ruling to the Pollution Control Board. This Amendment makes Senate Bill 1979 consistent with the way in which environmental authorities have acted with respect to public participation in the environmental area in the State of Illinois. And I urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "A question of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Borchers: "Do you think that this will delay any further the issue of permits in relation to construction. For example, Caterpillar factory or Staley's in marketed in Decatur. Would this further delay in permits to construction that would be vital to business interest and development of business interest in the State of Illinois?"

Currie: "No, I do not, Representative Borchers. And in fact, the Bill itself is meant to make sure that we are in compliance

with the Federal Clean Air Act Amendment, that Illinois will be able to do...to involve in new construction projects get highway dollars, get sewerage treatment plant dollars that we otherwise might not be eligible for. I don't think this Amendment to Senate Bill 1979 will have any effect at all on that issue."

Borchers: "Well, I....I always fear....having watched the Environmental Protection Agency for years. I always fear that anything that comes out of that agency is likely to hurt the business climate of the State of Illinois and help drive business away. So, I always like to look very closely at such an Amendment or an actual Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a significant change in the existing Environmental Protection Act. I might emphasize that, present law does not....not...provide for third party collateral attack on the issuance of a permit by the Pollution Control Board. If this Amendment is adopted, there will be no finality to state action. Any person....any individual who objects to the issuance of a permit, can walk in there and say, I object. The burden of proof is then on the....on the party that is seeking the permit. This can go on forever.....I....there have been nine hundred permits that have been processed by this....by this type of action. There has been zero citizen opposition, it's not needed. I am sure when the Act was drafted in 1970, that the Ladies husband took this into consideration and Professor Currie rejected this alien concept. I urge its defeat."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Meyer, who's Minority

Spokesman for the House Environment Committee is absolutely correct. In fact, our Committee considered this Amendment and had a great deal of discussion on it. What...the Lady is trying to do, the Environmental Protection Agency is sympathetic too. However, because the critical nature of Senate Bill 1979, the Environmental Protection Agency is....has advised all those people concerned with this Amendment, that they will help draft an Amendment next year which will handle this kind of problem that she's worried about on citizens participation. What she has done in this Amendment is, that the Amendment is drafted pretty loosely. In other words, any person that is 'adversely effected' could appeal to the Pollution Control Board. Well, there's no definition of what adversely effected is and some smoke stacks now are a thousand feet high or five hundred feet high and what you end up having is exactly what Representative Meyer's said, which is third party or collateral suits appealing, the decision of the Environmental Protection Agency. And I should also inform the Membership, that we thought in our Committee that this Amendment was so critical that we tendered it to the Pollution Control Board, the Pollution Control Board which would have the right under, Mrs. Currie's Amendment to receive that appeal from this third party collateral suit....does not....I repeat, the Pollution Control Board does not want this Amendment and in fact the Pollution Control Board asks us to defeat this Amendment. And so, for those reasons, I would ask you to defeat Mrs. Currie's Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the phrase, 'adversely effected' is used in the Amendment and speaks for itself. It seems to me the burden

would be on the person who claims to be adversely effected to demonstrate that particular fact. It is my....feeling that we should have that language in the Amendment, because I think, certainly it would be the intent of the Legislature, that anyone who was indeed adversely effected, be able to initiate these proceedings. After all, we do not want our citizens to be indiscriminately impacted by environmental pollution. And we want to give them, I think, the broadest latitude for being able to bring the impact of this pollution to the attention of the proper authorities. I believe that the Pollution Control Board is the proper authority, I think we have here, in their opposition, alleged opposition, simply one more example of the bureaucracy having to be dragged kicking and screaming into doing something that....it is indeed mandated to do in their original enabling legislation. I urge the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this Amendment. The proposed Amendment could bring construction of newer modified facilities to a...virtually to a stand still. Through delay and harassment. It would seriously damage permitting...permitting process by placing a cloud on every permit that's going to be issued in the future. Ample opportunities provided to any party to have input before a new source permit is issued. Such a procedure invites petitions holds whose sole purpose is to delay or harass the construction. Modification or continued operation of manufacturing plants. If anything, steps should be taken to speed up the permitting process, not slow it down. And that's exactly what this Amendment would do, slow it down."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Frederick."

Frederick, V.: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and

Gentlemen of the House, I rise also to oppose this Amendment although I'm sorry to do this because of the Sponsor of the Amendment, Representative Currie. I am also a citizen in favor of citizen participation in the permit process. The Environmental Protection Act currently provides for citizen participation in hearings for permits. The Bill, 1797...1979, does not change environmental requirements in Illinois. This Amendment is highly controversial because it gives standing to any citizen who claims to be adversely affected by a newer modified air pollution source and who has participated in a hearing before the Pollution Control Board. Any such citizen may petition the Board and have a hearing after a permit has been granted and contest the permit. Industry of course is strongly opposed to this Amendment, the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency and the Pollution Control Board both oppose this Amendment. EPA is in favor of citizen participation but not in this form. This is a critical Bill, if we wish to assist business in the State of Illinois. So, I urge your 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: " Any further questions? Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "The objections people have raised to the Amendment strike me as altogether wrong headed and backwards. We have heard on this floor that we do not want this year to encourage public participation in the permit granting program. In fact we tried in the final draft of this Amendment to meet the objections that were raised in the House Environment and Energy and Natural Resources Committee. We did make sure that only those adversely effected individuals who participate in the initial stages of the hearing would be permitted to bring a complaint after the fact of a grant, to the Pollution Control Board.

Finality has been mentioned as an issue, it isn't an issue at all. It's quiet clear from the very beginning of the record, whether an adversely effected individual cares...is involved, makes a complaint, is participating in the hearing. The Pollution Control Board will hear complaints made by those who's permits are not granted on appeal. All we're doing with this Amendment is saying, that adversely effected individuals in the public have an opportunity to bring their concerns to the Pollution Control Board in the same kind of way. I do not invision that we would see massive numbers of cases brought to the Board after grants of permits by the agency. I think anyone who has been involved in this field knows that in fact the problem is, the public doesn't participate as much as we would like it too, rather than that the public is out there trying to keep business and industry from doing the things that it needs to do every step of the way. We met the objections that those individuals and groups had early on in the original draft of the Amendment. I spoke to the Co-Chairman of the Illinois Pollution Control Board, Jacob Demel on Friday, he said, he was not opposed to this particular Amendment. If we can do it next year, it seems to me we ought to be willing to do it this year. Illinois has been one of the leaders in states across the nation in finding a role for public participation in environmental issues and I would urge this House to maintain our committments to public participation in the environmental area by voting 'yes' on Amendment 1, to Senate Bill 1979."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Ladies motion for the adoption of Amendment 1. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Former blue ribbon candidate large election for this....blue ribbon candidate for the House, Senator Bower. He was one of the blue ribbon

candidates....you're not a blue ribbon candidate in the Senate though. Have all voted who wish? Representative Katz."

Katz: "Briefly explaining my vote. Why should not a person who is affected by action of the EPA have a right to contest the ruling of the EPA. Why doesn't justice work both ways...isn't that fair that if, any party that's aggrieved has an equal right to go to court. That's what it amounts to and that's why I'm supporting this excellent Amendment by Representative Currie."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 28 'aye', 97 'no', the motion failed, the Amendment is not adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2020. Monroe Flinn. 2020."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2020, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections to the local Mass Transit District Act. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, lost in Committee. Amendment #2 and 3, were withdrawn previously. Floor Amendment #4, Sharp - Slape - Birchler - Watson and Flinn. Amends Senate Bill 2020 on page 2, line 32, by inserting before 'such district' the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sharp. Representative Sharp."

Sharp: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment states that any township or in counties where they don't have the township form of government, municipalities that are not served on a regular basis by the Mass Transit District, shall not be included in the Metro East Mass Transit District. In Madison and St Clair and Monroe counties, many areas are rural in nature, they are not,

they have never and probably never will be served by by-state in any manner and therefore, is the feeling that many Legislators from that area that they should not be included in the Mass Transit District. And I would move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly accept this Amendment. It does indeed take out all of the areas that are not now served by the by-state Metropolitan Bus System down in our area. It takes them out of the taxing district until such time as they vote themselves into the busing district and then at that point they become part of the taxing district. So, I support the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the motion for the adoption of Amendment 4. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carried, Amendments adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Watson. Amends Senate Bill 2020 on page 2, line 30, 31, 32, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 2020 simply states that no Metro East Mass Transit District may be created unless the creation of such district has been approved by a majority of the voters of the proposed district at a referendum election conducted in accordance with the general election law. Any county participating in a Metro East Mass Transit District may terminate its participation by resolution approved by majority vote of the County Board. This is simply a referendum Amendment, I feel the people of the Mass Transit District that we are proposing to establish in the Metro East area, should have the right to vote on whether they want to be a part of that district or not. I would move for the adoption of the

Amendment, anyone has any questions...why feel free to ask."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Amendment, this Amendment was defeated in Committee. It's just another effort to put it on and if you do put it on, you could just leave the Amendment as the first line. That no Mass Transit District will be created in this area and you could put a period right there because that's what it amounts too. For years the Legislature has been supporting the Metro East Bus System down there by way of supporting the By-state authority. Last year, both Houses told the area Legislators that this was the last year, until we come up with some local backing funds....collected locally, they would not get more than one thirty second of the sales tax collected in the area served. The same as the other Mass Transit Districts do downstate. To put this on the ballot would throw a red flag up before people and say to them, here's you an opportunity to vote against a tax. This system is equivalent to a school system, there are many people who pay for our schools who make no use of them and every opportunity they get for a bond issue, they vote against it. No one can argue the schools are not good for us, no one can argue that we shouldn't have the Mass Transit System in the Metro East area. To defeat this Bill and the Amendment will defeat the Bill. We are very simply saying to a good many people who can't afford the high price of gas, can't afford an automobile, who are working at rather low wages, that you now have no longer a system to ride to work. You either be on unemployment or public aid or some other support, you can't get to and from your job. It is up to all of us to support the continuance of the busing...bus system in the Metro East area. And I hope

we soundly defeat this Amendment, as it was in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, a number of us...four terms ago were involved with the establishment of the Regional Transportation Authority in the Chicago region. At the time I was doing research on RTA at that time, I learned that the Chicago Transit Authority had been established by a referendum. And so, I suggested to then Speaker Blair and Mayor Daley and a number of people involved in putting together RTA, that we ought to have a referendum. Representative Skinner and myself, Members on both sides of this aisle participated in that referendum. We debated this all over the six county region and the voters spoke. It was a close election but they spoke and they established RTA. I think if it is fair for the establishment of CTA in Chicago and RTA in the Chicago region, similarly the voters in...this region involved in Amendment offered by Representative Watson, also ought to be respected. And I think they'll make an intelligent choice. They know there's a gasoline shortage, they know the importance of public transportation as they did in our region, in Chicago. And I'm sure that they will do the right thing but, this is only an expression, this Amendment, a basic democracy and a basic respect for allowing the local people to do what they want to do. And I would urge support for this good Amendment, to allow for a referendum. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone further? Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Amendment. This Amendment would have cured one of the very large problems in the six county area and that is the ability to get out if you don't want to be in. There is an opt out section of this which I think will be extremely valuable in

maintaining the viability of any public transit system that might be approved. I am astounded at the fear that Legislators have of their own voters, their own constituents. The Sponsor of the Bill is afraid to let the Metro East citizens to vote on whether or not they shall have a tax increase. This General Assembly has not been voting for tax increases without a referendum very often. This is not the time to start. This is a tax increase, which is not a property tax increase, it's a sales tax increase. Those of you in suburban Cook County remember what happened when your sales taxes were increased by 20% without a referendum...less than six months ago. I think that the same attitude prevails here, that someone knows better than the voters what is good for them. And I reject that attitude and I hope this General Assembly will reject that attitude and I hope they will adopt this Amendment which requires a referendum prior to the....prior to the impositions of a sales tax in the Metro East area in the formation of a Mass Transit District but also give each County Board the ability to opt out, if somewhere along the line those County Boards....one of those County Boards decides that it has made a mistake. Now, one can not ask for anything more fair than that, but then again, I'm not sure the Sponsor of this Bill are interested in being fair to taxpayers of the Metro East area."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"

Skinner: "Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Watson to close."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't personally care if the people live in Chicago or Cairo, they ought to have an opportunity to voice their vote of approval or disapproval on any type of a tax increase. That's exactly what we're going to be doing, we are going to be forming a Commission

in the three county Metro East area which will have the right to establish a tax on the people of that district without their approval. This is a back door tax. I personally feel that the people of the Metro East area should have the right to decide for themselves, and the Illinois General Assembly should not cram down their throat this particular issue. We in Southwestern Illinois do not need an RTA. I would hope that the Members of the General Assembly will approve this Amendment and I urge for its adoption. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 5. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk....Skinner."

Skinner: "We certainly don't want this to pass without a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this there is 67 'aye' and 72 'no'. Representative Skinner requests a poll of the absentees. Representative Hoffman, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Alexander. Bullock. Capparelli. Capuzi."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capuzi, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Casey."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capparelli, 'no'. Proceed with the poll of the absentees. Casey, 'aye'. Abramson, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Hoffman, 'aye'? Continuing the poll of the absentees. Christensen. Dawson. John Dunn. Ebbesen. Ewell. Gaines. Getty. Huff. Huskey. Emil Jones. Laurino. Leverenz. Margalus. Mautino. McAuliffe. McBroom. Meyer. Molloy....Molloy, 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh, 'aye'. Ryan, 'aye'. Molloy, 'aye'. Representative Huskey, 'aye'. Margalus,

'aye'. Woodyard, 'aye'. Mautino, 'no'. Alexander, 'no'. VonBoeckman, 'no'. Terzich, 'no'. Representative Emil Jones, 'no'. Christensen, 'no'. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, would you change me from an indecisive 'present' to an indecisive 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman, we don't have that sort of a reastaff, we'll just have to vote you as 'aye'. Representative Watson."

Watson: "Have we finished polling the absentees?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk hasn't given me the count yet. Representative Bullock, votes 'no'. Representative Huff, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the absentees. Laurino. Leverenz. Margalus...."

Speaker Redmond: "Margalus voted, didn't he? He was in the aisle and he voted 'yes'."

Clerk O'Brien: "McAuliffe. McBroom. Meyer. Peters. Sandquist. Simms. Stearney. Telcser. Williams. Winchester. No further."

Speaker Redmond: "Now, what is the count? 77 'aye' and 80 'no'. Representative Reilly, for what purpose do....the motion fails. Now, Representative Reilly. Any further Amendments? The request....I didn't hear any request for it prior to announcing the....did you ask for it, Skinner. Well, tell me whether you did or you didn't. Well, if you don't remember how do I remember. I don't remember and I have announced the result. Well, Skinner says, he don't know and.....too late now. Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day, page 7. Representative Watson."

Watson: "I would like to ask to verify the Negative Roll Call on that previous Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian, come here. Representative

Flinn."

Flinn: "You announced the results of that vote."

Speaker Redmond: "I know it, I'm asking...."

Flinn: "And that is final."

Speaker Redmond: "...the parliamentary as how the rules provide is the way that it's going to be called. The Amendment...the count was 77 'aye' and 80 'no', that's after we had completed the poll of the absentees and I declared that it was lost. I didn't hear any, Representative Skinner says, he can't remember. Now, Representative Watson, after I declared, requests a verification of the Negative Roll Call."

Watson: "I really didn't....Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Watson: "I don't really feel I had the opportunity to ask for a Roll Call for verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Well....whatever the parliamentary...."

Watson: "I was talking to someone else about the issue. I'm asking for it now..."

Speaker Redmond: "It isn't up to the Chair to remind you, that you should be alert and on the toes here. I think we went through this, we had a poll of the absentees, much time was consumed. I sympathize with you, I have declared the result. Now, whatever the parliamentary tells me is what my decision is going to be. Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker. Representative Cal Skinner referred to if it did receive that he was going to verify the Negative Roll Call and that's the reason why I didn't get up and ask for the verification of the Negative Roll Call. He said, if it should reach it, I would ask for a verification of the Negative Roll Call. And that's the reason why nobody else made the request."

Speaker Redmond: "The parliamentary advises me that under

48(d), that inasmuch as we hadn't gone to another order of business that the motion is well taken. Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to register my protest. You did indeed announce the results of the vote. I stood and watched Representative Watson, I stood in the aisle there, I looked at Representative Skinner, I looked at those people who spoke against the...in favor of the Amendment rather. And not one of them raised up their hands to get your attention."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct but I haven't gone to next order of business and under 48(d), there is another floor Amendment. So, I couldn't have gone to anything except this particular Bill."

Flinn: "I distinctly heard you say, Third Reading, Short Debate. Now, if you'll pull the tape out, you'll would hear that you said, Third Reading, Short Debate."

Speaker Redmond: "There's another Amendment on this Bill that I didn't...wasn't aware of."

Flinn: "Well, take the Bill out of the record for the time being then."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute...wait a minute. Can't take it out of the record. You can't take it out of the record now. Representative Ryan, we're going to have a verification of the Negative Roll Call. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, as long as that's your decision, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to say. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say, Representative Ryan?"

Ryan: "Go ahead. Run it."

Speaker Redmond: "Negative Roll Call. Yeah."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Negative Roll Call. Alexander. Balanoff. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capuzi. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Epton. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Harris...."

Speaker Redmond: "Hanahan. From what to what? Representative Hanahan desires to be recorded as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the Poll of the negative vote. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Please vote me 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn is 'no'. Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Mr. Speaker, 'yes'. Please record me as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Winchester is 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the negative vote. Kornowicz...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Krska, for what purpose do you arise? May Representative Krska be verified? Representative Watson...Krska, be verified."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the negative vote. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Schraeder. Sharp....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the negative vote. Slape. Steczo. C. M. Stiehl. Taylor. Terzich. Vitek.

VonBoeckman. White. Willer. Williamson. Saw Wolf.
 Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any question of the Negative Roll Call?
 Everybody get ready to verify and do all that you want to
 do and don't scold me. Representative Watson..."

Watson: "What's the vote now, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 79 'aye', 81
 'no'."

Watson: "79 - 81?"

Speaker Redmond: "Right."

Watson: "Representative Bradley."

Speaker Redmond: "Bradley on the floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Everybody within hearing range of
 my voice, please come on the floor. I know you're around
 here some place so let's not delay."

Watson: "Representative Darrow."

Speaker Redmond: "He's over back of you. He's talking to Penny
 Pullen."

Watson: "Representative Henry."

Speaker Redmond: "Henry. Henry, here? May Representative
 Garmisa be verified? He's right here. Is Henry here?
 How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Watson: "Representative Lechowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Watson: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Redmond: "McGrew. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Here's McGrew, put him back on."

Watson: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Redmond: "How's O'Brien recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Wait a minute, Bradley is here.
Was Bradley taken off?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Yes, he was."

Speaker Redmond: "Put him back on."

Watson: "Representative Ronan."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Watson: "Ronan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ronan. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Watson: "Representative Pierce."

Speaker Redmond: "Pierce. How's he recorded? Is that Pierce in
his seat? How's Pierce recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Watson: "Representative VonBoeckman."

Speaker Redmond: "There's VonBoeckman."

Watson: "Thank you. Representative Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Here she is, over in the door."

Watson: "Representative Braun."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Watson: "Braun."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun. Here she is."

Watson: "She is here?"

Speaker Redmond: "She's here. Talking to Schneider. Who isn't
in his seat."

Watson: "Representative Christensen."

Speaker Redmond: "Lechowicz is here, put him back on.
Christensen is back in the back of the chamber.
Representative Pierce has returned, put him back.

VanDuyne, did we take VanDuyne off?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, Van Duyne was not taken off."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. Representative VanDuyne, how do you desire to be recorded? You don't....record VanDuyne as absent. Representative McAuliffe, 'aye'. Stearney, 'aye'."

Watson: "Representative Leon."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff, 'no'. Who was the last one?"

Watson: "Leon."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Leon here? How's he recorded? Is Leon here? Oh, he's in the aisle. Mulcahey....Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to be verified now?"

Speaker Redmond: "May he be verified? Representative Watson..."

Watson: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "....may he....Representative Ebbesen, 'aye', Ebbesen is 'aye'."

Watson: "Representative Kelly."

Speaker Redmond: "Kelly. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Watson: "Representative Madigan."

Speaker Redmond: "Down in front talking to VonBoeckman."

Watson: "Okay. Okay, that's it."

Speaker Redmond: "Ebbesen. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have a young man here who has two lemonades, doesn't know where to deliver them."

Speaker Redmond: "They paid for?"

Ebbesen: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's are they? Representative Flinn, for what purpose do you arise?"

Flinn: "Well, if the Gentleman is successful in getting off

enough 'no' votes, I would like to be on record now and a very timely one, I might add, verifying the 'aye' votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Very timely. What's the count, Mr. Clerk.? Representative Getty, for what purpose do you arise?"

Getty: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Getty, 'no'. Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "May I be verified, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "May Representative McMaster be verified? Representative Flinn, may McMaster be verified?"

Flinn: "Yeah."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. 82 'aye' and 78 'no'. Representative Flinn has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Peters, 'aye'. Representative Ralph Dunn, for what purpose do you arise?"

Dunn, Ralph: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, change me from 'aye' to 'no', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'no'. Yeah. Verify the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Ackerman. Anderson. Barnes. Bell. Bianco..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute....wait a minute. Representative Ewell. Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "How am I recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Ewell: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'no'. Representative Jones, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "He's already voted 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "You can only vote 'no' once."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing to poll the affirmative. Bianco. Birkinbine. Bluthardt. Borchers. Boucek. Bower. Burnidge. Campbell. Casey. Collins. Conti. Your mikes

open, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Your microphone is open. Daniels. Davis...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Henry, is it? Representative Henry desires to be recorded as 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "He was removed. Continuing the poll of the affirmative. Deuster. Donovan. Dyer. Ebbesen. Ewing. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hanahan. Hannig. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Johnson. Dave Jones. Karpel. Kent. Klosak. Kucharski. Leinenweber. Macdonald. Mahar. Margalus. Matula. McAuliffe. McCourt. McMaster. Molloy. Neff. Oblinger. Pechous. Peters. Piel. Polk. Pullen. Reed. Reilly. Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Ryan. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Schuneman. Skinner. Stanley..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel, request permission to be verified. Okay."

Clerk O'Brien: "Stearney. E. G. Steele. Stuffle. Sumner. Swanstrom. Totten. Tuerk. Vinson. Walsh. Watson. Wikoff. Winchester. J. J. Wolf. Woodyard. No further."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions, Representative Flinn?"

Flinn: "What's the count to begin with?"

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 82 'ayes', 81 'no'. Representative Stuffle, 'no'. Representative Kelly, 'no'. Now, what's the count? 81 'aye' and 83 'no' and the motion fails. Representative Catania."

Catania: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "I declared the results and I'm not going to go through it again."

Catania: "I don't think you've gone to the next order of business, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker. I suppose we could be here all day doing this unless you finally declare a verified Roll...."

Speaker Redmond: "I declared that the motion lost. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Slape. Amends Senate Bill 2020...and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Slape."

Slape: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to withdraw Amendment #6."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment 6, is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. I don't have anything on here that tells me that. Representative Skinner has requested a fiscal note, Mr. Flinn. So, it will have to stay on Second Reading. I hope this is worth it. Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Didn't his right to request a fiscal note limited to Second Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it's on Second Reading."

Flinn: "You didn't move it to Third?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well...it hadn't been called to my attention, the request for the fiscal note was on the Clerk's desk, so..."

Flinn: "Okay. That's fine, we'll get you one."

Speaker Redmond: "Anybody here from Channel 2, will you please come to the podium. Channel 2, that's the award winning Channel. It's that way on the count of Dave Caravello who works for them. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Chapman, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 18, 1980. Reported the same back with the following recommendations. Do pass as amended, Senate Bills 1626, 1638 and 1662."

Speaker Redmond: "Jack, ready for the Resolutions? General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "Further Committee Reports. Representative Matijevich, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 18, 1980. Reported the same back with the following recommendations. Do pass as amended Senate Bill 1665."

Speaker Redmond: "Introduction, First Reading. Representative Peters for what purpose to you rise?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, eariler in the day as part of the Agreed Resolutions. Resolution 884 was passed by the House which would to congratulate and thank Jo Furman for his services to the State of Illinois as a Director of the Board of Higher Education. With leave of the Chair and leave of the House, I would ask that all Members be added as cosponsors of that Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Hearing none, all Members will be listed as cosponsor."

Peters: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "To the Resolution. General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 104, Redmond - Ryan. Speaker's Table?"

Speaker Redmond: "Speaker's Table. Yeah. On page 7, Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day, Senate Bill 1821. Representative Bloom - Bower - Reilly - Yourell...that's it. I guess that's Senator Bower."

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day. Senate Bill 1821, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Financial Planning and Management Service Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Which of the illustrious Sponsors is going to handle that? Oh. The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all

voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 115 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate, page 2. 1522. Representative Christensen."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1522, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Christensen."

Christensen: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 1522 clarifies the Homestead Exemption Act. There's only about five or six counties in the State of Illinois, that doesn't automatically give them their exemption when they have it coming, and what this would do is...is make it possible to give them there exemption when they have it coming without them making an application and I'd ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130...43 'aye' and one 'no', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1548."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1548 a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi, Giorgi on the floor...Simms on the floor? Can you handle, 1548? Oh...Giorgi's here, I'm sorry...Representative Giorgi...1548."

Giorgi: "Simms will handle it."

Speaker Redmond: "Simms for Giorgi, Representative Simms...Are you on the Roll Call, Representative Simms?"

Simms: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, very much. Senate Bill

1548 amends the Environmental Protection Act by making a change to allow the Pollution Control Board to grant up to 90 days a variance for non compliance on the recommendation of the EPA. This Amendment has been agreed to by the EPA, by the Pollution Control Board and it was worked out between the two agencies. It had unanimous support in the Committee and I think it's a compromise and it solves a problem that has long overdue to be addressed. And for these reasons, I would move for the passage of Senate Bill 1548."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Is there a court house in Winnebago County in this one? Have all vote who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 142 'aye' and no 'nay', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1569."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1569, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts here in names in relation to the State Community College of East St. Louis. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge. Representative Wyvetter Younge. Wyvetter Younge. Out of the record. 2005."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2005, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for construction, use and maintenance of certer water terminal facilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Swanstrom."

Swanstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2005 amends an Act concerning waterways. It allows the Illinois Department of Transportation to sell water terminal land that is of no further use to the state. The Department of Transportation

wants to make a feasibility study on a twenty-one acre area, in the Chicago area that is of no further use to them. They want to do a feasibility study, Senate Bill 2005 will authorize the study and give the Department of Transportation to sell the property if that study determines that this will be the best use of the land. It passed out of the Senate 55 to nothing and I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey. In opposition."

Mulcahey: "Is this Short Debate."

Speaker Redmond: "This is Short Debate."

Mulcahey: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Mulcahey to explain his vote."

Mulcahey: "I already did, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye' and 5 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared pass. 2006."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2006, a Bill for an Act to authorize the Department of Transportation to convey by quit claim deeds, certainties describe in the DuPage County. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2006 authorizes the Department of Transportation to convey point three or three tenths of an acre of state owned land in DuPage County which was inadvertently acquired in 1959. The owner of the property would like the department to return that portion of land to him. This parcel of land is in excess and is of no use to the Department of Transportation. Conveyance will be by

quit claim deed and since no money was involved in the acquisition, this excess property...of this excess property, no money will be exchanged. And I would urge....this has no opposition that I know of Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and I would urge adoption of this....acceptance of Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I realize this is Short Debate. I do have a sincere question on this and I would like to ask it if there is no one in opposition."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative George Ray Hudson will give you a sincere answer."

Getty: "All right. I would like the record to reflect clearly that no compensation was paid to these people by the state for this land."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Yes, Representative Getty. I can give you that assurance. The compensation paid in 1959 was for the land actually needed for an improvement on I-55 and did not, repeat, not include any amount for the erroneously acquired parcel. Consequently, no appraisal was made on such parcel and the Department of Transportation, I again state, supports this Bill."

Getty: "So, we are returning that which rightfully belongs to these people."

Hudson: "Right. Rightfully belongs to the owner, was taken by mistake and no money was paid for it."

Getty: "Thank you. On that basis, I certainly would support it."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative DiPrima, for what purpose do you rise?"

DiPrima: "Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, we have in our presence my former seatmate, Michael Nardulli, now alderman of the City

of Chicago. Michael Nardulli, right here."

Speaker Redmond: "Have we taken the record on 2006 yet, Mr. Clerk? Take the record. On this question there's 157 'yes' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bills, Third Reading. 2007."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2007...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi for what purpose do you arise? Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I ask to suspend the appropriate rule...posting rule in order to hear Senate Bill 1589 in Appropriations II Committee tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Lady...any objection? Representative Ryan. Have you discuss it with Representative Ryan?"

Ryan: "It's the first I've heard of it, Mr. Speaker. What is the Bill.?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Ryan, I thought that Mr. Peters and Mr. Wikoff had already discussed that with you...I think you'll find this okay."

Ryan: "Nobody....nobody has talked to me about it."

Chapman: "Here comes Mr. Wikoff now."

Ryan: "All right. Hang on a minute then, I will look at it. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand that Representative Ryan has no objection, is that correct? Now, does she have leave to waive the posting rule? Hearing no objection, leave is granted and the rule is waived. The 'bigoloff' elephant from DuPage County, former State Representative Pate Philips. Right on the heels of his....Senate Bills, Third Reading 569. No, that was....my instructions were, to take that one out of the record. I guess it wants to go back in but I have a reason that I would like to hold it until

tomorrow. I would like to hold that one until tomorrow, it gives me a running start on Short Debate. 569."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 569, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman, Gene Hoffman. Gene Hoffman. 569. Representative Gene Hoffman. Representative Conti for what purpose do you arise?"

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't know when this was advanced to Third Reading because there has been an Amendment filed on it and I know that Senator...Representative Hoffman did say he was going to call it back for an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "June 13. June 13."

Conti: "And when was the Amendment filed? The Amendments were filed before June 13."

Speaker Redmond: "We don't have anything here. Well, he's not here so we'll take it out of the record. 1378...out of the record. 1506...out of the record. 1508, Satterthwaite."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1508, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Alcoholism and Intoxication Treatment Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Satterthwaite: "Members of the House, the purpose of Senate Bill 1508 is simply to clarify the original position for alcoholism treatment facilities. Last year we inadvertently passed a law that now puts them in the position of coming under two conflicting sets of rules and regulations. This Bill will simply clarify that they will remain under the Department of Public Health and the federal laws that apply to alcoholism and drug treatment facilities and I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1524."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1524, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels. Is Daniels on the floor? Do you want to call 1524? Out of the record. 1541...out of the record. 1543, Taylor. 1543...out of the record. 1544, Taylor...out of the record. 1545, Taylor...out of the record. 1577, Stuffle. Is Representative Stuffle on the floor? Out of the record. 1614. Is Vinson on the floor? Skirmishers out for Vinson. Oh, there he is. Out of the record. 1621, Epton. Read the Bill"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1621, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Insurance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the appropriation for the Department of Insurance which was approved by both the Appropriations Committee, of the Senate and the House. And calls for an appropriation of seven million, six hundred and fifty-six thousand dollars. We're pleased to add that the additional money that is given to the department has resulted in increase service to the public and has resulted in a decrease in some of the personnel. We hope to be able to continue in that process without adding further request of the budget and I would appreciate passage of this Senate Bill 1621... as amended."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Will the Gentleman yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Epton: "No."

Ryan: "You refuse to answer my questions, Representative?"

Epton: "Pardon me, Sir."

Ryan: "You refuse to answer my questions?"

Epton: "Well, I don't object to answer your questions if you'll tell me what your questions are. Then I....I'll reserve my objection."

Ryan: "What does the percent change in this budget over last years?"

Epton: "Originally the percent change was 10.9%."

Ryan: "What is it now?"

Epton: "10.9%."

Ryan: "Well, I suggest that you read your analysis. Do you know what the head count change is?"

Epton: "Well, actually, Sir. There....it was reduced to 8.9 and then there was an Amendment put on and if you would read the Amendment, Sir, you would find that we put thirteen thousand dollars back in the budget."

Ryan: "Thirteen six."

Epton: "Thirteen six, you are correct, Sir."

Ryan: "I have no further questions."

Epton: "Then I have no objection."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 131 'aye' and 11 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1622."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1622, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Human Rights...."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 1629, E. G. Steele...out of the record. 1639, Peters. Is Peters on the floor? Representative Peters. Telcser,

handle it? Is Telcser here? Now, who can handle it? Out of the record. 1643, Kornowicz. Is Representative Kornowicz here? Kornowicz, do you want to call 1643? Out of the record. 1707, Grossi. Representative Grossi, 1707."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 17...."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1709, VonBoeckman. 1709, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1709, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1709 changes the fee structure by the Illinois Commerce Commission for the trucking industry. This Bill passed the Senate 44 to nothing, it passed out of the Committee...Motor Vehicles Committee 9 to nothing. It is an agreed Bill between the Illinois Commerce Commission and the trucking industry, the teamsters and whoever was involved. I ask a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Anyone in opposition? The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1741, Getty."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1741, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1741 is a Bill which continues the process of placing the responsibility for taking care of peoples estates with the people who own the estates and provides that the

responsibility for mailing various notices would be transferred from the Clerk of the Court to the parties. A similar Bill passed out of the House, I believe with a 153 votes and I would ask for your support for this Senate Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 145 'aye', 5 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1570. Representative Capuzi. 1750 (sic). Capuzi is 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1750, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff. Neff. 1750, out of the record. 1752. Representative Giorgi, will you answer your phone."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1752, Telcser..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser. Is Telcser here? Out of the record. 1762."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1762, Daniels...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider, will you tell Mr. Daniels to go to his seat and handle 1762. 1762...out of the record. 1808, out of the record. 1813, Sharp."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1813...."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 1817, McGrew. 1817, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1817, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and

Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1817 is merely a clarification act, when we passed the Cooperate Personal Property Replacement Act we inadvertently had reference in here to working cash fund, obviously that is not part of the legislation. It would simply allow Junior Colleges to sell bonds at 75% of their regular anticipated by law. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I did have a question. Representative..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

McGrew: "Representative..."

Speaker Redmond: "McGrew."

Leinenweber: "McGrew, did you say that this Bill will now allow Community College Districts to fund their working cash fund through issuance of bonds?"

McGrew: "Absolutely not. No, this does not address the working cash fund at all except to delete it as language when we are talking about the authority to sell bonds for buildings. In essence, right now, Junior Colleges can sell 75% of 75%, of their assessed value instead of 75% as it was originally intended."

Leinenweber: "I'm reading from the synopsis in the.....and it says, it amends the Public Junior College Act to clarify to max about of bonds that may be issued for Community College District working cash fund. That is not the Bill?"

McGrew: "Well, it...no, it does not effect working cash fund, it's disburstment, it's collection or anything else. What it does is, is to again allow the Junior Colleges to have a maximum rate, I'm sorry, the maximum amount of bonds according to their assessed value."

Leinenweber: "Well, are you telling me yes or no, that the synopsis is accurate or inaccurate? I mean, which is it?"

McGrew: "Well, yes and no. The synopsis is inaccurate in that it does not totally explain the whole process."

Leinenweber: "In other words, this clarifies the amount that the bonds, I mean, issued for any purpose otherwise authorized?"

McGrew: "No, only for building."

Leinenweber: "And nothing to do with working cash fund?"

McGrew: "It has nothing to do with working cash, as a matter of fact if you get the Bill you will see a line through the middle where it says, working cash fund."

Leinenweber: "Then the synopsis is inaccurate?"

McGrew: "That's correct."

Leinenweber: "Well, that's all I asked in the first place."

McGrew: "That's what I answered in the first place."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye', 2 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1828. Out of the record. 1881."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1881, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections...to add Sections to the Nursing Home Care Reform Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. House...Senate Bill 1818(sic), is a clean-up to the Nursing Home Act and what it does, it provides some emergency features that we need. One feature is, that it provides a method of admitting either a comatose or unconscious person to a nursing home. It also corrects errors in citation of Section numbers, some grammatical errors...erroneous explanation of complimentary laws. There was an inconsistency in the original Bill of

hearing deadlines and it was also a failure to generalize options to any party to administer hearing authorized under the Act. All groups that are involved in the nursing home are supportive in the nursing home area are supporting this Bill and that includes the Department of Public Health, the Illinois State Medical Society, the Hospital Association, the Illinois Health Care Association and the Illinois Citizens for Better Care. I am not aware of any opposition to it and it is cosponsored by Representative Peters. I ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a questions, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Macdonald: "Is this the Bill that requires that all patients in nursing homes have to have a guardian appointed for them?"

Keane: "Representative, the....this is a clean-up Bill, corrects that problem."

Macdonald: "So, that that does not appear in this Bill at this time?"

Keane: "No, it corrects the problem that existed in the original Bill which you have just alluded to."

Macdonald: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock for what purpose do you arise?"

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I certainly understand, we're in the midst of debate but I rise on a point of personal privilege to introduce to the gallery and to Members of the House today distinguished citizens of Illinois. To my right and seated at my desk is the wife of a former candidate for United State Senator and former zoning appeal board member of Cook County and a member of the Ambassador Selection Committee a good friend of all of us both sides of the aisle, Mr. and

Mrs. Alec Seith, like to give them a hand."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further on 1881? Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "A question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker. Jim, I don't want to belabor the point but, the question was just asked about patients....residents of nursing homes and the extent to which guardians may have to be appointed. I received a lot of mail on that question and I want to satisfy myself. As I understand it, the Amendments on the Bill dealt with patients which were unconscious or comatose when they were admitted. To what extent does this Act now provide that residents of nursing homes might have to have guardians appointed in order to be admitted."

Keane: "It handles it similarly to the probate law. There is a presumption that the person is confident. If....I don't know if you have the Amendment in front of you, Cal..."

Schuneman: "No, I do not."

Keane: "Okay. It mentions that the....if the person is a minor, the parent is the guardian..."

Schuneman: "I'm sorry, I can't hear you, Dick."

Keane: "All right. An adult person shall be presumed to have the capacity to contract for admissions to a long term care facility unless he has been adjudicated a disabled person within the meaning of Section 11A-2 of the Probate Act of 1975."

Schuneman: "Okay, that seems to satisfy my objection. Thank you."

Keane: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield? I still do not understand the...your response to the last question. I have the Amendment in front of me and I wish you would indicate to me the source of that language."

Keane: "Yea, Dick, it's on page 3, line 13 of Amendment 1."

Brummer: "Okay, that indicates that the person may be admitted to a facility before the execution of a contract required by this Section provided that the patient..."

Keane: "We're at different spots."

Brummer: "That page 3, line 13."

Keane: "All right, the Amendments must be printed differently. Lets see....can you find Chapter 11...111 1/2, paragraph 4152-202, Section 2-202?"

Brummer: "No."

Keane: "Okay. Let me show you my....let me send the Amendment down to you."

Brummer: "Okay, would you restate again. It's very noisy and very difficult to hear, exactly under what circumstances the appointment of a guardian would be required before the individual could be admitted to the nursing home."

Keane: "For an adult....for an adult, he would have to be adjudicated as a disabled person. Under the terms of the Probate Act of 1975."

Brummer: "No, look on page 3, of that Amendment. Okay, this is a Senate Amendment here not a House Amendment."

Keane: "That's right, that's right."

Brummer: "Okay, we have the enrolled and engrossed version of the Senate Bill, I suppose. Then Senate...House Amendment #1 was adopted that was Sponsored by you which appears to substantially alter that."

Keane: "Dick, all I can tell you is, that it's the same as the Probate Act of 1975..."

Brummer: "And what is that?"

Keane: "If a person is legally confident to contract, then he may contract."

Brummer: "How does the administrator of the nursing home determines that individual is legally confident to

contract?"

Keane: "He is presumed confident unless he is adjudicated, non confident."

Brummer: "How would this be different than the law as it existed prior to the Nursing Home Reform Act of last year?"

Keane: "The only difference is, that there has to be now a...under the nursing home law, a contract between the person being admitted to a nursing home and the nursing....the nursing home...the person and the nursing home itself. Prior to the Nursing Home Act there was no need for a contract."

Brummer: "So, if the nursing home administrator saw an applicant coming in for admission....who he....really questioned I suppose the competence of, that that individual is not comp....comatose or whatever the other term you used. He could enter into a contract with that individual despite his serious personal question of whether that individual is in fact legally competent so long as that person had not been declared incompetent?"

Keane: "There is a presumption of competency that he can assume. If it is obvious that the person or it seems obvious to him that the person is no competent, then he also has a method..."

Brummer: "At that point can he take....can the contract be signed by a member of the immediate family as the same as a comatose individual or do they have to go through the appointment of the guardian first?"

Keane: "Yes, only if he's comatose or unconscious. But, even if...even if the nursing home operator feels that the person is incompetent, what he can do is, he can admit the person pending a hearing to determine the competency."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Keane: "Mr. Speaker, if Representative Peters is in the chamber,

I would yield to him to close."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz, for what purpose do you arise?"

Marovitz: "A question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Marovitz: "Representative Keane, I just want to go over this one more time, not for argumentative but just for clarification. Under what circumstances and for what purposes must a contract be entered into?"

Keane: "For....a contract has to be entered into for admittance to a nursing home."

Marovitz: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you."

Keane: "A contract has to be entered into between the nursing home and the patient as a condition of admittance."

Marovitz: "Okay. And, up until now since there has been no contract entered into according to your legislation, the contract for all people who are now in nursing homes would have to be entered into before January 1, 1981. Is that correct?"

Keane: "That's correct."

Marovitz: "And if no contract were entered into by that date, what would the status of those individuals be?"

Keane: "The person would no longer be in a nursing...he would have to remain in the nursing home he would have to indicate that he wanted to....basically its amounts to a consent to stay in a nursing home."

Marovitz: "So, in other words, if he didn't enter into a contract the nursing home could summarily dismiss him from the nursing home?"

Keane: "That's right."

Marovitz: "And, who is responsible for drawing up these contracts?"

Keane: "Well, let me correct something before, that was the

situation with the contract that existed before this Bill that we're talking about now. This Bill is a clean-up Bill and as you know, what you're talking about is the original Bill."

Marovitz: "Okay."

Keane: "And we're not address that in this Bill."

Marovitz: "Okay. What is this Bill? In regards to the con...does this Bill address the contracting responsibilities at all?"

Keane: "Yes, it defines what a family member is, who can enter into a contract when a person is comatose or unconscious. And it also has other factors. And a presumption of confidence of per....on the part of the patient."

Marovitz: "The individuals that are defined under this legislation who can enter into the contract on behalf of the patient, can only do that when the patient has been adjudicated....as not having the responsibility to act on his own?"

Keane: "Well, yeah. Anyone who would under the Probate Act of 1975, not be able to contract for himself would not be able to contract to get into a nursing home."

Marovitz: "Okay. Now without that adjudication, no one else would have the authority to act on his behalf?"

Keane: "That's right."

Marovitz: "Okay."

Keane: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to....Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to Representative Peters to close."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that the discussion on this Bill has brought out the problems that we face in the nursing industry. And the remedies which we have attempted to make by this Bill and

what Senator Daley has attempted to make by the model reform legislation that he introduced in the Senate. And which was passed by the Senate and the House and signed into law by the Governor. So, that those who may have some concerns as to the propriety of some of the provisions of the Bill, please note that your analysis⁵ will indicate that the Department of Public Health, The Hospital Association, The Health Care Association and the Medical Society and other groups interested in this area are all in favor of this particular piece of legislation. Representative Keane has done a very good job in explaining it both in Committee and here on the House floor. It is a good piece of legislation in my estimation, something that we should all be interested and addressing as the problems that this Bill addresses, should be addressed and I think this Bill does a good job in doing it. It's got a good vote in the Senate, 56 to nothing, it came out of Committee on a unanimous vote which I think indicates to the...or should indicate to the Members of the House that those individuals who are concerned of our nursing care and nursing programs are convinced of the propriety of the provisions of this piece of legislation in the fact that it will go towards solving the problems which have been presented. I would urge the Members of the House to vote approval of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 159 'aye'....160 'aye', no 'nay', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1956."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1956, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Downstate Public Transportation Act. Third

Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1956 extends for six months the three thirty seconds of the sales tax collected in the area served by the by-state development. The purpose of this extension is to buy six more months, originally we had a year in it and the Senate Amendment changes it to six months. The purpose for the extension is to buy time to create the mass transit district we talked about earlier. There was 17 voting 'aye' in the Transportation Committee, this passed by 40 votes in the Senate and I know of no real opposition. I ask for a favorable vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I stand to provide that....not real opposition. There's no reason that the extension of the three thirty seconds of the sales tax should occur for by-state. We're not waiting for a referendum in November under the companion Bill, there's no reason that the by-state transportation agency can not be allowed to levy a sales tax immediately. Why, as soon as we pass the Bill it will go to the Governor, the Governor can sign it and within three months, not six months within three months the sales tax can be flowing to the coffers out of the pockets of the people that live in the bi-state area. It depends on what your priorities are. If your priorities are that you want a sales tax increase...excuse me, a welfaring...why did I say sales tax increase when I look at Leverenz. If you want a cost of living increase for welfare employees or welfare recipients, this will take money away from that. If you want an increase for state education, it will take money away from that, if you want an increase in senior citizen property tax relief, it will take money away from that. If you want an increase in

salary for state employees this Bill will take money away from that. What you have to do is decide what your priorities are, if you're from the RTA area you ought to remember that there is no state subsidy from the state general fund anymore, that state subsidy exclusively goes to downstate public transportation districts with the by-state agency being the giant recipient of those subsidies. It's your money, your constituents money, decide whether you want to keep throwing it down RTA's rat hole or whether you want to put it into something useful."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Flinn....Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from suburban Cook County, I can not forget that there was a number of Legislators from downstate who joined with certain political forces to impose a sales tax on my constituents. Those votes came from different areas in downstate and what they joined in also, was taking the three thirty second that had been given under the original RTA proposal to fund RTA, to take that away at the same time that they imposed that sales tax on my constituents. Tit for tat, Mr. Speaker. If we can not have the three thirty seconds, then why can these gentlemen, who in fact consummated the murder that took place on that day when the sales tax increase was imposed in Cook County and whose votes were necessary to the consummation of that deal, why should they have the three thirty seconds. I propose to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I suppose I'm closing. If there's no..."

Speaker Redmond: "Anybody else. You had your hand up, I didn't know what your purpose was."

Flinn: "Well, the previous speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute now. Is there anybody else seeks

recognition? Representative Flinn to close."

Flinn: "The previous speaker apparently is not going to vote 'no' on the basis of the Bill, but to get even with me. Now, I didn't know people...I knew people done it but I didn't know that they admitted it on the floor. Now, so far as the previous speaker to him referring to three or four months, let me tell you, it's less...it's about two weeks from now until the first of July comes and that's when the bus system shuts down. No more subsidies, no more buses. That's exactly the way it is. We don't have three months and we're thinking six months is enough time to create the new district, get it in place by January 1, and if it's in place and ready to go before then we will not except any access money. This is up to that amount money that we would turn into the subsidy to the by-state authority. So, I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, apparently there's some misunderstanding about what the Bill does. It does not create a mass transit district. All it does is continue what we were already doing, for another six months. It doesn't do anything beyond that and the only purpose of it is to buy some time, some sorely needed time. Now, without this Bill, I want to tell you again and I hope everybody is listening. That there will be no buses in the Illinois side of the St. Louis area. There will be absolutely no buses running as of July 1, because Missouri does not intend to subsidize the Illinois Bus System. I would ask for a favorable vote and ask all of you to reconsider what

your doing to that area, if Representative Katz and those others want to get even, now is their time. Just let them jump on me, get even. But, I suggest that they won't be bothering me, I don't ride the buses. There are a lot of people who do that need them sorely."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Stiehl. Representative Griesheimer, will you please sit down. Representative Neff, please sit down."

Stiehl, C.M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support this legislation, it's very important to the metropolitan St. Louis area. Without this extension for six months, there will be no buses on the Illinois side of the river. The Sponsor of this Bill is absolutely right, and when we consider who uses these buses, it's the senior citizens, the school children and the poor who cannot afford their own transportation. This is absolutely necessary, all we're asking, is an extension to be able to provide the necessary legislation to establish a means of supporting a bus district. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 86 'aye', 62 'no'...I hear some female voice yelling, Mr. Speaker, who's that? Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, I'm not exactly a female voice..."

Speaker Redmond: "I'll say you aren't."

Flinn: "But I would like to poll the absentees. I hate to take the time of the House doing it but this is absolutely an urgent Bill to be passed."

Speaker Redmond: "On the question there's 85 'aye' and 62 'no'. Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Will you switch my vote from 'yes'....I mean from 'no' to 'yes'. 'No' to 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Bluthardt from 'no' to 'yes'. Representative Telcser, 'yes'. Representative Hanahan, 'no'. C'Brien, 'yes'. Anyone else? Representative Capuzi, 'aye'. What's the count now, Mr. Clerk? Representative Huskey for what purpose do you arise? 'Aye', on Huskey. Ebbesen, 'no'. Mahar, 'aye'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Representative Giorgi, 'aye'. Representative Daniels for what purpose do you arise?"

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we've had a discussion with the Sponsor of this Bill and it appears that there are some things that we will be able to understand a little bit better, so I vote 'aye' on this. Change my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels, 'aye'. Davis, 'aye'. Reed, 'aye'. Robbins, 'aye'. Henry, 'aye'. Oblinger, 'aye'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? I called you, Representative Mahar, 'no'. 95 'aye', 59 'no' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Borchers, 'aye'. 1966...wait a minute. Supplemental Calendar #1, it's on your desk. On the Order of Motions appears a motion with respect to House Joint Resolution 104, Representative Madigan is recognized."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Joint Resolution 10, would create a Joint Committee of the Legislature to prepare arguments to be offered to the voters in opposition to the proposed Constitutional Amendment which would reduce the size of the House of Representatives. More popularly known as the Quinn Amendment. I would request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Jaffe: "Representative Madigan, what would happen if we did not

adopt this Resolution and what would happen if we did not present the arguments for and against?"

Madigan: "If we failed to adopt the Resolution then there would be no Committee established to develop the arguments against the Amendment...."

Jaffe: "Well..."

Madigan: "If we do not develop the arguments against the Amendment then, in the event the Amendment does remain on the general election ballot, the people would be required to vote for or against the Amendment without an official argument in opposition to the Amendment."

Jaffe: "I remember one time we had..."

Madigan: "They would have one in favor of the Amendment. There would be an official argument in favor of the Amendment shown on the ballot."

Jaffe: "Well, who would write the one in favor of the Amendment because the Legislature is suppose to write those in favor and those against too, are they not?"

Madigan: "No, I'm told that the proponents have written it already."

Jaffe: "Well, I don't know how that could come into effect because I remember in prior years the Legislature wrote both the proponent and opponent arguments. And I wonder if we're not really a little bit premature with regards to House Resolution 104. I also wonder whether or not it is a fact that if we do not present the arguments, then that Amendment does not get on the ballot. Would that be correct, or is that incorrect?"

Madigan: "Answering your last question. First I feel that your statement is incorrect. That if we fail to take action the Amendment would still be shown on the election ballot. Answering your first question, in the other instances that you referred to, those were legislatively initiated

Amendments. And because of the legislative origin both the pro and anti arguments were developed in the Legislature. It is required by statute and so, is this."

Jaffe: "Well, would we also...would we write the pro arguments as well as the con arguments under this Resolution?"

Madigan: "I didn't hear your question, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Would we write both the pro and con arguments under this Resolution?"

Madigan: "No, we would write the con arguments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "It's along that same line of questioning. Who would write the pro arguments?"

Madigan: "The statute provides that the proponents of the Amendment. Pat Quinn, would write the argument in favor of the Amendment."

Schuneman: "And doesn't the statute provide that the opponents would similarly write the arguments against?"

Madigan: "That is correct, but the statute assigns that responsibility to the Legislature."

Schuneman: "The statute assigns the responsibility of writing the arguments against to the Legislature?"

Madigan: "That's correct."

Schuneman: "My concern about this is, frankly, the appearance of this Resolution to the public. It's well known that the Members of this General Assembly stand on both sides of this issue. Some favor it and some oppose it but, this Resolution might appear to the public to be an action on the part of this General Assembly to indicate that all Members of the General Assembly stand in opposition to this proposal. What would be your response to that concern, Representative?"

Madigan: "Mr. Schuneman, I cannot be responsible for the impression left in the minds of every voter in the state.

I presume that you have a copy of the Resolution in front of you, and that you can read the Resolution. The Resolution states that, it is desirable to provide the electors of this state with arguments on both sides of a proposition. To alter the composition in the manner of election in the Legislative branch of State Government. And then proceeds to create the Committee that would develop the anti arguments. Please understand, that the argument that is developed will be reviewed by all Members of the House and the Senate."

Schuneman: "Okay, but you're assuring this Body that the current statute places the responsibility for writing this argument on the Legislature. Is that true?"

Madigan: "That's correct."

Schuneman: "Thank you, very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Majority Leader yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "You correctly stated that the present law is, that those who initiated the proposition have the responsibility for drawing up the argument for. In fact, when they filed their petitions, they had to submit the names of those people who would draft the arguments for. The statute further provides that the General Assembly shall develop the arguments against and this Resolution is by way of implementing that statutory provision. I have one question. The statute provides that the accuracy and fairness of the proponents statement is to be tested by the Attorney General. And, if the Attorney General determines that the proponents statement is not accurate and fair, he has the authority to rewrite the statement. What tests are there for the accuracy and fairness of the General Assembly's statement? Other than the integrity of the

General Assembly."

Madigan: "The wisdom of the General Assembly."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Majority Leader."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that House Joint Resolution 104 be placed on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration. Representative Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor answer a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Sumner: "Thank you. Let's assume that the Amendment goes on the ballot. That it has been accepted. Now, as the law stands today, will both sides of the argument be printed and be put before the voter."

Madigan: "Yes. However, the arguments are...do not appear on the ballot but rather appear in a pamphlet which will be mailed to every voter in the state."

Sumner: "It will be mailed. But, when they go to the polls to vote, will this be in front of them or will it have to be mailed to them in advance?"

Madigan: "If they bring the pamphlet with them to the polling place, it will be in front of them."

Sumner: "Okay. Now, let's say your Resolution passes, then will it be in front of them in the polls? At the polling place?"

Madigan: "Only if they bring the pamphlet with them to the polling place."

Sumner: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is on the motion that House Joint Resolution 104 be placed on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question

there's 148 'aye' and no 'nay' and the motion carries. Representative Madigan on the question of the adoption of the motion. Do you want to proceed with that now? We just moved to take it from the table for immediate consideration."

Madigan: "Request leave for the same Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection to the same Roll Call on the question? Hearing no objection, we will use the same Roll Call on the question of the adoption of the Resolution. Senate Bills, Second Reading, Short Debate, on page 4."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1668, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1760."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1760, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Terzich. Amends Senate Bill 1760 on page 1, line 1, by inserting after all the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment 1, is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Terzich. Amends Senate Bill 1760 on page 1, line 1, by inserting after of the following. And to add Section 9-113.01 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 is similar to a Bill that the House previously passed. It got tied up in rules

and what it does, it provides that utilities who fail to complete repairs within twenty-one days of a notification, that the local municipality could affect those repairs and bill the utilities. And I spoke to the Sponsor on this and he has no objection and I would move for adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative John Dunn. The question is on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried, the Amendment is adopted. Is there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1799. He asks leave to return it to the Order of Short Debate. Is leave granted? Hearing no objection, it will be on Third Debate. 1799."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1799, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Employees Group Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Vinson. Amends Senate Bill 1799 on page 1, line 1, by deleting Section 3 and 11, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Vinson."

Speaker Redmond: "Vinson? Is Greiman on the floor? Representative Greiman, I didn't get your signal. Out of the record. He's what? Well, I don't know, it's up to Vinson and it's up to Greiman what he wants....out of the record. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurred with House in adoption of the following Joint Resolutions, to-wit: House Joint Resolutions 59 and 78, together with Amendments passed by

the Senate as amended June 18, 1980. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolutions. The adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to-wit, Senate Joint Resolution #89, 96, 103, 112 and 119. Adopted by the Senate June 18, 1980. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Telcser on the floor? 1966. Is Representative Ewing on the floor? Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Representative Ewing is on his way back to the floor, Mr. Speaker. I think if you read the Bill, why he will be here."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, will you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. 1966."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1966, Representative Ewing. A Bill for an Act relating to township organization and the cooperation between governmental entities and non profit corporation in regard to the transportation needs of public service programs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative Schuneman. It's been a busy day. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill which would authorize or direct the Department of Transportation to work with local transportation districts, local non for profit agencies such as schools and seniors citizens groups. To cooperate on the sharing of transportation facilities, there is no expenditure involved, it's merely a way of trying to see if we can utilize some of the buses that we fund through different public means and to get the most out of their

use. I would be glad to answer any questions, I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Lechowicz, in the Chair."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Ewing, on the matter of asking the groups to cooperate is one thing, once they do cooperate who is to, let's say bear the additional cost of...one example would be running the school buses for these cooperative programs. I have envisioned and maybe I'm wrong and you may correct me, if I am. That if the kids are...rather if the school district is finish with let's say the morning trip for the children to the schools and then the buses sit at the appropriate garages in the event that they are owned by the school district. Is it my assumption that at, let's say, ten o'clock to maybe 2 o'clock, that you would utilize those buses for various reasons? Is that correct? It's two parts. One is, if you do that who pays the additional cost?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "There would be...it would only be if they desired...if the school district agreed to use them. There wouldn't be anything that would require them to enter into this program. I think what we're talking about here is more of idea to see if these could be utilized and then possibly there may be other legislation introduced in this General Assembly at some time to...if funding is needed. But this does not require them to cooperate, require any public school to extend any fund or to use their buses if they don't see fit."

Schneider: "Well, it seems like a...you know, blowing in the wind in the sense it's a nice gesture on our part to suggest that perhaps they get together to do it. We have found in,

at least in school transportation the cost of running our buses is becoming very prohibited, the levy that we issue in regard to this matter continues to rise because of the cost of fuel. I think it's a nice gesture, it seems a little bit futile and...in that matter, you know, for that matter I don't know why we'd have such a proposal."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Leinenweber: "Representative Ewing, the Bill itself seems to be all well and good, certainly inter-governmental corporation is a noble idea. I have a question however, on Senate Amendment #1, which doesn't seem to have anything at all to do with the laudable purposes of your Bill and according to the synopsis, it says that, it allows townships Boards of Trustees to raise money by taxation for maintenance and operation of Township Committee for senior citizen services. What's this all about? I asked him a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He acknowledges the request for an answer."

Ewing: "I don't have the answer for that. We'll just take this out of the record and I'll have to get the answer."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave of the Sponsor to take Senate Bill 1966 out of the record. Senate Bill 1967, Mr. Flinn. Out of the record. Mr. Telcser on 1991...out of the record. Also, 1993. Senate Bill 2000, Mr. Peters. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2002, Mr. Bell. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2002, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Public Utility and Electrical Supplier Taxes. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bell: "Mr. Speaker....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bell."

Bell: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is rather a

simple Bill, it amends the Electric Fire Act and the Public Utility Act, to change the payment schedule of the public utility tax from a fiscal to a calendar year. This will make it easier to monitor the taxes paid by the public utilities and to collect the full amount. It passed the Senate 54 to nothing, it passed the House Public Utilities unanimously. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall Senate Bill 2002 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Marco...Marco. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 145 'ayes', no 'nay', one recorded as 'present', this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Thank you. House Bill 2004, Mr. Ewing. Read the Bill. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2004, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill put in and Sponsored on behalf of the Department of Revenue, it's a housekeeping Bill. The major, one of the major elements of this Bill is too, eliminate the requirement for withholding up to one thousand dollar on lottery winnings. Some of the new programs allow for more instant payment from agents of the Illinois Lottery and there has been a problem in the withholding area, everyone has at least a thousand dollar exemption in the State of Illinois and this brings it into compliance with the rest of the withholding. And I would ask for a favorable approval."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is

shall Senate Bill 2004 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Ropp. Ropp. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'ayes', 5 'no', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. At the request of the Sponsor, we will take out Senate Bill 2013 and 2014. House Bill...Senate Bill 2022, Mr. Reilly...out of the record. On the Calendar...Mr. Hoffman, would you like to proceed with Senate Bill 569? Out of the record. Miss Pullen, on 1378...out of the record. Mr. Mahar, on 1506. The Amendments not printed. Jack, you want to check on that Amendment. Senate Bill 1506. Mr. Daniels on Senate Bill 1524...out of the record. Mr. Taylor on Senate Bill 1541...out of the record. 1577, Mr. Stuffle...out of the record. Mr. Vinson on 1614. 1622, Mr. Reilly. 1629, Mr. Steele. Senate Bill 1966, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill...Senate Bill 1966, a Bill for an Act relating to township organization of corporation between governmental entities and non for profit corporation in regard to transportation needs of public service programs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I've answered the questions concerning Amendment 1, on this Bill, it is only to take out of the township code two sections that were numbered alike. It added no new authority. All the Bill does is, try to encourage cooperation and planning for the use of public transportation facilities between public and quasi-public not for profit groups. I think it's a good idea too look in to this, it isn't any extensive legislation, no expense and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion on Senate Bill 1966?"

The question is shall Senate Bill 1966 pass? All in favor vote 'aye' all opposed vote 'no'. Ropp. Capparelli. Thank you. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'ayes', 7 'no', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Back on page 3, of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1639. Mr. Peters. Out of the record. 1643, Mr. Kornowicz. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1577, Mr. Stuffle. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1577, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1577 is the formula rate distribution Bill for funding the thirty-nine Illinois Community Colleges for the coming fiscal year. It is the piece of legislation supported by the Community College Board. Even with yesterdays action by the House Appropriations II Committee which resulted in a reduction in the amount of money that tentatively may go the Community Colleges, this particular rate Bill still is designed in such a manner that whatever appropriation level is reached in our funding and our deliberations here and by the Governor, this piece of legislation will still work because there is a clause in it providing for proration if necessary, if the rates are too high, given a reduction in the appropriation. I would urge a favorable Roll Call on this piece of legislation and be glad to answer any questions that anyone might have."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall Senate Bill 1577 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this

question there's 143 'ayes', 2 'no's', 6 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, what purpose do you seek recognition? Your lights on. All right. On the Calendar on page 4, appears Senate Bill 1967."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1967, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1967 provides that the SO2 standards of the state be no more spended than the U.S. standards. And this is a Bill that is identical since the Rea Bill was admended to the Rea Bill and unless there's some questions, I would move for the adoption of the Bill. Ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall Senate Bill 1967 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 'ayes', 35 'no', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Calendar appears...kindly record Mr. Mugalian as 'no' on that last Bill. And Giorgi as 'aye'. 1643, Mr. Kornowicz. Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 1707, Mr. Grossi...out of the record. 1750, Mr. Neff....out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 1752, Telcser. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1752, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund Article of the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1752

was amended by Representative Terzich in his Committee by striking everything after the enacting clause. And inserting language which he and the Members of the Committee felt they wanted to do. And what the substance of the...over my objections, however, but I'm going to support the Bill. The substance of the Amendment was to delay the effective date of House Bill 2012, which is now Public Act 81-117, from January 1, 1981 to January 1, 1982. House Bill 2012 provided for employee contribution to the retirement systems, to be picked up by employers and treated as employer contributions for the purpose of the Internal Revenue Code. It authorized a corresponding reduction in the cash salary to off set against future salary increases. That's the substance of the Bill right now, and Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am going to support Senate Bill 1752 in its present form simply because I am hopeful that as the Bill winds its way through the legislative process, will be able to restore some of the items which Representative Terzich, so adjointly removed from the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentle.....the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "May I ask the Speaker...or the Sponsor a question, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates, he'll yield."

Macdonald: "Representative Telcser, I think we had discussed an Amendment that I had, to go on this Bill and I had requested that if you....could you bring it back to Third. I have been unable to reach the Senate Sponsor of your Bill to talk to him about the Amendment and I wondered, could...would it be possible to hold this Bill till we can get a hold of him?"

Telcser: "If that's your wish, I'll be glad to help you out."

Macdonald: "Well, I hate you to ask you to do that, but I would like to reach him and see what..."

Telcser: "Representative, I'm delighted to accomodate you, if that's your wish. Let me simply say, as we get to the closing days and we get caught in the crunch, I guess there's always the chance it wouldn't be called again. But, I'm delighted to do whatever you wish. You make the draw. Whatever you want, Representative."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed with the Bill."

Macdonald: "Your...proceed with the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed with the Bill."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I think I have explained the Bill as well as possible. I see no other hands raised for questions and I hope you would call for the question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall Senate Bill 1752 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 'ayes', 6 'no', 28 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1762, Mr. Daniels. Senate Bill 1808, Mrs. Braun. Out of the record. 1813, Mr. Sharp...out of the record. 1828, Mr. Keane. Keane...out of the record. 1991, Mr. Marovitz...Mr. Telcser. 1991. You're waiting for Amendments on 91 and 9...what about 93? Same thing. Well we've gone through the Calendar as far as Senate Bills, Third Reading for the second time. Is there anyone that would like to have a Senate Bill on Third Reading called at this time? Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You weren't recognized for that. Let's go on the Calendar on Senate Bills Second Reading. Oh, wait. Alan, do you want to have Senate Bill 19...1799 called?"

Out of the record. Senate Bill, Second Reading. 1457.
Has a fiscal note been filed? Fiscal note has been filed?
Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1457, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Occupation and Use Tax Act to reduce the tax rates on food and medicine. Second Reading of the Bill, no....no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, failed in Committee. Floor Amendment #2, Skinner. Amends Senate Bill 1457 on page 1, line 2 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Was inquiry made of the Chair as to whether the fiscal note had been filed?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I asked the question and the answer was 'yes'. The fiscal note has been filed."

Schuneman: "Was the Sponsor....was the fiscal note filed by the department that's involved here, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Sir, you know what the prerogative of any Member is, talk to the Clerk and take a look at the fiscal note."

Schuneman: "Okay, I would like to do that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr...."

Telcser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you take this Bill out of the record?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take the Bill out of the record, request of the Sponsor. Mr. Pierce, do you want to call 1497? Out of the record. Mr. Slape. Mr. Stanley, do you want to call your Bill? Mr. Collins. 1510."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Donovan has an Amendment to this Bill, I have an Amendment to this Bill but there was to be another one offered and I don't know if it's in yet."

There should be Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4, if they've all been filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "According to the Clerk, Amendment #4 is not in."

Collins: "Well, we're ready to proceed, Mr. Speaker, but we did tell Representative Conti, we would wait for his Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Why don't we proceed with the three Amendments, we'll move it on Third and we can always bring it back for the 4th Amendment."

Collins: "That's fine with me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1510, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relationship to township organization. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Donovan. Amends Senate Bill 1510 on page 1, line 5..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Donovan, withdraws Amendment #1. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Collins. Amends..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the...Senate Bill 1510 is a Bill designed to give downstate townships the same rights that Cook County townships have. To elect through their township central committee, to have party primaries rather than caucus. The Bill as written would have stricken the language for Cook County in its effort to clarify for down county...or downstate. So, Amendment #2 differentiates between counties of over three million and counties of less than three million. It is an agreed Amendment and it clarification and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Macon,

Mr. Donovan. Donovan."

Donovan: "Amendment #3, to House Bill 15..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, this is Amendment #2. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Donovan. Amends Senate Bill 1510 on page 1..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Donovan."

Donovan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3, to Senate Bill 1510 allows a vacancy that occurs in a township trustees to be filled by a call of 15 people in case....where there is a vacancy not filled by the Board of Trustees themselves. It can occur after 120 days, it allows...certainly a case in our county where we went on many many months and not been able to resolve the question of seating a trustee. And, the Amendment simply states that after a 120 days, a call of 15 people for a special town meeting and they can elect them by voice vote. So, I move for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1510."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is shall Amendment #3 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye' 'aye', opposed. Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading, with the understanding the Bill be brought back for, Mr. Conti's Amendment #4. 1518, Mr. Woodyard. Yes. Take the Bill out of the record, I guess. 1559, Mr. McClain. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1559, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2 was withdrawn. Floor Amendment #3, Ralph Dunn, amends Senate Bill 1559 on page 2, line..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn. Amendment #3."

Dunn, Ralph: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #3 would decrease the maximum amount of monetary award of scholarships. Would decrease it from two thousand as in the Bill as passed by...in Committee, down to nineteen hundred. This would still have a hundred dollar increase over the current law and still provide about a 15% increase over the past two years. The reason that I'm...to feel that I better offer this Amendment and urge its adoption is because at Appropriations II yesterday, reduced the appropriation by two million, seven hundred and fifty-four thousand dollars. Which would take into account the hundred dollar deduction...deduction that this Amendment called for. I would urge the adoption of it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would respectfully rise in opposition to Mr. Dunns' Amendment. This is the formula for the Illinois State Scholarship Commission grant program throughout the State of Illinois. This Bill as it passed out of the Senate and is now facing us in the House, would increase the maximum grant from eighteen hundred dollars to two thousand dollars for full time students in the State of Illinois. That is the recommendation of the Board of Higher Education, the Bill easily passed out of the Senate, passed out of the Committee here in the House of Representatives. And, now what Mr. Dunn is trying to do is, reduce that maximum grant by one hundred dollars.

The....I think that Mr. Dunn is wrong, frankly. If you look at the formulas that have taken place, with inflation coming for both private and public schools throughout the State of Illinois. That sum of money that we have increased and was recommended by the Board of Higher Education and passed by the Senate, is a modest increase. Frankly, it is the highest priority for the independant federation of independ colleges and it has the support of Board of Higher Education. So, from the Illinois State College Commission, Board of Higher Education and the private schools all standing firm against, Mr. Dunns' Amendment. And I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? Mr. Dunn to close.

Oh, I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Dunn was right in his statement, the Appropriations Committee did cut this...the money back for this to nineteen hundred dollars last year...or this coming year. The nineteen hundred dollars is going to provide adequate compensation to the majority of those who are seeking scholarships because, the majority of your state supported schools will not even run scholarship cost to this amount. This is basically for the private schools only and he is exactly right, the appropriation was cut back yesterday and I urge adoption of this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in echoing what the previous speaker has said. Is this revision is not made, there will in fact not be enough money in the Illinois State Scholarship Commission budget to cover the higher level of funding. We determined yesterday in Appropriations, that we were not going to be able to fund it at this rate as well as having given the deficiency

appropriation for the current fiscal year. This doesn't....this level will allow us to live within the budget so that we can cut back that appropriation by a little over two million dollars. It will still not cut it back to the level where we will balance over the two year period what we had anticipated spending for scholarships. But the State of Illinois has a very liberal policy in terms of scholarships. We have a much higher reimbursement rate than any other state in the nation, I believe. And we will still hold that position even if this Amendment goes on. I think we should be consistent, we should adopt this Amendment to have it consistent with what we did in the Appropriations Committee yesterday and I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank....thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to oppose Amendment #3. Frankly, let me point out a couple of things. Number one, it's true the Appropriations Committee did delete the 2.7 5 million dollars from the appropriation that is the Bill that I'm sponsoring...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. McGrew. Please give the Gentleman your attention."

McGrew: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you please give the Gentleman your attention."

McGrew: "I would like to point out that the vote on that deletion of 2.75 million was a Roll Call, 14 to 12. It was a very controversial issue then, it is now. I submit to you, this is a bad Amendment. Somehow, we get the philosophy that this is an aid to private schools. That is not the case. The dollars follow the students, they do not follow private schools. As a matter of fact, if you look at the trend of

the enrollments of the private institutions in the State of Illinois, you will find areas such as Galesburg and Knox, Augustana, within Rock Island and several others, that in essence what is happening, is the independent colleges are becoming residential colleges for those people that live in the communities in which the college is located. So, in essence, we're saying a poor student can't stay at home, we can't have this additional one hundred dollars grant to go to the institution that is in his particular community. I submit to you once again, this is not just a Bill for private schools. This is a Bill to aid students that are poor, that need the help, it's a residential program for those that live within that area. I submit and ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' 'aye', opposed. The previous question has been moved. Mr. Ralph Dunn to close on Amendment #3."

Dunn, Ralph: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would urge adoption of Senate...Amendment #3, to Senate Bill 1559. What this does, is grant a hundred dollar per year increase on every scholarship that mostly are independent schools because of the price. Eighteen hundred is increased to nineteen hundred, this is in keeping with the Governors budget with the budget message and it's also in keeping with the appropriation Bill that was reduced yesterday in the Appropriations II, by 2.7 5 million. I would urge an 'aye' vote in support for the budget and for Amendment #3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall Amendment #3 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'."

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti to explain his vote.
The timer is on.

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. It just simple arithm...mathematics, the Governor has agreed to give them eighteen hundred dollars. The Senate added on another two hundred dollars and now the Governor has finally agreed to give them the additional hundred dollars which would make it nineteen hundred dollars. And, it's just simply not in the budget and anything to go above this, as we said here about a week...week and a half ago, we're a billion dollars over the budget now. It's very very important that we pass this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer to explain his vote, the timer is on."

Brummer: "Yes, I think there must be some error with regard to the mechanics of the score board. Surely, that can't be correct. This is a terrible Amendment, ought not to go. We can only fairly provide money for the state scholarship program by defeating this Amendment. We ought to have more 'no' votes than 'yes' votes up there. If we're concerned about the level of which we're going to provide scholarship assistance to students who provide...who attend both private and public schools of higher education in this state. I would urge more 'no' votes and reverse that Roll Call up there."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn to explain his vote. The timer is on. John Dunn."

Dunn, John: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It looks sort of hopeless but I hope everyone here realizes what this means to private colleges and universities. They do not receive state aid, to the extent that the public supported colleges and universities do. They rely upon gifts, they rely upon tuitions, they rely

upon their own ingenuity to stay in the black. This is one small way to help them to increase...to increase the awards so that they can come close to being competitive with the state supported universities. When declining enrollment begins to hit and it already has, we may very well lose the diversity in education which has been such a great asset to our higher educational system in the State of Illinois and in this nation. This Amendment if you vote red and restore the grant level to two thousand dollars, it would go a long way to helping every private college, univeristy in the state with very little or no cost to the publicly supported institutions which have a means to get money through the appropriation process and don't need to get it this way. I would strongly and respectfully urge a red vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane. The timer is on."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to clarify that the, almost unanimously the private institutions of higher education support the two thousand dollar level. That, if you want to support the two thousand dollar level, you should vote red. I think it's important that we have funded, the General Assembly has been very sympathetic to the public higher education system. We have funded them very generously. The Illinois State Scholarships are very important to the private institutions and I would ask that the Members please consider their vote and support, with a red vote the private institutions of higher education in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's hard to believe the number of green votes up there. With a small increase, the two thousand dollars and

with all the pork that flies around this House, it's hard to believe that we would take our feelings out about budgetary process, out on a small increase like this. With the inflation rate going up as it is, and the need for quality education and the increase needs for funding for students and families, of quality students who deserve scholarships, a small increase from eighteen hundred to two thousand dollars, it's unbelievable that there's the kind of green votes there are. And I think people ought to rethink this and take a look at this and be voting red."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Have all voted who wish? Anything further? Take the record. On this question there's 80 'aye'...Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "I would like a verification of the poll of the absentees, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 80 'aye' and 73 'no'....Representative Marovitz has requested a poll of the absentees. Representative Conti."

Conti: "If he should succeed in this verification of the affirmative, I want a verification of the negative."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Capparelli, 'no'. Representative Taylor, 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Abramson. Balanoff. Braun. Catania. Dawson. Deuster. Ewing. Garmisa. Grossi. Hoffman...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman, 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Huff. Laurino. Leon. Leverenz. McAuliffe. Mugalian. Murphy..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun, for what purpose do you arise?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is she recorded?"

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

Braun: "Vote me 'no', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record her as 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees. Pierce.
Richmond. Simms and Terzich."

Speaker Redmond: "81 'aye', 76 'no'. Representative Conti."

Conti: "Take the record then."

Speaker Redmond: "What was your...."

Conti: "I said, in case it got the negative votes, I wanted the
verification of the negative."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Conti: "In case it reaches this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a verification of
the Affirmative Roll on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative McCourt, 'no'. The
Gentleman has requested a verification of the Affirmative
Roll Call. Proceed. Representative Collins desires to be
verified. Is that all right? Go ahead."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Ackerman. Anderson.
Barnes. Bell. Birkinbine. Boucek. Bower. Bullock.
Burnidge. Capuzi. Casey. Collins. Conti. Daniels.
Davis. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton. Virginia Frederick.
Dwight Friedrich. Gaines. Griesheimer. Hallock. Harris.
Hoffman. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Jaffe. Johnson. Dave
Jones. Kane. Karpziel. Kent. Klosak. Kucharski.
Leinenweber. Macdonald. Mahar. Margalus. Matula.
Mautino. McBroom. McPike. Oblinger. O'Brien. Pechous.
Peters. Piel. Polk. Pullen. Rea. Reed. Reilly.
Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Ryan. Satterthwaite. Schisler.
Schlickman. Schneider. Schoeberlein. Schuneman.
Stanley. Stearney. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Stuffle.
Swanstrom. Telcser. Totten. VanDuyne. VonBoeckman.
Walsh. Watson. Wikoff. Winchester. J. J. Wolf and

Woodyard."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Katz desires to be recorded as....verified, is that all right? Who's verifying this one? Wait a minute, wait a minute. Who's verifying? Everybody sit down. Your own seats. Come on. Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Record me as 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "No, it looks....wait a minute, let's get everybody seated first. Now, Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Please record me as 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Balanoff as 'no'. Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Record me as voting 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Garmisa, 'no'. Bullock, 'no'. Representative Murphy, 'no'. O'Brien, 'no'. Huff, 'no'. Representative Leon...would you please sit down, Katz. I can't see Representative Leon. Leon, 'no'. Representative Pechous, 'no'. Casey. Casey desires to be verified, is that all right? Okay. Any questions of the Affirmative....what's the count now, Mr. Clerk. I don't know, not as far as I know. He wasn't when I left. 77'aye', 85 'no'. Representative Conti."

Conti: "The vote."

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say?"

Conti: "I would like to have the verification of the negative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Just to clarify that Mr. Katz asked to be verified in his correct negative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, however, he was recorded. He requested leave to be verified."

Conti: "He's verified."

Marovitz: "So, he's verified. All right."

Conti: "That's right, he's verified."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, the question of whether he can be verified or not is up to the person requesting the verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, there was no objection at the time and he was standing right down here at the time he made the request."

Walsh: "Well, because Mr. Conti didn't realize that he was going to request a verification. Since he did, it is entirely up to him."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, Mr. Conti would extend that courtesy, I'm sure. Mr. Walsh might not but Conti would. Anything further? Representative Leon. May Representative Leon be verified? Representative Garmisa, may he be verified? Okay, proceed. Any questions? Proceed with the verification of the Negative Roll Call. Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "I just want to make sure that we preserve our right to verify the Affirmative Roll Call should the Roll Call change after Mr. Conti is through."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we're just going into a little three ring circus like we did this morning with Monroe Flinn. Let him do it right now. Or lets have another Roll Call then."

Marovitz: "Mr...Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute now, the request has been made for a verification of the Negative Roll Call. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Conti: "He just ran through the Affirmative Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say?"

Conti: "He just ran through the Affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "I know, I know, I'm ruling, I guess it's on

your side, I don't know. But let's proceed with the verification of the Negative Roll Call. Representative Vinson, may he be verified? Representative Conti indicates, yes. Representative Abramson...desires to be recorded as 'no'. I'm not going to take anymore changes or anymore additions until we get through with the verification of the Negative Roll Call. We'll never get through with this thing. Proceed with the Negative Roll Call. For what purpose do you arise? Schlickman."

Schlickman: "From an indecisive 'yes' to a decisive 'no'. Please."

Speaker Redmond: "Please, let's get some order on this thing. Representative Conti has requested a verification of the Negative Roll Call. Now, there's no great mystery about that. I'll get back to you, I'm not going to do anything except proceed with the Negative Roll Call. Everybody be in your seats. McAuliffe. Nardulli, where are you suppose to sit? Everybody sit down where you belong. Murphy, you're not in your seat. You've forgotten...you've forgotten, I'll get to you. You've forgotten Hanahan's Rules. Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I notice that, I don't know why I'm fighting for the Governor when most of our Members themselves, on this side of the aisle are voting...changing their votes to 'aye'. If they want to go back home and tell their constituents that they spent a billion three hundred thousand dollars more than the Governor's asking for, let them go home and explain it, I can't believe the....verification of the Negative Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 77 'aye' and 85 'no' and the motion fails. Representative Schlickman desires to be recorded as 'no'. Failed. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "I would like to be changed from 'yes' to 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Objection has been raised. On page 7, Constitutional Amendments, Third Reading, House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 1. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker....."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, Third Reading."

McClain: "Yeah, would you kindly move 1359 to Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Do I have three more Amendments on that Bill? Okay. Anymore Amendments? Any Floor Amendments? Put the number back up on there."

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, Wikoff. Amends Senate Bill 1559 on page 1, by deleting lines 1 and 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff. Representative Hudson, Schuneman, Dawson, please take your own seat. Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Basically what 1559 does, makes the Chairman of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission a member of the Board of Higher Education and requires the Illinois State Scholarship to submit their budget to the Board of Higher Education. Which will include the current anticipated programs and puts the Illinois State Scholarship under the Board of Higher Education jurisdiction."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Board of Higher Education doesn't even want this Amendment. What this Amendment does, it places the Illinois State Scholarship Commission under the authority of the Board of Higher Education. Now, what that does is, that right now we have a very unique system in the

State of Illinois whereby, the Illinois State Scholarship Commission is pretty much an autonomous body and submit their budget for an informal approval from a Board of Higher Education every year. For instance, the last Amendment that we've just defeated, that was Board of Higher Education recommendation of two thousand dollars for the maximum grant. What this Amendment will do, is just completely alter the philosophy of how we have conducted business in the Illinois Scholarship Commission by forcing them to be under the Board of Higher Education. This is a power grab that's not even a Board of Higher Education one. I would remind you folks that, right now the Commission is just lost their Joe Board, executive director, they've employed a new one. I think it's time for us to let the new one take over and see how he does for a year or so, before we make some significant alterations in the conduct of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. This is not a good Amendment, it's the same kind of Amendment that we fought back in the House last year, we fight back every year, it's just basically a power grab that not even the Board of Higher Education desires. I think it's an unfortunate Amendment and I'd ask for it to be resoundingly defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to oppose the Amendment. Let me tell you right now, this Bill is virtually in practice. The Illinois State Scholarship Commission makes their recommendations, they submit it to the Board of Higher Education, it is once again reviewed there and then acted upon by the General Assembly result of both of those observations. If we adopt this Amendment we are deleting the right of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission to

be an independent body. To address student needs throughout the state. I tell you this very same Bill was introduced and defeated in this House of Representatives, it is not a new concept, it is not one that is endorsed at this moment and I would ask that you vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Amendment. The State Scholarship Commission is the one section of Higher Education that is not coordinated by the State Board of Higher Education. We distribute something like eighty million dollars a year through this Scholarship Commission. The decisions the Scholarship Commission makes have a tremendous impact on tuition and fees of an awful lot of other things and those are the things that should be coordinated through the general budgeting recommendations of the Board of Higher Education. And, I would strongly urge the adoption of this Amendment. Too long have we had the Scholarship Commission going in one direction and the rest of Higher Education going in another. And, I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Amendment. The General Assembly in its wisdom, put the Illinois State Scholarship as a separate Commission. If its brought under the Board of Higher Education which this was attempted last year, if it is brought under the Board of Higher Education the Commission will lose a good deal of flexibility. The amounts of money that the General Assembly gives to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission for distribution are to Higher Education. It's better that it be separate from the decision making...those who make decisions in terms of courses and terms of funding of

public higher education and it should remain separate. For the same reasons that Rep....the previous speaker gave to bring it together, I would use those reasons as a rationale to oppose the merger of these two bodies. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the main question be put. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries...was it McGrew? Right, Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In closing I would like to correct one error that was made earlier. The first speaker...speaker who spoke in opposition stated that the Board of Higher Education was opposed to this. They have taken no position, they are neutral. They...as I stated earlier, it requires the Scholarship Commission to submit the budget to the Board of Higher Education which will include their current and their anticipated programs. Presently they do submit a budget for review but the Board of Higher Education is not able to review the programs as they go along and its been part of the problem that the Scholarship Commission has gotten themselves into in the past and I would strongly urge the adoption of this Amendment which would, I believe be beneficial to not only the Scholarship Commission but those who's receiving a scholarship and the State of Illinois. Urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question these's 13...14 'aye' and 70 'no', the motion failed. The Amendment is not adopted. Anything further?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you take this Bill out of the record, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Out of the record. Now, on the Supplemental Calendar #2. Representative Stuffle is recognized with respect to a motion."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I filed the motion in writing, at this time I would move to suspend Rule 33(a), with regard to Senate Bill 1739, 1740 and Senate Bill 2019, so that those Bills could appear today on the Supplemental Calendar on the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day and I so move."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this motion by Representative Stuffle. These Bills were just heard in the Labor and Commerce Committee, there was some very important beneficial Amendments that were placed on this legislation for the benefit of a free enterprize system in our state. There may be further Amendments that Members might like to offer on this particular piece of legislation. And this legislative package should be treated the same as any other matter and allowed it to be first appear on the Calendar tomorrow under First Legislative Day because we have not given all the Members an opportunity perhaps to draw Amendments and to address the question. This legislation should not be treated any differently than anything else or using any other type of area to bring this matter to the full body without everybody having the opportunity to draw Amendments which can be complicated. So, I would object to Representative Stuffles' motion, simply on the bases that every Legislator should have the opportunity to review what

has been done and if they would like to offer Amendments of their own, to have that opportunity. But this is an extremely important area of legislation that should not be stampeded through the legislative process without the process of everyone having an ample opportunity. So, I would urge that we reject the Representatives motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of Representative Stuffles' Amendments....motion. Representative Stuffle is fully of aware the fact that the State of Illinois is in a state of emergency economically and the measures that he's asking this House to consider are of an emergency nature and deserve our expeditious attention. I think that the previous speaker certainly understands that this is merely a motion for the House to consider these measures at their earliest possible convenience. And, so for that reason and for many many more, I rise in support of Representative Stuffles motion and would urge all of the Members of the House to support Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, should we discuss this before the Supplemental Calendar has been distributed?"

Speaker Redmond: "The motion....the motion to authorize the printing of it. Representative Kosinski."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question, the question is shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no', in the opinion of the Chair, the motion fails. Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to vehemently oppose this motion. We have ten days at least, perhaps longer in this Session, we have plenty of time to

consider these Bills in the orderly manner in which all other Bills are considered. As the Gentleman from Winnebago pointed out, there are some other Amendments being drawn, we have plenty of time to consider those Amendments, there's no reason to rush in to this on a Supplemental Calendar basis. We have plenty of time to take care of this matter in an orderly fashion and I would urge you to defeat this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this motion, these Bills are the very important Workers' Compensation Bills about which we have all received a lot of correspondence and a lot of complaint over the years. This matter has sufficient time to move through the orderly process of this House and be heard according to the rules of this House without the suspension of this rule. I would urge the House to follow the rules to be deliberative about this matter, we should not rust into this and hurry up the process on this particular Bill. I urge the defeat of the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk repeat the motion so that we have some idea of what we're voting on."

Speaker Redmond: "Read the motion."

Clerk Leone: "I move to suspend Rule 33(a), with regard to Senate Bills 1739, 1740 and 2019 and to allow such Bills to be printed on a Supplemental Calendar on the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day, today, June 18, 1980."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you understand it, Representative Walsh?"

Walsh: "Now, Mr. Speaker, how can the Gentleman make that motion since the Bills are not on the Order....on any order? Have you been referring to Supplemental Calendar #2?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's been reported out of Committee and...."

Walsh: "But the Bills are not on any order at all. They will be on the Order of First Legislative Day, tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "When...if the motion...."

Walsh: "If the Calendar..."

Speaker Redmond: "If the motion carries, they'll be on Second Reading, First Legislative Day, today."

Walsh: "We can't..."

Speaker Redmond: "If the motion does not carry, then they will be on tomorrow. Representative Ryan. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Was Representative Walsh, finished, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Were you finished, Representative Walsh?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, we ruled on his point. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I don't think Representative Walsh was through with his questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you....do you want to address the Chair?"

Ryan: "Yes, I do, but I want my Members to have a fair shake..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Proceed."

Ryan: "I don't think it's out of order to..."

Speaker Redmond: "We've ruled on your question, Representative Walsh. Representative Robbins. Well, that may be. I may be wrong and that will make the first time. Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I thought the Supplemental Calendar had to lay on our desks for an hour, did this motion bypass the Supplemental Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "The motion is so that the Supplemental Calendar can be printed and that the Bills, the three Bills enumerated there will appear on the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Will who?"

Ryan: "The Sponsor of the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, he will."

Ryan: "Representative Stuffle, can you tell me why it is that an issue of such importance that you want to short circuit this by one day?" Can you give us some logic for this?"

Stuffle: "We're trying to speed up the process, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Speed up the process to eliminate the possibility for some more Amendments or what? I don't understand."

Stuffle: "It's not my desire to do that, I would like to have this heard. Some of your Members have argued we've gotten a long time to wait. I don't like to wait until the last minute in the process."

Ryan: "All we have to do, Representative, is wait until tomorrow morning and your Bill will be on the Calendar and we won't have to go to the needed....added expense and bother of printing an extra Calendar. And, I really see no need for your motion. Now, I might add...I might add, Representative Stuffle that part of the agreement that I had with the Sponsor of the Bill, Representative Madigan, when I gave up the Sponsorship of it. Was that every Member of this Body would have a fair opportunity and chance to amend the Bill, or to present their Amendments. Is this an attempt to short circuit or stop any Amendments proceeding?"

Stuffle: "I don't see it as that at all. From the decisions that I've had, I'm not even a Member of Labor and Commerce since yesterday. I think all the Members are quit well aware of what's in those Amendments. I know I've been approached a dozen times today and yesterday about those Amendments. We're aware of other Amendments coming out, I don't think we should leave this lie around, I think there is nothing wrong with moving it up in the process and

that's why I'm doing it."

Ryan: "Well, it's not a matter....it's only one day, Representative and we certainly got some other matters that we could go and give the Members that weren't on that Committee yesterday an opportunity to look at that Bill and to study the Amendments and prepare what they may think is proper. Now, I think the short circuit of process is certainly an unfair procedure and I'm not sure I understand what your reasoning is, other than you must have your votes ready to tube the Bill, I don't understand why you would want to do it otherwise."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Stuffle to close."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think this Bill ought to be moved up in the process. I find it interesting that some of the people who rise and object to this maneuver and done the same thing in past Sessions, in fact this year. It's important, I think, this Bill be heard now. As soon as possible, instead of waiting until the last minute. It is an important Bill and I think the people out there believe the opposite of the opponents of this motion. They get tired of seeing us wait until the last few days as some people have proposed, they want us to act when the Bill is ready. The Bill is ready, I think people are cognizance in what's in the Amendment. They know what other Amendments may come forth, they know what their position are in most cases. They can read and I think most are ready to go. There is no reason to delay this, it ought to be put out here now because if it's not put out here now, and if we're not here Friday we may not take this up until next week to the last week of the Session. I'm not the Sponsor of the Bill, I have great faith in the Majority Leader, I think he will act fairly and accomodate people in offering

Amendments and I urge adoption of the motion, so that we don't have to sit here until the 11th hour on an important issue and something rammed down our throat one way or the other. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. It requires 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? Representative Simms, you spoke once."

Simms: "If this should reach 89...89 votes, I would like a verification of the affirmative."

Speaker Redmond: "What will you do if it doesn't? Representative Collins."

Collins: "Just to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. I had to snicker somewhat at the pious remarks of the previous speaker in regard to this Bill. I sat in Labor and Commerce Committee yesterday and watched as the Democratic Members of the Committee tried to present a cosmetic Bill to try and fool the people of the State of Illinois as to whether they had any cares about unemployment Workmens' Compensation Insurance. But, they got a surprise yesterday in Committee...."

Speaker Redmond: "Confine your remarks to the motion."

Collins: "Well, I'm speaking to the motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think you are."

Collins: "It hurts, doesn't it."

Speaker Redmond: "It does when you don't speak to the motion. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question...83 'ayes', 83 'no'. Representative Stuffle. Request a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees. Representative Collins."

Collins: "There's one Member voting who hasn't arrived on the floor yet."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, he will. Representative Younge, 'aye'."

Representative Satterthwaite, 'aye'. Representative Burnidge....Woodyard, 'no'. Representative Huff, 'aye'. Representative Dyer, 'no'. Have you polled the absentees?"

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Ackerman. Dawson. Flinn. Hanahan. Stearney and Williams."

Speaker Redmond: "Any additions? Representative Ackerman, 'no'. What is the count? 86 'aye' and 86 'no'. The motion fails. Constitutional Amendments, Third Reading, page 7....Members only on the floor. No, staff. No, Secretaries, Members only on the floor. Two pages, of two on each side. That's no family, no wives, no children, no stepfathers. Representative Daniels, for what purpose?"

Daniels: "What about the Senators?"

Speaker Redmond: "Who is it? I think our rules permit the Senators, I don't quite understand why but we do. Did you read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #1. This Resolution has been read a third time previously."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Taylor. James Taylor. Representative Deuster, for what purpose do you rise?"

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, if it is the intention of Sponsor Taylor to begin a discussion of the merits of this subject, and I don't want to presume upon that. I don't know whether it's being called or not. If...he's nodding, indicating that it will be called. Representative Matijevich and myself have...had several conversations on this subject. As all Members know, the Equal Rights Amendment has been debated for about eight years, and there are many Members here who do not want to hear any further debate. They feel that they've heard enough, and the last time this subject came up, we limited debate to one person on one side and one person on the other. It is a feeling that the subject is important, and it should...the merits of this subject

should be seriously considered. On the other hand, it should not go on forever. Representative Matijevich and I have had a conversation concerning what we would think might be some reasonable limits on debate. In accordance with that conversation, I would like to suggest, at this time, and perhaps put it in the form of a motion unless there's leave of the House, that the debate on the Equal Rights Amendment be limited to one half hour for each side, which would be a maximum of one hour of debate and that that one half hour would be on each side. If the Members want it shorter or longer, that's certainly...no one...neither Matijevich or myself or anyone else want to cut off any Members who want to talk, and, on the other hand, we want to recognize the fact that many Members are weary of the subject. And, so, at this time, I would suggest, for the consideration of the proponents, that we try to reach an agreement on limiting the debate on this subject to a maximum of one hour to be equally divided."

Speaker Redmond: "Last...Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like...if that's a motion, I'd like to speak against it. This matter has been before the House, I think, 11, 12, maybe 13 times in the last seven or eight years. Since that time, the Body has changed considerably. There are many Members of this Body who have not heard all the arguments, pro and con, on ERA. I don't know of any more important matter than ERA to face this General Assembly. You may think so, Penny, but I don't. I think it's something that's going to affect, if it does become enacted as part of our Constitution, I think it's going to affect the people of the United States, perhaps, more seriously...more closely, than any Amendment that has ever been adopted since the first ten Amendments to the Constitution. So, I oppose the limitation of the debate.

I would hope that you would rule that it's out of order. I hope that you would allow us to speak and us, if necessary, the ten minutes that we're allotted under the rules, and the one minute to explain votes. I oppose the motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have no objection to a limitation on the amount of total debate on the subject, but I wonder if the Representative on the other side of the aisle who is suggesting a limitation would modify that to say that since it requires a three-fifths favorable vote for passage, that the proponents ought to have three-fifths of the allotted time?"

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the only way that we could do it, the Parliamentarian advises me, is that it...it really is the nature of a motion to limit debate which could be done with two-thirds of those voting. Is that correct? Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "I would like to make a substitute motion, Mr. Speaker, if the Parliamentarian would accept it. And, that would be to limit debate to two speakers on each side rather than one half hour, so that the Speaker would not have to choose who should get the half hour on each side...limit it to two speakers on each side. I think that every Member in this House, if he has been conscientious at all, has heard every argument proposed on either side of the Amendment, and I would make a substitute motion that debate be limited to two speakers on each side."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Contrary to statements made earlier, I don't believe that any discussion...I don't believe that any discussion that we will have on this topic today will make one bit of difference in terms of the outcome on this issue at all today, the...the substitute motion made by Representative Marovitz is far preferable to no limitation at all or the limitation suggested by Representative Deuster. And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the substitute motion made by Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Redmond: "Repre...I think we're giving it a longer time here than if we had a full debate. The Parliamentarian has suggested that we put Representative Marovitz's suggestion and take two-thirds, and the suggestion, if that fails, we'll go immediately to the consideration with full debate. Anybody got anything to add to that? Representative Peters."

Peters: "When we vote on the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. The question is on Representative Marovitz's motion that the debate be limited to two proponents and two opponents. Now, those...those in favor of that motion vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "To explain my vote, when I consider that I have five granddaughters, besides all the other young girls whose lives and mutilation and whose futures may be in doubt, I think that to not have a full debate on this would be ridiculous, and it'd be negligent of our duty. There's a lot of stink over this United States, and it might employ...it might apply to half a million young women in a hell of a situation, and we should have full debate."

Speaker Redmond: "Take the record. On this question there are 73

'aye' and 61 'no'. It does not carry. Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House..."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll have full debate. There's no...Representative Davis. We've already wasted 20 minutes."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Not only do we have..."

Speaker Redmond: "We have gotten tired."

Davis: "Not only do we have a number of new Representatives who have not had the issue before them before, but this month we have a new gallery as well, and would you please, at this point, admonish the gallery partisans from both sides of the issue on the demonstration rule in the House."

Speaker Redmond: "The House rules provide that there will be no demonstration from our visitors in the gallery. You are our guests, and if there's any violation of that rule, we will clear the gallery. Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I did not vote on that motion just a few moments ago, because I filed this motion...the Amendment January 2, 1979, and I've waited all this time to have an opportunity to discuss the merits of this Amendment, hopefully, that we will adopt today. I want to, Mr. Speaker, be sort of like a quarterback in this issue, because we have five chief Cosponsors: Representative Sandquist, Representative Matijevich, Representative Giddy Dyer, Representative Mike Madigan, and myself. I would certainly like to be the one that closed debate on the very end. I think Representative Sandquist would like to speak before me in the closing, and, Mr. Speaker, I have not asked much of you or anyone of this House. But, this is something that I'm quite concerned about. It's a very hard thing, and I think the people here are ready for the vote. Mr. Speaker, I yield

the debate to Representative Matijevich."

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

Duester: "I just have an inquiry. Are we going to hear from all the proponents?"

Speaker Redmond: "We'll hear from...177 Members. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one moment. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for the record I believe that we ought to insert the Equal Rights Amendment in its full context and all of its wording. And, I think that probably when we do that, although it will surprise nobody in the House, because we have worded on the Equal Rights Amendment for so long, it will surprise many across the country as to what the working of the Equal Rights Amendment really is, because as I've communicated with many people as all of you have, when you really tell them in the words of the Equal Rights Amendment what it is, many are flabbergasted and write back to me and say, 'Well, what is the fuss all about?' Many who have polls taken on the Equal Rights Amendment, when the polls are taken on the wording of the Equal Rights Amendment, the polls come back strongly in favor of it. When you have a poll saying, 'Do you support ERA?', surprisingly the results are different. And, I think as we discuss the issue today, we'll find out why. So, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Equal Rights Amendment says, 'Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex. The Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this Article, and this Amendment shall take effect two years after date...the date of ratification.' In 1920, 60

years ago, the United States passed the Nineteenth Amendment. That Amendment provided that women shall have the right to vote. Much of the emotion that we face today, much of the arguments...many of the arguments that we face today, many of the side issues that we face today are exactly the same side issues that happened 60 years ago. And, today, 60 years later, the issue is this, are women in America entitled to full citizenship? The issue is, is a woman a person in the eyes of the law? And, as we enter this new decade, as we enter 1988...1980, I think it is almost ridiculous that there can be any debate over something so basic...an issue that I think is so simple as the equality of rights under the law and especially in this great country of ours. But, it is not surprising to me, because as I said, the Equal Rights Amendment is facing exactly the same emotional arguments that were heard 60 years ago. You hear the arguments that if you are for the Equal Rights Amendment, that somehow that you are against God; that if you are for the Equal Rights Amendment, that somehow you are against family; if you are for the Equal Rights Amendment, that somehow you are against morality; and if you are for the Equal Rights Amendment, somehow you are against this great country of ours. I think that it is time that we consider this emotion...this Amendment not on myths, but on merit. It is time to end the emotion and the commotion on the Equal Rights Amendment and start to work towards motion and to work toward movement, toward the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment, because we are talking about equality of rights. Why, at this time, do we need an Equal Rights Amendment? I think that if you look about, that you can honestly say that women still face widespread legal and social discrimination. There is no questions but what there are some discriminations against

men, which we also can protect against. But, if we want to be honest about the real reason for the Equal Rights Amendment, it is because of the widespread discrimination against women, and we might as well face that fact. The Constitutional Amendment will protect people...all people in every state from being denied equality of rights under the law. In other words, this great country of ours should not be concerned that one state, one at a time, should work toward equality. We, as a country...we, as a people, should stand for equality of rights, and what we're really talking about is that in our Constitution...that in this document that we all stand on in our country, that this precept ought to be in our...in our Constitution and especially in this day and age. A defeat, I think, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, would constitute rejection of women's equality with men. I think that women and men, when we talk about rights, ought to stand beside one another, that one should not be behind the other, that we should be equal under the law. More than 46 million women are in the work force. They work, Ladies and Gentlemen, for the same reasons...the same reasons that men work. They work because they must work to earn a living, just as we do. They work, and if we believe in family, as I know we all do, how many families can make it if two in a family aren't working nowadays? And, they ought not to be working for a wage that brings back one and a half the income it should. They should be working for a full income based on the job that they have, and I believe that is a fact, as many of us have seen and many of us have seen the buttons around here, that for every dollar that a man earns that the women does earn 59¢. And, the sorrowful fact is that in spite of the gains that have been made in recent years, and, Ladies and Gentlemen, I stand here as one who

was part of the debate eight years ago, and at that time I said if the Equal Rights Amendment did no more...did nothing else than became a symbol...became a symbol that we stand against discrimination, if it did nothing more than raise the consciousness of people that we be for quality of rights, that that alone would be worth the effort if it did nothing more. And, I stand here eight years later and say yet today...yet today if that's all it did...if that's all it did, it'd be worth it, because we, who have been part of this for eight years, can see...can see the consciousness that has been raised in the eight years of the debate and the gains that have been made, believe me, would not have been made if it were not for the discussion and the debate of the Equal Rights Amendment all through the land. And, let me tell you, my memory comes back to the day that I was sitting in Committee...in a Committee waiting for my Bill to be heard when I heard a young woman by the name of Susan Catania in that Committee. She didn't know me. She didn't know me, and came into that Committee because of the basic discriminations against her as a woman on unemployment compensation. I sat in that Committee and said to myself, these are the discriminations that women face all over our land, and that's the reason if any...and if you don't know it, that's the reason that Susan Catania learned about the legislative process and the need to bring into our law and erase many of the discriminations that exist, and she's done that. But, we need more than that. We need more than piecemeal legislation. We need this great country of ours to stand for equality of rights under the law for everybody. I don't know how anybody can be against that. The average women...high school graduate earns less than male high school dropouts. That's a fact. The average woman college graduate earns less than grade school...those

with grade school educations who are men...women. That...men...that's a fact. And, another fact that we ought to consider, because I know that we all worry about making a living for our family, it is a fact that nine million are...women are sole heads of their family. Now, we all believe in family, but, believe me, we're in God's hands. Everyone of us. We're in God's hands, and a woman who believes in her family, her husband, and her children doesn't know when God's going to take him tomorrow. She doesn't know, and, believe me, that's the time that many women all over this country have found out that there are discriminations against them as the single head of...of a household, and they find it out the tough way. Now, the matter of employment and pay. We all realize that we have an Equal Pay Act, yet in spite of that legislation it doesn't cover everybody. It covers only those employers who employ over 15 persons, and if we believe in the Equal Pay Act....fine believe that there should not be discrimination based on the type of work that one does, we ought to believe that it ought to stand for everybody, not just for a class of employers. And, the fact of the matter is, even with that legislation, which, believe me, I don't think would've happened if it weren't for the discussion on the Equal Rights Amendment, but the fact is that there are...there is such a backlog of cases that we still have so much discrimination against women on the Equal Pay Act. And I believe that the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment will quicken the time that we will eliminate those discriminations; and I think what we need its, as I'm sure many of you do, also, under the Equal Rights Amendment, rather than women having the burden of proving that such laws as...that do discriminate against them, the state would be required to show that their laws do not

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

June 18, 1980.

discriminate. And that's where the burden ought to be if you really believe in equality of rights under the law. As the matter of education, we have Title IX which was supposed to end discrimination in education, yet there are discriminations, and the Equal Rights Amendment, I...I believe, will mean...mean that these goals will be carried out much more effectively if there is that basic precept in our great charter. And, many women have learned the hard way, in spite of a Federal Credit Act, that they have had much difficulty after their husbands have passed away to receive credit, and we find that those discriminations still exist today even with federal legislation. So, I believe that there is so much that must be done, and we must stand for this in our charter. Now, many have talked about the extension and many have said that that was unfair, but the concept of a deadline came about to ensure that the proposed Amendment would not float around endlessly, and I don't believe that the Equal Rights Amendment, in any manner, shape, or form, has ended and discussion has kept on going. It's been ongoing, and, therefore, I think the matter of the extension was logical, that as long as there was ongoing debate, the reason for having the extension was logical, too. Don't forget the matter of a time limit in it was proposed originally by the opponents of the Equal Rights Amendment, and Congress, as the courts have said in a decision, have the right to extend, and if anybody feels that is an issue, that, I'm sure, will be interpreted later. But, I...the present court decision on it is as clear as can be. Now, as I was reading the Equal Rights Amendment, as soon as I finished with that first Section, I heard somebody shout out Section two, and I've been through all of these debates, and every year there was some emotional argument came up, you know,

after we got through the silly arguments about unisex, and the single bathrooms, and what have you...every...homosexual marriages and whatnot...every issue that was used emotionally only that had no sense or merit to it at all. All of a sudden when all the issues...other issues were dissipated, along came this matter of Section two and the matter of states' rights. Now, if I, for one moment, and I as a Legislator above all as all of you, but I think one who stands for the legislative process just as strongly as all of you, if I for a moment thought that this Amendment would, in any way, cripple states' rights, I wouldn't be for it. But, the truth of the matter is that the United States Constitution specifically grants the Federal Government only those rights which the states specifically relinquish, and nowhere in the context of the Equal Rights Amendment, which I cited, do the states relinquish their rights to legislate, and as long as we have the Tenth Amendment, and I think the courts have said that when you amend the Constitution, every Amendment should be taken in context. The only way that we could eliminate states' rights under the present Constitution would be by repeal of the Tenth Amendment, and nothing in the context of it, in any way, repeals the Tenth Amendment. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I feel so strongly about equality of rights. I feel so strongly in my country. I will take a back seat to nobody in believing in my great country. This is our great country...our great country. I'm one who doesn't happen to believe that to be a good American, you just don't do it by reciting the pledge of allegiance. You just don't do it by certain things unless you have it in your heart to be and act like an American and stand for what America stands for and if America doesn't stand for

equality of rights under the law for all people, then I guess I don't understand my great country, but I think I do. And, I really think that all of us here believe in morality, but what is so moral if people who don't have full rights, if people who work in our stereotypes and end up in certain jobs just because in this great country of ours, because of the history of it, we place people in their own place? I think women's places ought to be every place. I've heard it said women ought to be put in their place. I don't believe it. I think women and men belong every place in this great country. They ought to have all of the opportunities that all of us have. I believe that the Equal Rights Amendment is talking about human rights. Really, that's what I believe it's all about, because if we really believe in human rights, we believe that rights belong to everybody, man and woman, and I think that is the basic, important issue in the Equal Rights Amendment. This country, I believe, is a country that the whole future of the world has a stake in, and if our country really believes in human rights like I think it does, I think there is a great future for the world, and I think in this day and age, in 1980, 60 years after we debated the same emotional arguments that gave women the right to vote, that we, at this time as a Legislature in Illinois...as a Legislature, that we know the precepts that Abraham Lincoln stood for, that we in Illinois, and let's face it. There's only one reason why we haven't passed it in Illinois, and that is the matter of the three-fifths vote, and we all know that. But, we in Illinois ought to here and now stand for and say that Illinois, the House in Illinois, the Legislature in Illinois, stands for equality of rights under the law. That's what it's about...all about. Nothing more than that. It's a precept in our

Constitution, and I think you're for it, and I appreciate your vote for it. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson. Representative Deuster, proceed. Please sit down. I know who wants the recognition. Please sit down."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we all want to vote for something, and we know what the consequences are. Very briefly, the Equal Rights Amendment is unnecessary and, secondly, if it were simply unnecessary, why, we could put it in the Constitution and say, well, what's wrong with saying something twice? But, the fact is it's harmful. Now, I'm a proud Member of this Illinois General Assembly and this county. We can all be proud Americans. We have a wonderful Constitution, and under this Constitution which I'm holding in my hand, I'm not going to try and rely on oratory, but facts and documents. This Constitution guarantees the equal protection of the law to every person, and that applies to every state and every state court from Alabama, to Mississippi, to New York, to California, to Illinois. Every person sitting in that gallery, and every person on this House floor, and everybody in America is equal right now. They don't need the Equal Rights Amendment. Some people say, 'Well, we're not in the Constitution.' I've heard that over and over again. I have a document here, a report from the Illinois Legislative Council, that said the courts have always construed women to be persons. They're persons under the Fourteenth Amendment. I've also analyzed the argument they say, 'Well, the courts aren't doing enough. They're not helping us.' I have the 'Ludke' case. This is the well-publicized case of the female sports

reporter that felt she was denied her equal opportunity to...because she was denied the opportunity to go in the New York Yankees' locker room to interview the athletes after their ball game, and this is the case that held they have an equal opportunity, women do, to go right into the locker room, and this case also held that there's no right to privacy on the right of the ball players. If they're concerned about women looking at them, they can carry towels around. Now, how much further do we have to go? They're equal. They're persons. The courts have bent over backwards to guarantee that equal protection of the law. Why is the Equal Rights Amendment harmful? I have four documents right here. First, a report of the U. S. House Judiciary Committee that heard this, and this is the report that says that unless they amended it this would require that women and mothers go into combat and in the military service. Everybody here ought to know that if you want to vote 'yes' for ERA, you better go back and be prepared to face your grandchildren, your granddaughters, and all the women in your district and say, 'I voted to Constitutionally mandate a sex neutral military and to draft women.' If you want to do that, do that. But, this is the U. S. House report, so they put the Wiggin's Amendment on, and the Wiggin's Amendment said that, notwithstanding this equality which we're all for, we'd still allow Congress to exempt women from the draft if they want to. I was there at the time. We were in the middle of the Vietnam War. On the floor of the House, unfortunately, the feminists came in and said, 'We want absolute equality. We want to go to war.' This report tells about the university girls...the University of Kansas and other places. They were barefoot, and they were sitting around, and they said, 'We want to go in with the

boys.' And, they really, I think, wanted to bring the Vietnam War to an end, but, nonetheless, Congress struck down that Wiggin's Amendment, so now that's why we have the ruckus. That's why the seven years have expired. That's why the ladies in the gallery, and around this nation...the Illinois General Assembly has had the courage to say 'no' to this thing, because we're not for drafting women. That's the U. S. House Committee report. Here's the Senate Committee report that says that ERA will require Congress to treat men and women equally with respect to the draft and entirely all through military service. Then the Judiciary Committee of this House heard testimony by Kathleen Carpenter, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense. On page 10, she states the opinion of the Legal Council of the Department of Defense that, yes, ERA would require drafting women and treating them equally. A lot of people refer to the Yale Law Journal. This is the law journal that studied the Equal Rights Amendment, and, again, it says not only would they have to draft women, put them into combat, but all of the military standards for height and weight and everything else would have to be sex neutralized. And, finally, the most shocking thing is that the right of privacy would not be guaranteed to women. There's some conversation that...well, that we wouldn't put them in barracks or we would provide for their privacy. There's no way...military life, and every veteran on the floor of this House knows that. Finally, on the subject of drafting, just last week the Senate and, as did the House down in Washington, rejected an Amendment to draft women. I would say that's one harmful consequence. Another, is that the Equal Rights Amendment provides for no exception. Congress, and I served with a Member of Congress and a lot of our colleagues...former colleagues are down there, they

passed, in 1972, an education Amendment saying there would be no sex discrimination in the field of education. You know what they discovered? They discovered they jeopardized the Boy Scouts, and the Girl Scouts, the sororities, the fraternities, Boy's State, and Boy's Nation, Girl's State, Girl's Nation, beauty contests, all of these things, and when the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare told them what they had done, they came running in with an Amendment and if any of you want to read the document, it's the United States Code annotated Title 20...education, and they proceeded later in 1974 to exempt the Boy Scouts, and the Girl Scouts, and the sororities, all of which discriminate on sex, but for good reasons. Now, the problem with the Equal Rights Amendment is we throw this thing in the Constitution, we all must trust the United States Supreme Court to come up with exceptions to allow the Boy Scouts and the sororities to continue. I'm not sure I want to trust that, because in race relations we used to have separate, but equal. You could segregate...put the blacks here and the whites there, but in the Brown case, in school desegregation in 1954, they threw that out. Now, how can we expect the Supreme Court to go back and say, 'Separate but equal is okay for men and women and boys and girls, although it's not good for blacks and whites.' I don't think the court can do that, and I just think we are wiping out, constitutionally, all these exceptions. Now, on abortions. There are a lot of right to left...right to life Members who have been voting for ERA, and I think they're making a big mistake, because when Congress also eliminated sex discrimination in schools, they said to the Federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 'Prepare some guidelines to implement this.' I served on a Committee to review these

guidelines, and that's why I'm familiar with them. In these guidelines, they recognized the fact that abortion is a right of women, and so they prohibit any discrimination in insurance policies and in any policies of educational institutions on the grounds of abortion. So, it is clear that if we amend this, at least the federal bureaucrats and lawyers, the same ones who implemented the Title IX regulations, they are the ones who we're turning over this whole ball game to implement ERA, and they will wipe out, completely, any control that the Supreme Court has recognized us to control the subject of abortion. As you know, the National Organization of Women...I say that one of the basic rights of women, and I have their policy statement here, is completely to control their own body, their own reproductive life, and this includes not only abortions, but the right to be lesbians if they want to. Now, that is a right that the women, who are in this town promoting this Amendment, think that they are promoting, and so it is not a scare issue or something phony to say that homosexual rights and abortion rights will be affected, because they will in the eyes of a great many of these opponents. On point that's been overlooked, the Virginia General Assembly studied this, and they are, like us, an unratified state, because they appointed a lot of law school deans, lawyers, and many of them were ERA proponents, to study the effects on ERA on their state laws. And, the most shocking thing, in a way, is that it would require the state prisons to be sexually integrated. As you know, at Dwight we have mainly all females, and we segregate women in our prisons, not because we are against them, but because we want to protect them. Do you want to put some women in the Cook County jail? Do you want total sex equality? Do you want to integrate women into the

state prison system? Do you want to be responsible for what happens in prisons? I don't think so. Senate document 25 from the Virginia General Assembly points that out, and that's not oratory. That is a document. I would like to say that I've analyzed a lot of the arguments on the part of the proponents...59%. I attended an education seminar today. They were complaining that half of the high school girls that take vocational training want to be mothers. Now, there's nothing ERA will do about what our young women want to do, and if they are mothers, they don't get into the...they don't get into the job circuit, and they don't make as much money as their husbands who go out and hold a job all through the extent of the marriage. I would say this, we know the Equal Rights Amendment is unnecessary. We've got documentary proof that it would be harmful. The only thing that we really need to do is enforce the rights of equality that women already have right now. Lastly, some Members of this House really don't care, or they're undecided, and so they're looking to follow the most politically advantageous route. We're listening to political pressure. I would say for...not...this is not a partisan issue, but for the Gentlemen and Ladies on this side of the aisle, if you're looking for Leadership among our Republican leaders, the only President...the Republican President who had an opportunity to vote on the Equal Rights Amendment was Gerald Ford. And, you know what he did, he took a walk, and he explained the reason he took a walk, cause he did not want to vote for drafting the women of Grand Rapids, Michigan. How about another great leader of the Republican Party? If we call Gerry Ford a moderate, John Anderson is a liberal. John Anderson took a walk and did not vote. Now, that's rather surprising, and on the conservative

side, Governor Reagan is opposed to it, so I don't think that we, on this side of the aisle, have to look up to great leaders who have no constitutional obligation here and follow their lead. I think we all ought to vote our conscience. To me, as I look around this chamber, the best argument to support the fact that women are equal and they're getting equal pay is to look at...there's...just about every row there's a Lady Member. We have 22 Lady Members of this House. They're equal. They can file their petitions. They can run. They're getting the same pay, and they're a perfect demonstration of the fact that women enjoy equal opportunity in this country. And, lastly and in conclu..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close. Your time is up."

Deuster: "Yes, in concluding I would say this, and I...I hate to mention this, but I think the safest vote on this subject is a 'present' vote for anybody who is concerned. I think it is outrageous. I think it is shocking for high public officials in this nation, and I say the very highest public officials, to be on the telephone asking Members to change their vote from 'no' to 'yes' in return for expending millions of dollars of public funds in projects in their districts. And, we already have one poor, young lady from Chicago who has been indicted by a grand jury for coming to this town and offering a thousand dollars. I think it is equally reprehensible for a public official, and the public officials can be on either side of the aisle, or in the Federal Government, or the State Government, to either offer a job or offer millions of dollars of expenditures of tax money in return for a switch from a 'no' vote to a 'yes' vote. I'm confident that if that occurs, that we're going to have grand juries and a lot of innocent people may

be before a grand jury explaining, did this public official call them? Did they switch from 'no' to 'yes'? And why? And, that's going to be embarrassing, not only for the public officials that some of you were trying to help, but it'll be further embarrassment to this Illinois General Assembly. My hope is that we all can look at the merits, study these documents, study these facts, and vote your conscience. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, there is a saying in French that goes... (French phrase). It translates the more things change, the more they remain the same. Imagine, if you will, the arguments that we hear against the Equal Rights Amendment. Imagine them in a historical perspective, and let us take...let us say four particular eras. Let us take the Israelites having the same discussion as to whether or not they should leave Egypt as they huddle behind the pyramids. Take again the colonists as they meet in the local inn and discuss the issue of whether they should separate from England. Again, retreat to the back of the big white house and listen to the slaves debate the Emancipation Proclamation. Again, we can listen to ourselves debate the ERA. In each of these instances, the arguments are the same. There have always been the historical arguments of the Israelites who said that we were born in Egypt. It is God's will that we born...that we stay here, and we will always be here. Think of the colonists who said we were born English. It is God's will and there's no need for this new nation. And, again, my own forefathers who said we've always been slaves. We were born on the plantation, and it's God's will that we remain slaves. And, again, I refer you to the arguments against the ERA. Again, we look at the Israelites and the

pyramids. There were those who called upon future uncertainties and fear, and they say we don't know where we'll get water, and the desert is hot, and we ought to stay in Egypt. And, there were those in the colonies who said we don't know anything about liberty or democracy, and there were slaves who cried we have no land, no education, and today there are people who cry that the ERA would somehow bring some unknown to equal rights for women. Again, there are those who, behind the pyramids, talked of their special benefits, and their special privileges, such as pyramid building and being doers of the water. Where would they find, in a new land, such privileges? And, then there were the colonists who said, well, where do we ever get off by having a government to think for us, to tax us without representation, and we don't have to do anything for ourselves? And, there were the slaves behind the big house who had the special privileges of finding a few chitterlings that were thrown away and a few pigs feet that were left, and after all, couldn't these slaves sometimes sire the master's children or perhaps steal a little of his bourbon? These were great privileges and great benefits, and today we would have our women as coffee fetchers for 59¢ an hour or 59% of the pay. We would have them as scrub women. We would have them as maids. Again, would we lose these special privileges and special protections and benefits? Again, they argued the argument was a protection. There were the Israelites who said, but we need the Egyptian chariot, the colonists who cried out, we need the English navy, and the slaves who said, we need the master to protect us from floggings by strangers. And, again today, there are those who say, well, for some reason or another we have to oppose the equal rights, because, after all, we need the protection of the husbands. And,

then they talk of love. They say if we flee egypt, the Pharoah will no longer love us. If we flee the colonies, the King will no longer love us, and if we flee slavery, the master will no longer love us. And, today, they tell the women that somehow that the husbands would not love them anymore. Again, there has been a triumphant argument through all four of these phases of history, and that has been that of military service, and the cowards who huddled behind the pyramids cried out, but we are exempt from serving in the army. But, they had no religious freedom. And, there were the colonists who said, we are exempt from serving in the army, but they had no liberty. There were the slaves who cried out, we are exempt from serving in the army, but they had no freedom. And, there are those today who would cry out again, the women are exempt from military service, but they have no equality. Again, behind the pyramid there was the character assassination of each and every group. They talked about the leaders who were with Moses. They character assassinated the people who were for the colonists. They character assassinated the people who wanted freedom from slavery. And, today, we do the same character assassinations. Finally, Ladies and Gentlemen, in looking at these, I have decided that if I were there, I would vote 'yes' with Moses to flee the pyramids. I would vote 'yes' with Washington and Jefferson, and I would vote with Patrick Henry. I would vote 'yes' with Lincoln on the theory that all men are created equal, and today I would vote for the women that they are created equal. Today, I ask that the truths of Harriet Tubman are not in vain and that the embodiment of Lottie Holliman be honored, that we relish the..."

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

Ewell: "That we relish the spirit of Susan B. Anthony, and that

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 18, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

we, here in America, judge the women by the content of their character rather than their XY chromosomes. And, in memory of an honored hero of mine, I would ask that the women who have walked beside us in every battle from abolition, to suffrage, to civil rights, to fair employment, to open housing, I would ask that this honored Assembly free them at least...free them at last and let us say, thank God, Almighty. Let us free them at last."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, common sense...I think it's time for common sense to prevail in the General Assembly. This issue has had full treatment in this House...treatment consisting of vote trading on other issues, threats against re-election, threats of being deprived of positions, and plums for our districts, offers for campaign contributions, efforts pitting Legislator against Legislator with false rumors and ridiculous insinuations. This issue should be decided by each and everyone of us strictly on its own merits and no other reason. There is not one of us in this House that does not believe in equal rights, equal opportunity, equal pay, equal treatment for all. You can do all the arguing you want to do to the contrary, but common sense tells me that with ERA as a federal mandate, it would be unconstitutional to avoid requiring women to march into combat with men, and there would not be any legislative or executive prerogative for Congress or the President. Common sense tells me that with ERA as a federal mandate the power of the Federal Government will have its effect on all our lives governing our laws at the local level, because it does supersede states' rights. Government should protect and preserve the tradition of the family unit, not destroy it. Can't you see that an Amendment as

vague as this as the one that's proposed is going to be a continuous process of interpretation by the courts from day one? And, common sense tells me that six different judges give you six different interpretations. Specific legislation passed and enforced is the answer. That has got to be the answer, and the Federal Government itself is going this route to correct the discriminations in the social security law. That is the way we can outlaw discrimination, to put it into effect, and to enforce it. Now, common sense also tells me that well-intentioned, fair-minded, thinking people are being used. My friends, being used by radical extremists who support a Communist and Socialist philosophy of government and whose sole purpose is to destroy us internally by throwing their support behind the ERA movement. Common sense tells me that to ratify such a vague and questionable Amendment to our national Constitution will bring us problems that we haven't even dreamed of yet. We would do just as well, my friends, I think to forget the wording in this proposed Amendment and just simply add one great big question mark. A common sense vote is a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, five times we have been called upon to vote on ERA. This is the sixth time, and five times I previously have voted against ERA. In voting 'no' in the past, I have not been against equality of the sexes. My concern about ERA has been manifold. The adequacy of the existing Fourteenth Amendment, the inherent conflict between the Fourteenth and proposed Twenty-seventh Amendment, and that ERA was merely symbolic as many have asserted. Abortion and homosexuality have not and did not affect my thinking. In my opinion, there is no connection between these subjects and with ERA.

Abortion has been dealt with by the United States Supreme Court as an issue involving due process and not discrimination, and homosexuality is a matter of sexual preference, not a matter of sex. The draft has not been bothersome to me. Equality is not the same as sameness. Under the Fourteenth Amendment, the U. S. Supreme Court has said there may be classification of persons so long as it's reasonable. Under the proposed Twenty-seventh Amendment, I was advised previously that there could be no classification whether it was reasonable or unreasonable. In 1972 when ERA was first presented to the states for ratification, I think this analysis was valid. But, since then the United States Supreme Court has shed new light for me. As recent as last year, 1979, the Supreme Court has refused to place sex in the same category as race and national origin with respect to classification. Now, since 1954, the court has ruled that classifications based on race or national origin are suspect classification, which can only be sustained on a showing of compelling circumstances, but to date, under the Fourteenth Amendment, the United States Supreme Court refuses to extend the heightened standard of scrutiny to classifications based on sex. Section one of ERA is written in absolute terms. The text of the Fourteenth Amendment is equally absolute. In fact, they are like the First Amendment, but despite their unambiguous and absolute language, the First and Fourteenth Amendments have been interpreted by the courts to permit many restraints. It's reasonable...it's common sense to anticipate that the courts will likewise interpret and apply the Twenty-seventh Amendment allowing restraint but only with the showing of a extraordinary justification...a showing by the federal Congress or by the individual states. Section two, investing in the Congress the power

to enforce ERA, is no different from Section two of the Thirteenth Amendment prohibiting slavery. Section five of the Fourteenth Amendment, guaranteeing equal protection of the laws to all persons, Section two of the Fifteenth Amendment, giving blacks the right to vote, the second part of the Nineteenth Amendment, giving women the right to vote, Section two of the Twenty-third Amendment, establishing the Electoral College, Section two of the Twenty-fourth Amendment, abolishing the poll tax, and Section two of the Twenty-sixth Amendment, giving eighteen-year-olds the right to vote. In other words, ERA's Section two is a traditional means for the implementation of U. S. Constitutional rights. It's as American as the flag and apple pie and is not an insidious device for the overthrow of states' rights. Now, for the first time, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I shall vote for ERA believing that the Fourteenth Amendment is inadequate to elevate women to their rightful status. The proposed Twenty-seventh Amendment will advance their rights and protect the interests of women and that the proposed Twenty-seventh Amendment will free all persons from unreasonable classification based on sex by telling government to leave people alone unless it, government, can justify its interference. I would conclude, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, with a slightly partisan note. As a Republican, I am acting and voting consistently with the Republican Party's platform supporting ratification of ERA, and I would call to this Body's....House that the Republican Party was the first national party to endorse the ERA in 1940. Finally, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in the words of that grand old person, Everett Dirksen, ERA is an idea whose time has come. I respectfully urge your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative George Ray Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition to this Amendment as I have over a period of nine years. The argument here today, in my opinion, is not one of fair treatment for our women. We all want this. The argument is over the means of achieving that fair treatment. The argument is over whether or not the Equal Rights Amendment is the way to go. I'm opposed to this Amendment and have been, because I believe from the bottom of my...I'm opposed, because I believe from the bottom of my heart the Amendment to be unnecessary and dangerous. The only reason, Ladies and Gentlemen, it seems to me that any Amendment should be passed...an Amendment to the federal Constitution is that it give us something we need, we do not have, and have no other way of getting. In this case, none of these apply. The Equal Rights Amendment is unnecessary, because there is nothing that this Amendment can give our women in regards to protection against sex discrimination that they do not already have or have a way of getting. We have the Equal Pay Act of 1963. We have Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1972. We have the Civil Rights Commission Act of '72, the Higher Education Act of 1972, the Revenue Act of 1971, to mention but a few. And, there are executive orders and a host of state and federal laws and regulations providing against specific forms of discrimination based on sex, and we have the Fourteenth Amendment which does provide for equal protection for all persons, and, as Representative Deuster so ably mentioned, certainly all persons covers women. This Amendment is being used increasingly to cover cases of sex discrimination, but we have, in mentioning these few, only scratched the surface on protections already in place. My second objection is that it is dangerous. It is

dangerous, because Section two provides an unwarranted and treacherous transfer of legislative power from a state to the Federal Government. It is dangerous, because we take a vaguely worded Amendment about which constitutional authorities simply do not agree as to the...as to the implications, as to its ramifications, as to its impact on society. And under Section 2, we grant affirmative powers to Congress and the federal courts to define after...after ratification, what Section 1 of the Amendment means and to enforce that yet to be determined definition. In addition, Section 2 enables Congress to preempt the field...to preempt the field and substitute its judgment, and its power, and law for that of the states, even though state laws may be in harmony with Section 1. This, my friends,...this, my friends, is a legislative blank check that we are considering here today. And I urge you to think before you sign this legislative blank check with your vote. Think before you vote to let Congress, the courts, and federal agencies fill in the amount that we may find coming due. Think before we create a legislative Trojan horse, roll it through the gates of an unsuspecting society, and wait then to see what happens. This is a dangerous betrayal of our duties as State Legislators. We should not, we must not...it seems to me, unleash on our American citizens the legislative mischief of ERA. The protections are already with us, and where they are not they can be put in place by specific legislation to design...designed to cure a specific ill. In closing, my colleagues, I urge you to stand fast against this constitutional meddling designed as a quick fix for social injustices real or imagined, and stand fast against the unconscionable arm twisting that has shifted this whole question from one of principle to one of pressure. I urge

you to say 'no' to this constitutional Frankenstein which rigidly interpreted, and I believe it will be, will lock our women into a doctrinaire mold of sameness with the men with no exclusions, with no exceptions, no recognition of differences no matter how real or reasonable these differences may be. Thousands may...millions of our women across this land do not want a unisex society and are begging us...begging us to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: 'Representative Kent.'

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For eight years I have voted 'no'. I will continue to do so. My reasons are these: eight years ago when I first made my vote, I had studied the Amendment and had my opinion of what it was, and it came..."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me...oh, pardon me. I'm sorry. This thing runs away with me every once in a while. Representative Kent."

Kent: "...It came to me I should vote 'no'. In those eight years I have talked to the people of my district. I have listened to the people of my district, and those who said that they wanted the ERA, I asked them very pointedly, what do you think that you will have with the passage of this Amendment that you do not have now? I think right down to the last one they said, 'I want equal pay. Equal pay is available now. The law is there. We do make a dollar if we want to. If we do the same job, we make a dollar. We do not make fifty-nine cents. I stand before you as one who makes the same money as you do, but it took work. Women must work to do it. Last night I spoke at Girl's State in Jacksonville. When I told them that I was opposed to the ERA, instantly they were on their feet cheering. It was the most wonderful feeling. It gave me strength in what I am doing. The young people of this age don't want

it either. They were very strong in their convictions, and tonight I am pleased to say that I not only represent the people of my age as they keep telling me I am a fuddy-duddy because I won't go for ERA, I represent the young woman of this state, and I will continue to vote 'no', because when this passes, don't expect any more pay than you have right now unless you ask for it, unless you work for it. Women can do anything they want to do in the laws, and the rules, and the Constitution that we have now providing they want to do it bad enough. I urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of the Equal Right Amendment. It seems to me that of late more than ever this Body has been torn apart by this particular piece of legislation. It seems to have torn apart not only the House, but this state, the nation, and people who rightly or wrongly oppose and support this particular measure. Right meaning people who oppose abortion. Right meaning people who oppose the proliferation of rights for gays and other things that have been brought into this issue, have been pegged as people who are trying to ram those same things through by the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. That is not right at all. That is entirely wrong. What has bothered me most of all, and I was not going to say anything today but I decided to of late, is the attack upon the people who support this particular Amendment. The people who even from the clergy, God fearing, Bible reading, as the opponents call themselves, people in my district have been attacked and maligned time after time by the opponents of this issue. And it seems to me that it is time that we stand up, take a stand, and have enough guts to say to those people who don't believe in the right of free speech apparently in

some cases, or the right to believe even in religion as you want to, that we believe in religion, we believe in our rights, we believe in the rights of men and women, not just women. The time has come to stop lifting passages from the Bible in opposition to this particular Amendment. The time has come to stop wrapping ourselves in the American flag, to stop wrapping ourselves in the issue of motherhood because there are just as many people out there who believe in family, who believe in God, who believe in the Bible, who are for this Amendment as against it. There are just as many Americans, patriots, and believers on the proponent side of this issue as there are opponents. I don't care what the opponents say on that issue. And I think it is a slide of great proportion to attack those who are pro ERA, to call them anti-family, to call them anti-God, to call them anti-religion, to say to them on one hand that they are for things that they aren't for in the way of some of those issues: abortion, gay rights, and so forth. That's not what this is all about. It seems to me, too, that it is time it was said again that this is not just about equality for women, but equality for men, and I happen to be one who has taken some flack from the proponents because I have said that I think it is time that some women in this country stood up and accepted some responsibility along with their rights, and too many of them want it both ways, and that is one of the reasons I am for this particular Amendment, because I think it is time that people don't have it both ways. I think it is time they accept their rights with their responsibilities. And I say to you, and I say to the opponents, I proudly oppose gay rights. I oppose abortion on demand, and I oppose phonies whether they come with, for, or against equal rights. It comes down to a position of having the courage to vote your

conviction right or wrong, pro or con, the bottom line is can you sleep with yourself at night? Can you live with your conscience? Can you vote 'yes' and stand up and be all the things they've accused you of being, and tell them you're not? And I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steele."

Steele: "...Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the ERA Amendment. If we are truly interested in equal rights, and if we are truly interested in equal treatment, then why is it that we are here today for the eighth time in the last nine years having to vote again on this question that has failed to pass time and time again? And yet that same equal treatment, and that same equal opportunity to reconsider a previous vote is not available to those who oppose the ERA. So this issue should pass the Legislature this year. Those in opposition would not be given an equal opportunity or equal chance to vote eight times again until it was defeated to reconsider that vote. So there is a serious inequality here in the very manner in which this issue is being discussed, and that's the reason uppermost in my mind why it should be defeated. But perhaps there is a greater danger of the Equal Rights Amendment that is brought to our mind in the last year, and that is the realization that women are subject to the draft just like men with or without the Equal Rights Amendment. But if ERA passes, they are not only subject to the draft, but they are subject to combat duty as well. ERA says there shall be no distinction between men and women in fighting on the front lines. Congress can make no distinction between men and women. This is bad for women. It is bad for men because when a soldier is carrying that machine gun up a hill to the front line, that ammunition carrier has to be right by

his side. He can't be five steps behind. He can't be ten steps behind because the person isn't strong enough or doesn't have the same physical capabilities of staying up with him. It is a matter of life and death. It is team work. You have to work together. So I think it is wrong to force women into the front lines. I don't think we should force them to go there, and I think ERA should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise to explain my vote, to speak on this issue, and on a point of personal privilege. Unfortunately, some of the Members of this Assembly have resorted to character assassinations as a tactic to cloud the real issue of the Equal Rights Amendment. Although I have been cleared of any wrongdoing, I still deeply resent the cheap shots certain fellow Members of this House have taken against me. I believe that these gutterball tactics, and immature antics have done great harm to the integrity of this House. And although it has been suggested to me that I should vote in favor of this Bill simply to retaliate against those unscrupulous Members, to do so, would stoop to the same childish tactics as my accusers. It would be a vote for the wrong reason. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have pondered this vote on the Equal Rights Amendment almost daily. I have never publicly committed myself to the Equal Rights Amendment, in fact, quite to the contrary. In 1978 I campaigned as a stop ERA candidate, and to me, that is the bottom line. The bottom line is that I must now live up to that campaign promise and vote 'no' on the Equal Rights Amendment. To me, that is the issue. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I have been here since this matter first came up for its first vote, and very much like another Representative who spoke earlier, I voted for it...but I should say unlike...first three times of my recollection I voted 'aye' because I said, too, like I heard today on the floor, who could be against such a simple statement as equality or equal rights should not be denied or abridged because of sex. It certainly makes common sense to me. And I was told, and it took me a little while before I checked the Illinois Constitution that Illinois has an Equal Rights Amendment. I heard the Governor say that up on the podium earlier this year. Illinois has an Equal Rights Amendment. If it is good enough for Illinois, it ought to be good enough for the rest of the United States. And I looked, and what did I find? I found no Equal Rights Amendment in the Illinois per se. I found that the Illinois Constitution provides that equal protection of the laws all not be denied or abridged on account of sex. Not equal rights. Well what is the difference? The difference is that the Illinois Constitution merely reflects the saying and the provisions of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution. And the Supreme Court and the federal courts have more and more gone to the 14th Amendment to give equal protection of the law, to give equality, to eliminate discrimination in actions based on sex. I said many of the things that I intended to say today have already been said, and I know the mind can only retain about as much as the posterior will allow and so I'll cut my remarks, but I want to clarify a few things. We heard some ancient history about Israel. Israel does have an equal rights provision in their laws. I believe it is in their Constitution, but what does it provide? It provides those things that were

denied during the debate in Congress that would have given some reasonable leeway in the dealing with sex in the service. While they have an equal protection or an equal rights provision when it comes to the question of women in the service, it is not absolute equality. They serve shorter terms than men do. They're exempt from service if they marry or have a child. They live in separate barracks, and they are not subject to combat. And nobody here who can tell me that if we adopt the Equal Rights Amendment that Congress or the federal courts can make those distinctions. They won't have authority to make those distinctions. I also heard the first...or I think it was the second Speaker in favor of equal rights...the Amendment name that a number of instances of discrimination based on sex. At least he thought they were. I venture to say that there is not one of those instances that have been brought up today as an example of sex discrimination that is in presently in violation of the federal Constitutional or federal laws. I believe, and I changed my opinion about equal rights, the need for it. I believe there is no need for it because I think we already have them. Between the federal legislation that is passed in the last 20 years, there abouts, between the interpretations by the federal courts of the provisions of the 14th Amendment, I see no necessity for adopting as part of our Constitution, as part of our permanent structure of law, this proposed Equal Rights Amendment. All I can see happening if it is adopted is the opening of the turning over of a barrel of worms, not a can of worms, a barrel of worms that the federal courts will be wrestling with for the next 5,200 years. I have heard attorneys here speak about many things. They seem to be Supreme Court justices. They say these things that those who oppose equal rights point out...are not so.

They are silly, ridiculous. I don't know how they can come to that conclusion. Again I say the greatest danger that I foresee is turning over all this authority to the federal government, to the federal courts to determine over the next 50 to 100 years just what in the world we really meant when we adopted the Equal Rights Amendment. I hope that is never necessary. I want to point out another thing. Man, you need strength to oppose equal rights. You don't need it to be for it. If you talk about being abused, you don't know what it means to be abused until you've turned from being a 'yes' man to a 'no' man. You'll get the pressures. You'll get the cuss words. You'll get the threats. You'll get the duress. Man, it's there. I hope that those who are conscientiously opposed to equal rights, and have been for all these years, will not cave in to the pressure and the duress that they have been under this past month and a half or two months. I would ask you for what its worth, you know, I smile a little bit because...I have been told by one Member of this House...this is some years ago, the 14th Amendment was not satisfactory because person does not include sex. If it doesn't include sex, then why in the world are we always amending the various statutes of our state to eliminate the word he and substitute the word person? I have heard some of these people argue so much that one time one said that we ought to change the name mailman to person person. It makes sense to me. It makes better sense than some of their arguments. I oppose the Amendment, and I hope that we defeat it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "yes...yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've heard a number of arguments here today, and some of the things I was going to say have already been said, and some of the phony things that have been said by

the opponents have already been answered. But what I want to say here is that while it took the women 50 years to get the right to vote, it is not going to take them that long to get this ERA passed. It is going to pass sometime, and it is not going to go away. And those of you who think that it is, you just don't know what's involved because I have been to colleges. I have been to high schools, and I say that the young people, both the men and the women together want equal rights because if the women don't have it, the men don't have it either. And this is something that we've got to have, and I want my four kids, both the two boys and the two girls, all to have the rights. And then, the real thing I want to talk about though is to my colleagues on this side of the aisle and the Republican Party. We're the Party that grew out of the rights of individuals. We're the Party that started by electing Abraham Lincoln to preserve the rights of people. And what I'm saying is they've been throwing arguments here today that...that indicate that some of our leaders are not for it. Everyone knows that Gerald Ford was for ERA. It was in our platform when he was a candidate for president. And John Anderson, to say that he is not for equal rights is an asinine thing in my estimation. But what I want you to know...that we've got to support here, Republicans. We've got to support our Governor. We cannot let this equal rights go down today because of a lack of Republican votes. Because the people who are leading it here today, that are trying to get the 'no' votes are the same people who took the Republican Party down to defeat in 1964, and if you follow them here today, and follow them in 1980...our Party with its great opportunity this year is going to go down to defeat then, too. So I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capuzi. Representative Capuzi."

Capuzi: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that this subject has been debated enough, and I move the previous question."

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

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Mr. Speaker, I have listened very closely to the debate this afternoon, and I have heard all the arguments, pros and cons. But we better not today forget that we are the heirs of the first revolution. And let the words go forth from this time and place. The friends and foes alike, that the time has come to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment. And we are unwilling to witness or permit the sole undoing of those human rights to which this nation has always been committed as which we are committed today. The Equal Rights Amendment is a very simple thing. The Equal Rights Amendment will mean hiring and promotional practice based on the true merits of an individual applicant regardless of sex. The Equal Rights Amendment will provide a legal precedence for equalizational of rights made clear by the law thereby minimizing the difference in judicial ruling with which business must deal. And I think the 'resent' will mean a saving of time and money. The Equal Rights Amendment will mandate uniformity and regulations affecting companies operating nation-wide. The Equal Rights Amendment will clarify the economic status of women including credit standings. The Equal Rights Amendment will increase the dollars coming into the home. Most of the women have not been as lucky to find the loophole that Representative Kent was able to find. The Equal Rights Amendment will increase the income of the single woman

household. Twenty-five percent of all U.S. households are run by women. And I think most of you will agree with that. So, let's both sides exploit what problems you name of instead of belaboring those problems which divide us. In your hands, my fellow Legislators, more than mine, rests the power of political failure of our poor. Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been so much to give testimonial to his national loyalty. Not a trumpet summons us again...neither a cause to bear arms. Those arms we sometimes need. Neither a cause to battle, but in battle we are. The cause of a battle brewing of a long twilight struggle year in and year out rejoicing in hope patient in turbulations that the State of Illinois will go on record as freeing our womanhood by ratifying the Equal Rights Amendment. Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, last night I had dream. I had a dream that this House and the great State of Illinois went on record. I had a dream last night, Mr. Speaker that on that board up there when the vote is casted, we will have somewhere in the neighborhood of 108 votes and better. Mr. Speaker, in the words of the great Martin Luther King, he said, 'Freed at last, freed at last. Thank God Almighty, we're freed at last'. I solicit your support for the Equal Rights Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Now, in order to facilitate, every Member please be in your seat. That's Hanahan's rules. Be in your seat. Now the question is shall House Constitutional Amendment #1 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Only your own switch. Representative Borchers, one minute to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Very quickly I want to explain my vote. I am a soldier, and you don't know what you're doing. You people up there that are for the ERA are condemning your

daughters, your granddaughters to death, mutilation, and rape. Now I know this, because if you'll look at these metals, I've been there. I know what it is. If you think that you are being excused by the Constitution from military duty, you're wrong. With the equal rights you must assume equal responsibility, and that means in the front line trenches. If you think the wars are no longer possible, forget it. We'll always have war. We're that way. For 5,000 years we've had them. We shall continue. And one other thing, don't think that I am opposed to the draft. But as an officer, I can put girls to the... I don't have to and this...ERA...if this Amendment becomes the law, I will..."

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

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise both to make an apology and a confession. Many of you in the last few weeks received a phone call from a person who you thought was the President of the United States. I confess that I called you. I apologize because I didn't think the impersonation was that good. I would have told you on the phone, but some of you were so excited to get a call from the President I didn't want to break your hearts. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In my one minute I just want to quote from two very famous Americans...one woman and one man. Equal time. The woman, Marlo Thomas, who visited us once before when we were voting on the Equal Rights Amendment. Marlo Thomas Donohue said: 'It is unAmerican for one American to vote against the constitutional rights of another American.' The Gentleman I want to quote from served in this Body. His

portrait is on the wall. He was the first President elected by our Party. I am proud of that. Those of you who take the Am-Trak train back to Chicago have noticed these words in the station. Right after the war between the states, the bloody war to do away with slavery, this is what Abraham Lincoln said: 'May our children and our children's children through a thousand generations continue to enjoy the benefits conferred upon us by a united country.' He didn't say our sons and our son's sons. He said, our children, our daughters, as well as our sons. Why should our daughters have to run the high hurdles in life when our sons can run the low hurdles? All we ask is an equal chance at the starting gate. Like genuine risk, we'll get there on our own talents if we just have an equal opportunity to start. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania, one minute to explain her vote."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. speaker and Members of the House. Has anybody ever pointed out to most of you that it was Congressman 'Emanuel Seller' who introduced the Bill just before the end of World War II that would have drafted single women. It was the same Congressman Seller who kept ERA bottled up for decades in the House Judiciary Committee saying he wanted to protect women, to keep women on a pedestal. That is the American myth, Ladies and Gentlemen...the romance versus the reality. When they want us, they know where to find us. It won't be taking the bitter with the sweet if we get ERA ratified. It will be taking the bitter with the bitter if we don't get it ratified. We'll be drafted when they need us. You can count on it. We'll get equal responsibility, but we won't have equal rights. Please let us have equal rights before we get equal responsibility."

Speaker Redmond: "The rules do not permit taking of pictures during explanations of votes. Representative Brummer. The cameras, out. Representative Brummer, one minute to explain your vote."

Brummer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The bottom line here today is what does ERA do or what does it not do? We have heard both proponents say this is what it does and this is what it does not do. We have heard the same things in the opposite veins say...said by the opponents. We have had questions raised about ERA. What is ERA's impact on equal pay? What is ERA's impact on abortion? What is ERA's impact on social security rights? What is the impact of ERA's on draft of women in the military service and combat? What is the affect and impact of ERA on the family, on state's rights, on rights of privacy, on segregation of women in prisons? We have heard many other questions raised. The bottom line is 'What does ERA do?' The answer in my opinion is no one knows. We have certainly had reknowned..."

Speaker Redmond: "Your time is up. One minute isn't very long, so that's what the rules provide for. Bring your remarks to a close, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "No one knows with certainty what ERA does. Constitutional experts disagree. If we pass ERA we will only allow the courts to determine what ERA means. That should not occur, and we ought to defeat ERA and continue to work for equal rights legislation, and I would suggest a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis, one minute. Timer's on."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the people of the United States think that they have seen federal legislative oppression and federal judicial aggression, they haven't seen anything yet if the 27th Amendment is ratified. I

would simply leave you in my explanation of vote with a toast. Here's to women who are superior in every way and now wish to be merely equal."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly, one minute to explain your vote."

Kelly: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I am very seriously considering voting for this Amendment because of the vigorous lobbying activities by the anti-ERA persons last week in trying to defeat and defeating the call for a Constitutional Convention for the unborn. In my opinion, ERA has and always will take the backseat in the priority list to the abortion issue, and it certainly seems strange to me that we should be debating rights when over seven million babies have been violated in their rights since January of 1973. Ladies and Gentlemen, I am going to vote against this Amendment, but I repeat my warning to the opponents. If you continue to have an organized effort in defeating the call for a convention, you may very well see me vote favorably toward this proposition next time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Much has been said this afternoon on all counts, pro and con, regarding the Equal Rights Amendment. The one issue that seems to have been misunderstood on a consistent basis, and has caused much concern and opposition to the Amendment is the second Sections which states that Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of the Amendment. The truth is that seven other Constitutional Amendments have the same provision. They are the 13th, 14th, 15th, 19th, 23rd, 24th, and 26th Amendments. The language of the 10th Amendment in essence requires such a provision if the wording of an Amendment, a Constitutional Amendment, does not grant such powers in the

actual language of the Amendment. the 10th Amendment says, quote, 'The powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution nor prohibited by it to the states are reserved to the states respectively or to the people.' It is ironic that those who oppose the Equal Rights Amendment use the 14th Amendment as that part of the Constitution..."

Speaker Redmond: "One minute isn't very long. Conclude your remarks."

Macdonald: "They've used the 14th Amendment, and that Amendment has the very identical language that the 27th Amendment in its second Section has. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I urge you to join with me and bring long overdue equality. I strongly support the Equal Rights Amendment and vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J. David Jones, one minute to explain your vote."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to explain my non vote. In my comments of two years ago on the same subject, I said I will have to withhold my vote and abstain until the Senate has taken action similar to what we have done here today. As you all know it has to pass both Houses, and they should have it on the Third Reading in the same position that we do. In two years, the Senate has done nothing. I'll have to keep my word just as I have during my 16 years in this House. Irrespective of a call from the President of the United States, and I should have asked him how come you're calling Illinois when you haven't passed it in Georgia? I say to my colleagues of this House that I have stated my position, and I am prepared to take the consequences of my actions, and I have my hard hat over two years ago at hand for whatever flack or fall out that may prevail. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Every time we heard bogus arguments that we have heard for years and years by the opponents of this legislation, they are refuted. First we heard about unisex washrooms. That was refuted. Then we heard about the social security system. And that was refuted. Then we heard about child support, alimony, and maintenance, and that was refuted by court decisions and legal experience. Then we heard about the draft, and that was made mute by the under...deputy under the Secretary of Defense testifying that the United State and the Department of Defense have the legal right to draft women today and will consider to use women when and if necessary and up to their capability. There are no arguments left, Ladies and Gentlemen. The only proper vote is an 'aye' vote for this important Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Gaines, one minute to protect...to explain his vote."

Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First I want to take this opportunity to praise some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that have brought the fact out that freedom is for everybody. And I am asking the concerned citizens and voters in this chamber to be as concerned about the rights of blacks and other minorities as well as for women. And I am calling on my colleagues from the other side of the aisle to vote for ERA as a step toward equality for everyone. And I am appalled that they should be attacked as they have been attacked while standing up for the rights of the citizens...they voted...of their voters. So in closing, I am asking the non-black concerned Legislators to be concerned about the plight of the black masses in these cities....if you don't want some Miami type riots in Chicago and East St. Louis and other places. So this is

just one phase, equality for everyone. So if you pass this, and I hope we will, it is not the end. It is the beginning. And that is why I am asking all the Legislators, black and white alike, to vote 'yes' on ERA."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk, one minute to explain his vote."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, first of all, let me assure everyone I believe in human rights. I also believe that we have, its been mentioned many times today, equal protection under the federal Constitution. I also feel we have equal protection under the state Constitution. We have the Civil Rights Act. We have equal pay for equal work. The language in Section 1 is unnecessary, and I further feel we do, in fact, lose our state's rights because of the language in Section II. Therefore, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock, one minute to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is perhaps one of the proudest votes that I have cast in my ten years in the General Assembly. I succeeded an individual who served for 36 years in this House, and the legacy of the former 'Corniel A. Davis' represented this House as one fighting for human rights and dignity for all people in the State of Illinois, particularly for blacks and the oppressed. And I assured him when I came to the General Assembly that I would work very hard to see that the Equal Rights Amendment is passed, and I am proud to vote 'aye' on this measure today. In conclusion, House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #16 will come before this Body, and that deals with the District of Columbia and the people of that district to have full enfranchisement. I hope that those of you in the

gallery and those of you on both sides of the aisle who have lobbied extensively for House...Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #1 for full equality for women will give parity and will give the same consideration to House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #16 for full enfranchisement for the District of Columbia."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robbins, one minute to explain his vote. Timer's on. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, point of order, Mr. Speaker. Did I understand you to say previously during this debate or at the initiation of the debate that no secretaries, no clerks, no staff or anybody that is not entitled..."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Yourell: "To the House floor shall be not recognized."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Yourell: "Then I would suggest that the Chair has a responsibility to remove those people right now."

Speaker Redmond: "You tell me where they are, and I'll remove them."

Yourell: "They're all over, Mr. Speaker. I don't have to tell you. You..."

Speaker Redmond: "All persons not..."

Yourell: "...Recognize. You know 177 Members of this House."

Speaker Redmond: "All persons not entitled to the floor please leave the floor. Representative Robbins, one minute to explain his vote."

Robbins: "Mr...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first of all, I represent my district. My district has been polled. It is again..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell, for what purpose do you rise."

Yourell: "There are still Mem...people on this floor..."

Speaker Redmond: "You point them out to me, and I'll order them

off."

Yourell: "Former Representative Edgar is over there from the Governor's staff should be removed from the floor. Mr. 'Gilio' over there is not a Member should be removed. There are many Members over here who should not be on the floor of the House, and I wish you would exercise the authority of the chair and remove those Members."

Speaker Redmond: "Under the rules, former Members are entitled to the floor. The Governor's representative is entitled to the floor. We've ruled people not entitled to the floor, and they are. Representative Robbins, continue."

Robbins: "As I stated earlier, I represent the people in my district. My district says no. I will vote 'no'. The one thing that we should think about is if we would all vote 'yes', we would get rid of this problem as far as the Illinois General Assembly is concerned. We will bring it down upon the women. I have six daughters. I can also vote the way they asked me to, because they asked me to vote the way the district did. I had a sister-in-law that believes in equal rights. The government helped her find a job. She received equal pay loading steel and booming it down and handling chains that were almost twice her weight. If this is what the women want, let them have it."

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

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I voted 'no' on this Amendment four years ago when I was first privileged to serve in this Body. The reason for voting 'no' at that time was because of Section II which states, 'The congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this Article.' Tonight I am voting 'no', and for the same reason plain and simple. I believe in state's rights and so do those people

of my district. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich, one minute to explain his vote. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there have been a lot of legalistic opinions around here. I...mine are very simple. In the first place, I really believe in state sovereignty. Some of the people have come to me and said...I said why are you for it, and they said well, we might want to move to Arkansas. I said if you move to Arkansas you just live under the laws they pass down there and become a citizen there. If you want to stay in Illinois we have an Equal Rights Amendment here. The other thing that has been mentioned many times, I can't understand how anyone in this House would be willing to turn any more power over to the Congress of the United States and the Supreme Court of this Country. Certainly the biggest problems we have have been created by the Supreme Court of the United States, and I don't want any more from that source."

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

Christensen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, some of the previous speakers stated that women can do almost anything they want to do. Some say that women can have anything and earn enough money if they work hard enough. I would like to say this to those people who are voting red. If they can go back to the women in their district and tell them that they are not being discriminated against in any way, then keep voting red. But if you have to go back and say you are almost equal, then I would suggest you vote green."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all vote who wish? Representative Johnson, one minute to explain your vote."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, I think probably everybody has articulated

every argument on both sides, and I am sure that everyone's considered opinion on this is sincere and heartfelt. I guess the bottom line was expressed as well as anyone by Representative Brummer, and that is there's two ways of accomplishing an objective that most Americans share, and that is irratification of sex discrimination and a guarantee of equal rights under the law for everyone, and one of them is a crooked root, by crooked, I mean not certain, and the other is a direct root that reaches that goal in a comprehensive way without some collateral problems or potential problems, and I pursue the latter root. I think a 'no' vote on this is a responsible vote, a responsible vote not only for people who favor equal rights, but for those who believe...the Equal Rights Amendment, but those who believe in equal rights as well. I think that in balance this is an unnecessary Amendment to the Constitution, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge, one minute to explain your vote. Timer's on."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am voting 'yes' for the ERA because I believe fundamentally that all human beings are equal, and they have a right to be treated equal under the law. I have heard, and I have listened very carefully to all the speeches here today, and I remember something that Franklin 'Delanor' Roosevelt said back in the thirties, and that is 'The only thing we have to fear is fear itself.' I believe that basically we are all here in order to help every individual develop to the fullest of his or her potential. The Equal Rights Amendment will give women an opportunity to be treated fairly under the law. I think that each woman in our society is entitled to that right under the law. The basic issue here is fairness, simple fairness, and I believe that if we enact this Amendment, we

will have a greater, a more majestic democracy...a stronger and a more solid democracy, and I believe it is the institu..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, will you please poll the absentees?"

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 97 'aye', and 70 'no', and a request has been made for a poll of the absentees. Please be in your seat. Senator Washington, be in your seat."

Clerk Leon: "Poll of the absentees. Barnes..."

Speaker Redmond: "Barnes, 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Dawson...Harris. Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Laurino. Leon..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leon, 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Stearney. VonBoeckman and Williamson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williamson."

Williamson: "Mr. Speaker, how did I vote?"

Speaker Redmond: "How did he vote? Absent, I believe."

Williamson: "Put me on as 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williamson as 'aye'. Representative...anything further? Representative Jones. Emil Jones."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, no matter how you vote on this issue, if you come from a district like I do, and you listen and you read your mail, you vote for it, you make enemies, you vote against it you make enemies, but the Assistant Majority Leader who has worked very hard on this issue, James Taylor, leaned very hard on me, and said he wants this vote, so vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Emil Jones, 'aye'. Yeah...Anyone else who wants to be on the Roll Call? Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to please be voted 'aye' in compliance with the way I have voted in the past. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "This isn't an explanation of votes. 'Prohabitation' is doing it..."

Harris: "I would like to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Harris, 'aye'. Anything further? How many are there, Mr. Clerk? On this question there's 101 'aye', and 71 'no'...Who? Representative Stearney...Stearney, 'aye'. Anything further now before you start all the...anyone want to be added on the Roll Call? Representative Chapman. What is...what is the count? 102 'aye', and 71 'no'. Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. Representative Madigan. You don't have anything do you, Clerk? Representative Madigan, 12 o'clock tomorrow."

Madigan: "Does the Clerk require any time?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, you don't require any time, do you? No."

Madigan: "I move that we adjourn to 12 noon tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "They all know. Don't forget the Island Bay Yacht Club. Representative Madigan, moved that we adjourn until tomorrow at 12 o'clock. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carried. The House stands adjourned, 12 o'clock tomorrow."

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 18, 1980

PAGE 1

SB-1480	2ND READING	PAGE	3
SB-1508	3RD READING	PAGE	50
SB-1510	2ND READING	PAGE	84
SB-1522	3RD READING	PAGE	45
SB-1548	3RD READING	PAGE	45
SB-1559	2ND READING	PAGE	86
SB-1577	3RD READING	PAGE	80
SB-1589	MOTIONS	PAGE	49
SB-1621	3RD READING	PAGE	51
SB-1668	2ND READING	PAGE	73
SB-1709	3RD READING	PAGE	53
SB-1728	2ND READING	PAGE	8
SB-1739	MOTIONS	PAGE	102
SB-1740	MOTIONS	PAGE	102
SB-1741	3RD READING	PAGE	53
SB-1747	2ND READING	PAGE	13
SB-1752	3RD READING	PAGE	81
SB-1760	2ND READING	PAGE	73
SB-1810	2ND READING	PAGE	14
SB-1815	2ND READING	PAGE	14
SB-1817	3RD READING	PAGE	54
SB-1821	3RD READING	PAGE	44
SB-1881	3RD READING	PAGE	56
SB-1884	2ND READING	PAGE	14
SB-1956	3RD READING	PAGE	63
SB-1957	2ND READING	PAGE	15
SB-1966	3RD READING	PAGE	75
	3RD READING	PAGE	79
SB-1967	3RD READING	PAGE	81
SB-1979	2ND READING	PAGE	21
SB-2002	3RD READING	PAGE	77
SB-2004	3RD READING	PAGE	78
SB-2005	3RD READING	PAGE	46
SB-2006	3RD READING	PAGE	47
SB-2019	MOTIONS	PAGE	102
SB-2020	2ND READING	PAGE	28
HJR-0104	1ST READING	PAGE	44
	3RD READING	PAGE	68
*HJR-0001	3RD READING	PAGE	109

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 18, 1980

PAGE 2

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
SPEAKER REDMOND - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	2
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	3
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	43
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	74
ERA, 3RD READING	PAGE	109
HOUSE ADJOURNED	PAGE	161