

W. Robert Blair: "The House will please come to order.
The prayer will be by Joe Carey."

Carey: "Let us pray. The public can get its distance and be
the best thing, O God, be merciful to me a sinner. Amen."

W. Robert Blair: "Introduction and first reading of constitu-
tional Amendments."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution #20, Keller, et al. Re-
solved by the House of Representatives, 78th General
Assembly, State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein that
there shall be submitted to the Elections of this State at
the General Election next occurring at least six months
after the adoption of the resolution and proposition to
the Act, Section 11 to Article 9, of the Constitution, the
added Section to read as follows: Article IX - Section 11.
Restrictions on New or Increased Taxes. No tax, whether
a property or non-property tax, may be increased above the
rate or amount authorized on the effective date of this
Section, nor may any new tax be imposed, by the state or
any unit of local government or school district, unless



the increase or the imposition of the new tax is approved by the electors of this State or of the unit of local government or school district, as the case may be, by referendum. Schedule. This amendment to the Constitution is effective upon its approval by the electors at the 1974 general election. The first reading of the Constitutional amendment. I guess that's all we got, huh?"

W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Friedland from Kan moves that we recess until 10:00 o'clock. All in favor say Aye."

W. Robert Blair: "The House will be in order. The invocation this morning by visiting clergy introduced by Dr. Johnson."

Dr. Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House. The invocation this morning, will be given by Reverend Marvin Raymond who is pastor of Trinity Lutheran Church in Moline, Pastor Raymond."

Pastor Raymond: "Let us pray. O Lord, God, who art the refuge in strength of thy people in all generations and therefore, are possible help even on this present moment. We pause, then, to return thanks to Thee for the blessings of the past. Even though these moments of prayer are not intended as our only contact with Thee, this date, yet they often become just that. Forgive us, then, Lord, for our lack of better communication with Thee. Sensing the growing responsibility that our fellow men place upon us, help us to so discharge our duties in such a manner, that we are true to the best that we know. Truly helpful to those that look to us for help, bringing honor to the reputation of



our fair State and glory to Thy holy name O most high. Give us the unction of our spirit to lead and guide us to sense what things should have top priority on our time and our devotion to this day. Bless us with good judgement in dealing with the same. We also are mindful of the illness and approaching surgery for Representative John Grotberg. We pray that Thou will work through the doctors and nurses with the healing helpfulness for him, that we may be returned to health and to service here in the House. This we ask in the name of Jesus Christ, who had a sense of mission and dedicated Himself to it. Amen."

W. Robert Blair: "Roll call for attendance." The Gentlemen from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Mr. Speaker, would you please have the record to indicate that Representative Krause and Representative Richard Carter are absent because of illness."

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

W. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, will be record show that Representatives Granata, Wall, and Randolph are absent because of illness."

W. Robert Blair: "And Grotberg. The journal will so indicate. Committee Reports."

Fred Selcke: "A...Mr. Schoeberlein from Public Utilities to which House Bill 534 was referred reported same back with the recommendation that the bill do pass and be referred to the Appropriations Committee. Mrs. Dyer from Higher Education to which House Bill 384 was referred, reported same back with amendments thereto, with the recommendation that the



amendments be adopted, that the bill, as amended, do not pass. Mrs. Dyer from Higher Education, to which House Bill 473 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the bill do not pass. Mrs. Dyer, from Higher Education, to which House Bill 474 was referred, reported the same back with amendments thereto, with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted, that the bill, as amended do pass. Mrs. Dyer, from Higher Education, to which House Bill 621 was referred, reported same back with the recommendation that the bill do pass. No further committee reports."

W. Robert Blair: "Introductions."

Fred Selcke: "A...House Bill 919, McAvoy. Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, first reading of the bill."

W. Robert Blair: "Agreed resolutions."

Fred Selcke: "A...House Resolution 155, Skinner, et al. House Resolution 158, Terzich, et al. House Resolution 160, Duff, et al. House Resolution 161, Matijevich, et al. House Resolution 162, R. N. Holloway, et al. House Resolution 167, R. L. Dunne, et al. House Resolution, Polk, and House Joint Resolution 19, DiPrima."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the questions on the adoption of the agreed resolutions. All those in favor say Aye, opposed,

No, the Ayes have it and the agreed resolutions are adopted.

Fred Selcke: "That was Kosinski here."

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

W. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recess for thirty



for the purpose of a Rules Committee meeting and I would ask the members of the Rules Committee immediately in Room 212."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the Gentleman now is noticing that there will be a Rules Committee called for 212 immediately upon recess and we'll be back on the floor ...a...in thirty minutes...a ten minutes of eleven. All those in favor of the gentleman's motion to recess say Aye. Opposed No, and the House will be in recess. Members of the Rules Committee in 212."

Telcser: "We're going to be convening the House in about fifteen minutes."

W. Robert Blair: "Alreight, the House will be in order. The members please be in their seats. The door keeper clear the aisles of those persons not entitled to the floor, so that we may conduct our business in an orderly manner. The Gentlemen from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think for the second time in the history of my being a member of this body, which has been a considerable length of time, I'm going to avail myself this morning, to use a point of personal privilege, and I don't think that probably with considering the matter that is before us today that it could be a more appropriate time than for me to .a.s.say that the Speaker, yesterday,



ask a young lady to serve as the Speaker of this House, and I know how deeply she was touched by the designation by the Speaker of having her to act as the temporary Speaker of this House. I've know this young lady for a considerable amount of time. I knew her at the democratic national convention in Miami, I've known her now that since she has come to this House for her first term, and we got along pretty good down in Miami, quit laughin, but I want the members of this body to recognize the acting Speaker as of yesterday, of the legislature, our friend, Peggy Smith Martin, from my immediate left."

W. Robert Blair: "For what purpose do you rise, Mrs. Martin?"
A...proceed."

Mrs. Martin: Right: I'd just like to take this opportunity to thank Representative Choate for that very kind word. I'd like to thank you too, Mr. Speaker. It was indeed a pleasure and an honor on yesterday for me, as a woman, from a poor community of Chicago to serve as temporary Speaker. Not only vesterday, but if you remember when I cam here on January 10, I first nominated a woman for the first time in the history of this State, to become Speaker. Not being disrespectful to you at all, Mr. Speaker. I think that today that ...a...hopefully, we'll be having E.R.A. and I should like to come back at that time in full support of E.R.A. having for one time in my life as a woman been Speaker of the House. It was, indeed, an honor that was bestowed upon me and I'd like to thank you very much and I hope the time will come again. Thank you."



W. Robert Blair: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Well, Mr. Leinenweber rise?"

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to the House a group from our 42nd Districe and also the 39th District, from Joliet Junior College's Political Science Class. They are on a field trip, hopefully to learn something. They are here with their .a..a.. Professor, Ms. Anderson."

W. Robert Blair: "Where are they?"

Leinenweber: "Up in the balcony scattered around, I understand. Please stand."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

W. Robert Blair: "Start."

Cunningham: "The House is honored to have the lovely wife of another distinguished Representative from Will County in the Speaker's gallery at the right side. I would introduce Mrs. Jerry Leinenweber. Jane, Tom, Jim, and Harry."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, we're waiting for some things to come out of the...a...out of printing for the desk and while were doing that we will go to third reading for a couple of bills that, right at the start of the calendar, that need to be addressed early becuae they ran out of time. So House Bills third reading, House Bill 4, I understand, the gentleman does not desire to be called and so proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 5, Washington. An act making January 15 a holiday, third reading of the bill."



W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington."
Washington: "Mr. Speaker, and members of the House. I ask
leave to join House Bill 6 was fired because they are
companion bills."

W. Robert Blair: "Does the gentleman have leave? Hearing no
objection, read 6."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 6, Washington, a bill for an act to
amend an act delaying promissory notes, third reading of
the bill."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. House Bill
5 and 6 provide. Mr. Speaker may I have som order please?"

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, let's have a little order in the
chamber."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. House Bill
5&6 provide that on January 15 of each year, that it shall
be a State holiday in memory of our late Dr. Martin Luther
King. I'm goint to be very brief Mr. Speaker, because of
several other members of the House, have remarks to make
relative to this bill. Let me simply say this, last session
we passed this Bill out of the House with a tremendous vote,
it passed the Senate and went to the Governor. The Governor,
after considering this bill for a long period of time, placed
upon it an amendatory veto and brought it back to the House.
I let the bill die there and introduced it again this year.
I think the Governor was rather hard pressed to place an
amendatory veto on that bill. Because I am convinced, based
upon his performance in the passed, with our cumulative



April 4, 1973

4-4-73

commemorative holiday law, that he was in sympathy with the bill. I want to make one thing very clear. In no way does this bill effect the schools in the State. There will be no school holiday. All it provides is that on January 15 of each year, that there shall be a State holiday and that the Governor, by proclamation, can provide for certain events staged by the State and has with it all the other concomitance that go along with a State holiday. I need not impress upon you the importance of this bill to many, many people in- the State of Illinois and throughout the country. There's a movement afoot now, in practically every State in the Union to provide for State holidays in memory of Dr. King. No State yet, has done this. I feel that it will be coming. But I would like for this State, the great State of Abraham Lincoln-, to be the first State to pay due recognition to what we all consider to be an extremely great man. I will confine my additional remarks, Mr. Speaker, to closing, because several members have indicated they wish to speak. I urge your acceptance of House Bills 5 and 6."

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

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. I rise to support the two bills in questin here on this day, a day that I think was a day of infamy in the history of this country. I tend to be slow in what I'm about to say for I had the privilege and I had in my lifetime fortunate to



able to walk some of the paths with Dr. King. I would cherish that forever. Hopefully, I wish that many of us here today and many of the young people that will be touched by his life in the coming generation, would have had that privilege. I believe that we could not do more to further his dreams than to have a day set aside to celebrate the birth of this great man. Mr. Speaker, could I have a little order."

W. Robert Blair: "Proceed."

Barnes: "I shall be very brief with my comments, but I would like to read something that I set down last night and thinking about the days and the days that have passed, April 4, 1968. I would like to offer this that was written in one of the works of Jerome Bennett, it comes from his book, What Manner of Man. He said in that book, if it is true as Carl Sandberg has so eloquently said, that a tree is measured best when it is down, and in April 1968, in the Easter season, when a tall young tree fell in the United States of America, men sided with each other in describing its size. Best described, I believe, in the words of Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, King was called to God, if Amos and Michael were prophets in the eighth century B.C. Martin Luther King was a prophet in the 20th century. If Isiah was called to God to prophesize in his day, Martin Luther was called to God to prophesize in his day. If Hosiiah was sent to preach in forgiveness centuries ago, Martin Luther was sent to expound the doctrine of non-violence and forgive-



ness in the third quarter of the 20th century. I think that those words are the most eloquent words that could be written about a person and the most eloquent thing that could be said about any individual. I believe that a heritage has been left, not only the State, but this country as a whole, and has been left to a people, and I think that in a dream that was deferred on April 4, 1968, that we could, in some measurable way, continue to let generations to come, to know of a man whose deeds was forever burned in the etchings of this country. A man, who should be honored with a holiday honoring the birth in this nation. Mr. Speaker, I am imploring everyone in this House, who did not have the opportunity to know this man, who did not have the opportunity to ever be within his company, to reflect on the life that he performed for us to follow, and I implore you to vote Aye on making our State to be the first State in this nation to recognize and to honor this man in this way. Thank you very much."

Blair: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Juckett."

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield for a question or two?"

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

Juckett: "How many State holidays are there that honor a man?"

Washington: "I'll have to rely upon my memory which is not infallible, Representative Juckett, but Abraham Lincoln is one, George Washington is another, to the best of my recollection, there may be others. Christopher Columbus



pardon me Victor Arrigo. Christopher Columbus.

Juckett: Oka, so that there are two holidays specifically for men, one being Christopher Columbus, and one being Abraham Lincoln,"

Washington: "And George Washington."

Juckett: "No I think you'll find that George Washington's...a... its not his birthday and its called President's Day and it honors all Presidents."

Washington: "I would accept that information."

Juckett: "How many ..a...how many Illinoisians are so honored by having their birthdays declared as holidays?"

Washington: "I'm not aware of any Representative Juckett, and I don't understand what direction your interrogation is going in. Let me say simply this. If there is no precedent for what I'm doing today, it does not concern me, what I'm simply saying, and what Representative Barnes said, and what other speakers will say, is that here is a man who a substantial number of people throughout this country, particularly in the State of Illinois, deemed set to honor by a State holiday. This legislative body is a precedent setter. I can think of no better precedent to set, not only in this State, but throughout the country, than by honoring the late Dr. Martin Luther King. So if your interrogation is going to continue along those lines, except my last remark as covering the entire spectrum of what you can conceive of as being the reason why we should not support this bill."



Juckett: "Well, if and when we set this precedent, how much will this cost the State of Illinois in taxes paid to employees? How much will this cost the consuming public for salaries and wages which are paid, but which are not earned?"

Washington: "I'm not aware of the cost, but I say whatever the cost, we have an obligation to people who make a tremendous contribution to this country and State, and I think the American people, and particularly Illinoisians, are prepared to pay that cost, because they realize that life is not simply a question of bread and money, we have to do honor, we have to uplift ourselves, we have to respect and do justice to the people who set standards in life for us to follow. And I think the people in the State of Illinois, and the General Assembly in the past, has indicated that they are prepared to pay that cost."

Juckett: "Although this bill is and has been introduced with good intent, I think we ought to look beyond the emotionalism of its very able sponsor. We ought to look beyond the phrases and the catchy tunes which he is playing for us. We have to realize that there are over 100,000 employees of the State of Illinois and each and every year that this bill, if it becomes law, would be in effect, we would be paying millions of dollars for people not to report to work. We also have to look at the consumers and the fact that the consumer will have to pay likewise, not just millions of dollars in taxes, but millions of dollars in



4-4-73

items for which they are not going to get any kind of return. And, let's take a look at the bill, itself. It says that it shall be a legal holiday. Now what does that mean? That means that we who abide by legal holidays will not go to work. It also means that the school children will not go to school. Now wouldn't it be a more fitting tribute to this great man of peace, that we declare it to be a commemorative holiday and that we require that in the schools, they learn about the objectives of this man, rather than saying, Oh goody, hey, we got a day off from school and let's go out and play. There not going to give a darn about the fact that it was somebody's birthday. They're not going to pay any attention to that. All they're going to say is that Hey, we got a day off, we don't have to go to school. Or we've got a day off with pay and we don't have to worry about it. It would be much more fitting to teach the principles of a man that this sponsor is trying to honor than it is to say let's have a day off, because when we have a day off, it literally means, a day off. Their not going to think about Martin Luther King, their not going to think about his principles, their not going to give a darn about it. They're just going to say Hey let's thank Representative ...the Representative who put this bill in. So let's cast a vote no and then let's come back and do it the right way, so that we can learn his principles, we can learn his standards for which he stood and died for, and at the same time, we can save



millions and millions of dollars. So I would urge a no vote on this very misguided, but well-intentioned bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The lady from Cook, Mrs. Martin."

Martin: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. Today a baffled nation takes inventory, reassessing its development at a time when polarization among its people is deeper than it has ever been since the Civil War. We are in a civil crisis, so it is perhaps appropriate that we come before this General Assembly, asking this body to set aside a day to commemorate the life of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. It is not a singular achievement, the fact that he was a recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize. Over three scores of honorary degrees, and nearly 500 awards for civil leadership, that we honor with a holiday, it is what he inspired black people to do collectively, and what he led the nation to be. Martin Luther King believed in America, he spoke of it with an eloquent and profound love, he loved its institutions and while belaboring its needs for reform, he never belittled the land of his birth. In the last 1960's, black youth, after an emotional and physical exhausting period covering three or more years and the best in humanity of Mississippi, South West Georgia, and Alabama, where they wore themselves out in the struggle for freedom, cried inwards and wore their voices out crying black power in an equal critical struggle to define their self-identity racially. In 1963, most of them had gone to Washington asserting that there was no black or white issue



in the nation. Only an issue of justice versus injustice. They were irreputably right, but the pain of the Mississippi project and the riots of Watts had brought them by 1965 to see that the hard lines of black and white were possibly irratricable. The melting pot had become a boiling caldrion in Mississippi and Minnesota, compelling blacks to affirm themselves against the overwhelming landscape of white America. Dr. King, who sent the reality in that argument none the less, perceived a clear truth that America must indeed become one nation indivisible with liberty and justice for all. And all included, Mr. Speaker, poor white, Chicanos, Puerticans Americans, women and children whose rights were continually in jeopardy. The fact that America was bread on Edmond, Prentice, Reardon, Elmer, along Highway 51, where Viola Nautso was to die after carrying civil rights marchers back to their headquarters in Montgomery, were again to haunted at Market Park in Chicago. Most of us remember the tragdey which brought Chicago and a large number of norther cities to the very brink of distress, on those terrible spring nights while in the wake of Dr. King's death, but have any of you stopped to think of what might have happened, the night that Dr. King was bent in gaze in Market Park. What might have happened had the ...that he truly been the agitator, a trouble maker, many have called him. We are not asking to commemorate the life of a saint along, we are requesting this place, the land of Lincoln, to celebrate the life of a man who could



and did walk with kings, but kept the common touch. We kept the pulse of the common people, unknown beyond the acreage of their cotton fields, or peanuts sections. The fugitive sides of streets and back alleys of southern cities of our hard asphalt of our metropolitan northern cities. He listened to their heartbeat, chartered the cardiac conditions of the nation itself, rather on I Street in Washington or J Street in Montgomery, rather on East 58th Street Watts, or East 47th Street in Chicago. April 4, 1968 event at the Laraine Hotel in Memphis was an attempt to assassinate the nation's conscience, but Martin Luther King did not die in Memphis and he will not die in the history of our conscious memory. His journey to the mountaintop tells his people to see beyond the horizon painted in the drab color of helplessness. It lead them to hold on with some very persuasive signs suggested that there may be the last hold out. I am a freshman legislator today, a woman, and a black person, whose election can be partly attributed to his words. For again, it is but a small, no less significant, part of his legicacy that when we were in Selma, Alabama, in 1965, only 6 parts..."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, we need a little order, the lady now will bring her remarks to a close, her time is expiring."

Martin: "Only 6.5 of the black population of Dallas County were registered to vote. Today over 65% of the black population is registered and five of Selma 10 city councilman are black."



Indeed, Alabama had no black public elected officials outside of Macon. Today there are over 2700 elected black officials whereas when we were on the bridge in Alabama, we had only 200 blackpublic elected officials. Ladies and gentlemen of this House, today five year's ago, Martin Luther King was killed. I beg of you to please vote yes on House Bill 5 and 6. Thank you very much."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Piotrowicz."

Piotrowicz: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House.

This measure we have before us to day, to me, is more than just a recognition of the contributions that Dr. King has made to us in terms of awareness of problems and purpose and reordering of priorities. I think what it means that a recognition on our part of the contributions made by thousands of people to the development of our nation. It is a recognition on our part of the contribution members of his race have made to the development of our nation and our way of life. Without taking any more time, Mr. Speaker I favor this bill, this measure and urge the members of this assembly to give it a favorable vote."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Thompson."

Thompson: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House.

I rise with pride in support of these bills. I'm surprised that some of the things that have been said in brining in the conversation, the dollar sign. I'm surprised that the remarks that our made, sometimes making a joke out of the bills, and I would like to inform one of the previous



speakers that man does not live by bread alone. Perhaps if more of us would pattern our lives after the life of Dr. King and what he stood for, we would not be living in these chaotic times in which we are facing today. I think it would behoove all of us to remember what he stood for. I think the bills are befitting and beneficial and I think every one of us should vote yes on this bill and try to pattern our lives from the things that Dr. King stood for. Thank you very much."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Ms. Catania."

Catania: "As a lady, not a gentleman, arise, Mr. Speaker, to support House Bills 5 and 6. I think that no one in this House would dispute the fact that Dr. Martin Luther King was a great black leader. And I think that as the history books of the State of Illinois begin to include black history as well as white history, we are slowly achieving some appreciation of the contribution of black citizens to this nation. The fabric of American history is not just one color. It is many colors and I think that we have an opportunity to recognize that today in this House. I think that every resident of the State should be able to be aware and acknowledge the greatness of Dr. Martin Luther King. The greatest advocate of non-violence that this nation has known. And I'm sure that we would all agree that a yearly reminder of the value of non-violence would be a good thing in this State. I would ask you not to listen to me read, but to read for yourselves the



in the Chicago Tribune today by Vernon Gerog. He says it all a lot better than I could say it, about Dr. Martin Luther King. I hope that you will join me in voting Aye on House Bills 5 and 6, which means a great deal to the people of my district, also I think to the people of the State of Illinois, and also to the people of the entire United States."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentleman of the House.

A sense of inadequacy falls offensively upon me as I search for words to express my love, my respect, and my admiration for Dr. Martin Luther King. I want to thank the Speaker of this House for recognizing me, calling upon me after one of the ladies of this House, a distinguished lady of this House has spoken. It is altogether fitting and proper in describing Martin Luther King that I follow the solemn words of a dedicated female member of this House, because if you will review your history and the life of Dr. Martin Luther King, it was a noble woman, a noble woman, if you please, and we stand here now, they tell me on the eve of equal rights, the Equal Rights Amendment. It was a noble woman that inspired Dr. Martin Luther King in his famous Montgomery bus boycott. Her name was Rosa Park. She had worked all day. She was tired. She boarded a bus, public transportation in Montgomery. She paid her fare like everybody else on the bus. She was seated quietly and respectfully on that bus. Finally,



when the bus reached a certain section of the city, it became crowded and she was told simply because of her color she had to give up her seat although she had paid the same fare that everyone who had boarded that bus had paid. She refused to give up her seat, and you know the story, she was arrested. Taken to jail. It was the courage of this noble woman when, let me tell you something, this is true, this is true here in this country. Very little is said about the courage of noble women. It was the courage of this noble woman, being deprived of her seat, being persecuted on that bus, that inspired Dr. Martin Luther King. Yes, he had a great educated mind. And an educated mind is a valuable asset. But let me tell you something else about Martin Luther King, he had an educated heart. And an educated heart, is far more valuable than an educated mind. For out of the abundance of the heart....."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, now..... could we have a little order here, please."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

W. Robert Blair: "All right."

Davis: "I'm quoting the scripture now. Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. Dr. Martin Luther King spoke out of the abundance of his heart. His heart was as broad as the needs of the poor people whatever their race or color may be. With his heart, he won friends to his call, friends of all races and all creeds. I can see now the number of young Jewish Rabbies marching with him."



I can see now the number of Roman Catholics and nuns marching with him. I can see now the Epicopal priests marching with him. I can see..... my mind goes back to that horrible scene down in my native state of Mississippi, where two white people and one black person was buried under the damn, I can see this, for he won the admiration of all people with his heart, his courage, his calm judgement, and his common sense motivated him and lead people to follow his call. That's why I say that there's a sense of inadequency in me trying to express words that would desribe Dr. Martin Luther King. No oratorio was any greater, for the very oratory of Martin Luther King was like a flight of golden arrows, calling upon the ears of all the black children. Nobody can ever frame a picture large enough to include the Christ-like character of Dr. Martin Luther King. To him that doith good, having the unlimited power to do evil. And he had the unlimited power, with all of his followers to do evil, remember this. Dr. Martin Luther King deserved praise, not only for the good which he has done, but for the evil that he fought against. Instead of his nonvilent principles, he could legally lift millions of people to violence, done a disservice to this nation, do you hear. But he choose the nonviolent philosophy, knowing full well of the great admanition that comes out of his Bible. That if you live by the sword, you die by the sword. He went about doing good, nonviolently. We ask today, only for a meager measure of the great honor,



the great honor that is due Martin Luther King, not only by the State of Illinois, but by this nation, for his nonviolent philosophy. We hold up our heads, we make a pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States, and we talk about one nation indivisible, and this is what we say..... with liberty and justice for all. Well let me tell you this and Martin Luther King and his philosophy. Help to make this..... in these times, one nation indivisibly with liberty and justice to all. I plead with you now to vote 'yes' for the Bills sponsored by my distinguished colleague, five and six, in this House, an honor of a great American, Dr. Martin Luther King."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, while urging the Members of the General Assembly to vote in favor of these two Bills, I move the previous question."

W. Robert Blair: "I just heard the last part of that. All those in favor say 'aye', the opposed 'no'. All right the previous question has been moved. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harold Washington to close."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'll be very very brief. I think it is very fitting on this day, which is the anniversary of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, that this great House should rise to the occasion and pay due deference to his life and works. We've heard some excellent remarks about the life of Dr. King, but one phrase that caught my ear was that used by



Representative Piotrowicz, and if he may excuse me for not doing full justice to his remarks, I think he put his finger on the real crux of what we're talking about. Representative Piotrowicz said that we're not just honoring one great man who was great, but what we're honoring is a travail and the history and the contributions of a great people in this country. And on that note, ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to support House Bill #5 and #6."

W. Robert Blair: "Question is shall these two Bills pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no' and the Clerk will take two records. Explanation? Have all voted who wished? Houlihan... Jim Houlihan 'aye'. Capuzi, 'aye'. The Clerk will take the record. On each of these questions the vote is 114 'ayes'.....15 'nays', each of these Bills having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, the Rules Committee this morning pursuant to Rule 11, adopted a motion to go to a special order of business, which order of business shall be consideration of a rule change ah.... that's noted on the Supplemental House Calendar that's on your desk and ah.... Mr. Speaker, I move that we go to that order of business."

W. Robert Blair: "Well, ah.... the ah... special order has been distributed and it is on the Members desks, and the Majority Leader is calling attention of the Members to the



fact that that special order is on their desks. For what purpose does the gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirshfeld arise?"

Hirshfeld: "A point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

After we have considered the matter that has just been brought up by the distinguished Majority Leader, when we go to the subject matter itself, that this rule concerns itself with, namely the Constitutional Amendments, will the Constitutional Amendments be called in the order they are on the calendar?"

W. Robert Blair: "Well, ah... that's a couple of places down ah... the business. Under the rules ah... every order of business goes through numerical call and ah.... that's the way that the Speaker would ask the Clerk to go is we do get to that this morning. Anybody who doesn't desire to have their resolutions called, they may ask that they be taken out of the record when we get to them."

Hirshfeld: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

W. Robert Blair: "O'kay. Now,....there has been put on your desks, as noted by the Majority Leader, a special order of the day, which was considered by the Committee on Rules this morning. That is now on the Members desks. And there has also been printed a Supplemental House Calendar, which shows the special order of the day, so I will go to that special order of business for deliberation by the House at this time. Now, the Clerk will read the matters that are listed under the special order."



Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution 176, W. D. Walsh. WHEREAS, the Attorney General of the State of Illinois has ruled, in Opinion S-456, dated May 11, 1972, that Section 4 of Article XIV of the Illinois Constitution of 1970 is unconstitutional and void as in conflict with Article V of the United States Constitution and....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Wait a minute. Ah.. for what purpose does the gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. Juckett, rise?"

R. S. Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Under Rule 73, both Rules 73 (c), (d) and (e), I think, are applicable on this Rule. And, it says that, 'Rules may be amended only by Resolution', which this is. And, Section (e) indicates that, 'Resolutions for the Amendments, for the House Rules, for the Joint Rules may be initiated by the Committee on Rules', which I understand this is. And, Rule (d) says that, 'the Committee of Rules... on Rules, when considering Resolutions under this Sub-Section (c), which would apply to the House Rules Committee, shall be subject to the notice requirements of Rule 18'. Rule 18 is the Posting Resolution which indicates, I believe, six and a half days and I don't recall that notice has been given for this Rules Resolution change. My point of order then is that we can not take action on this Resolution because the proper posting has not been made."



And thus, there would have to be notice and further deliberations."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, the Chair's ruling on that is that ah.. the requirement ah.. for notice to which you referred under Section (d) is limited to ah.. the situation described in the first sentence of (d). And, that is, 'Any Resolution proposing to amend a House Rule or Joint Rule, which is offered by a Member on the floor, shall be referred to the Committee on Rules'. That is not the case here. Ah.. this is a matter which is coming directly out of the Rules Committee and ah.. is operative under ah.. Rules... under Section (f) which is a Resolution to amend the House Rules. A Joint Rule which is adopted by a three-fifths vote of the Members of the Committee on Rules may be adopted by an affirmative vote of 89 Members'."

R. S. Juckett: "Well, Mr. Speaker, under Section (d), they do have two Sections and they do refer, as you so indicated, to a person. But, the sentence I read refers to Section (c) which says that, 'Rules may be amended only by Resolutions. And, any Resolution being offered to amend the Rule, which is also included under Section (e), will not comply to the ah.. Rule on Notice'. The sentence, that I'm referring to, does not apply to only the Section (d), but it applies to, 'Rules may be amended only by Resolutions'."

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



G. W. Shea: "It seems that this morning we met with the House, and I heard no objection at that time to the meeting, and any ah.. objection to posting."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. well all right. Two points is that.. with regard to the point that you made, ah.. that ah.. the literal reading that.. of that last sentence of that section is contradictory on its face, and that's the clause with the typographical error there where you read (c).. That's supposed to be (d). Ah.. the Committee on Rules. 'When considering Resolutions under this sub-section', and this sub-section is (d), not (c). Now, secondly, ah.. the Journal of February 1, 1973, shows that this matter has been under consideration by ah.. the Rules Committee ah.. since that time on the Resolution by Mrs. Catania. The exact language that's here, and so the Chair rules that your point is not well taken. All right. The Clerk will continue to read. All right. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

D. E. Deuster: "Ah..Mr. Speaker, I was on the ah.. Floor earlier in the day listening intently and ah.. I heardthe Chair announce that we were going on to take a recess, at which time the Rules Committee would be meeting. And I listened very carefully, because I've been following the subject with great interest, as the Chair knows, and I heard no reference to this subject. However, as a Member, I suspected what the subject might be, and so I went



downstairs and discovered that the subject was indeed what I suspected it was. Ah.. I don't think I want to proceed when we're considering the solemn and important Legislative responsibility of amending the.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Would you state your point of order?"

That's what you're up for."

D. E. Deuster: "Yes, my point of order is that.. is that the Chair's ruling that ah.. no notice need be given of a meeting of the Rules Committee.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "That's quite correct. And that's why we're proceeding on with provisions of sub-section (d). There's no notice requirement because it's not a standing hearing Committee."

D. E. Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a further Parliamentary Inquiry. I realize that is the position of the Chair, now, at the hour of 10 minutes to one."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, we'll meet tomorrow and the next day."

D. E. Deuster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

C. J. Fleck: "Ah.. as a question to the Resolution.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "We haven't had an opportunity to have it read yet. And as soon as we can get to that, ah.. why then the Chair will recognize ah.. any other points of order."



Fredric B. Selcke: "That Section IV of Article XIV, the Illinois Constitution of 1970 is unconstitutional and void, as with conflict with Article V of the United States Constitution, and the pronouncement of the United States Supreme Court, interpreting the Federal Constitutional provision, and whereas the Attorney General of the State of Illinois.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Wait a minute now. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Juckett arise?"

R. S. Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the information that you gave to me about Representative Catania's Resolution being before the House Rules Committee. I must call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that the Resolution that we are dealing with is House Resolution 176. The last Resolution that I have a record of from our date of Thursday, March 22nd of our our Journals, shows House Resolution 139, so obviously, House Resclution 176 had to be introduced after March 22nd, and I would suspect it was introduced today or yesterday. It also refers to the Attorney General's opinion, not only of May 11th, 1972, but also the opinion of April 2nd, 1973. So, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit House Resolution 176 is not been in the House for any length of time, that it was specifically introduced within the last day or even this morning, and that Mr. Speaker, there was no provision of the Rules leave, that this Resolution does not comply with the Rules, and I again reiterate my point



that we are acting illégally as a House of Representatives by considering that we have not, in regard to House Resolution 176, followed the Rules of the House."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

B. B. Wolfe: "Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I'm assuming Mr. Speaker, that the House is acting under Rule 73 (e) on Resolutions for amendment of House Rules or the Joint Rules which may be initiated by the Committee on Rules. Now, it seems to me that the special order of the day which was voted on by the Rules Committee when all of this transpired is, as was our Colleague, that the Committee was proceeding under its Rules properly to consider a special order of the day and a Resolution of that Committee which is permitted under Rule 73 (e), on the initiation, 73 (d). I have a notation on my Rules of an Amendment which was placed on the Rule before the Committee which inserted the words 'shall not be subject to the notice requirements of Rule 18' with some two months so that, in my opinion, the Rule.. the consideration of this special order of the day and the change in the Rules is a proper order of the House."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

D. E. Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle indicated that he had a different set of Rules



than what I have. He indicated that there was a word 'not' in there, and there's not in my printed Rules and I was wondering what Rules we're going by.. his or mine or ours or whose."

Fredric B. Selcke: "WHEREAS the Attorney General of the State of Illinois has ruled his opinion of S. 571, dated April 2nd, 1973, Section I, of an act in relation to ratification of proposed Amendments to the Constitution issued by the United States of America enacted by the 73rd General Assembly and approved by the Governor in June 25, 1963, as unconstitutional and void for the same reason and additional reasons set out in the opinion, and whereas the Attorney General of the State of Illinois has further ruled in his opinion of April 2nd, 1973, and in our Federal ratification capacity of the Legislature has been delegated the power to establish the reasonable standards and procedures for carrying out the ratification process and that borrowing the use of extreme standard in conflict with Article V. Each House made with its own Rules determine how many votes are needed to ratify a proposed Amendment to the United States' Constitution. Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the 78th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that House Rule 42 is amended to read as follows: 42. Resolution concerning proposed Constitutional Amendments. (a) Resolutions proposing any change in the Constitution in the State of Illinois



or the United States shall be so designated and numbered consecutively.(b) Such Resolutions shall be read once in full and assigned to Committee in the manner approved provided in Rule 31. (c) Such Resolutions shall be read in full a second and third time on different days and reproduced and placed on the Members' desks before the vote is taken on final passage..(d) No Resolution proposing a change in the Constitution in the State of Illinois shall pass except upon an affirmative vote of 107 Members. (e) No Resolution proposing a change in the Constitution of the United States including a ratification of a proposed Amendment shall pass except an affirmative vote of 89 Members. (f) Provisions of this Rule may be suspended only upon an.. upon an affirmative vote of 107 Members."

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

Yes, ah.. correct that. The ah.. Sponsor of the Resolutions is Mr. Katz, and not Mr. William Walsh, as indicated by the Clerk. Right?"

H. A. Katz: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the question that we have before us today is whether or not the interpretation that necessarily has to be made in the absence of binding court decisions regarding matters of the Constitution and the laws of the United States and Illinois, are to be made by each of us individually in our individual



capacity as Legislators. Now whether or not we will follow the opinions that are formally handed down by that public official elected by the people of Illinois to serve in the capacity as legal advisor to all of the public officials of the State of Illinois. Now, I understand that it is the position of some of the Members of the General Assembly that the opinions that have been handed down by the Attorney General of Illinois are not in their opinions accurate legal opinions reflecting the true state of the Law on the question of the ratification of Amendments to the Federal Constitution.

Briefly I would say to you that it really begs the question to argue the merit of an individual opinion of the Attorney General. Because there is not a lawyer in the House here who could not make strong arguments on large numbers on . . . of matters that are of public laws arguing persuasively each way. The fact is that the Attorney General in his official capacity as Attorney General has ruled upon the precise issue that is before us. And that issue is what vote is required to ratify a Federal Constitution Amendment. Our Rules, as adopted earlier this year, provide for 107 votes. It was, adopted, I might add, without discussion. But upon reflection the Members of this Committee believe that the cause of Governmental regularity requires that we accept the opinions of the officially elected Attorney General of the State of Illinois



until such time as the High Courts of this State and of the Nation have ruled upon that precise point. The question basically involved is the question of whether or not in determining ratification of Federal Constitutional Amendment each State is free to prescribe its own procedures or whether it is a matter of Federal Law. I would say that the Attorney General has in support of his position two very strong decisions of the United States' Supreme Court. The first such decision, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is a decision of the United States' Supreme Court in 1920, dealing with the question of ratification of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution, and a couple of sentences from that opinion indicates very clearly that the Supreme Court has, in fact, passed upon that issue. And I quote from that decision, 'it is true that the power to legislate in the enactment of the laws of the State is derived from the people of the State, but the power to ratify a proposed Amendment to the Federal Constitution has a start in the Federal Constitution. The act of ratification by the State derives its authority from the Federal Constitution to which the State and its people have a right assented.' And the Court adds, 'had any other view might lead to endless confusion in the matter of ratification of Federal Amendments.' The Attorney General states also a second United States' Supreme Court decision dealing also with

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

this precise question of whether or not the process of the Amendment of the Federal Constitution is to be governed by Federal or State Law. And he cites an opinion of the United States' Supreme Court in Lesser vs. Donette in which Mr. Justice Randise, one of the great scholars of the court said, 'the second contention is that in the Constitution of several of the 36 states named in the proclamation of the Secretary of State, there are provisions which render inoperative the alleged ratification by their Legislatures.' The argument is, by reason of these specific provisions, the Legislatures were without power to ratify, 'but the function of a State Legislature,' Mr. Justice Randise said, 'in ratifying an Amendment to the Federal Constitution like the function of Congress in proposing the Amendment is a Federal function derived from the Federal Constitution. And it transcends any limitations so to be imposed by the people of the State.' And thus, the Attorney General concludes, that the provisions of the Illinois Constitution that provide for 107 votes required for the ratification of the Federal Constitution are inoperative due to the fact that it is not a matter of Illinois law involved but a matter of Federal law. And the supremacy clause of the Federal Constitution transcends any provisions of State law statutory or Constitutional and hence, 89 votes is required. Now it is not my purpose to justify or not the opinion of the

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Attorney General. I cited, however, the opinions of the United States' Supreme Court, so that this House, and the Members of the general public would know that the Attorney General had, in fact, stopped and cited the United States' Supreme Court opinions in his rulings, which rulings very clearly indicate that the provision of the Illinois Constitution is not operated as it relates to the Federal Constitutional Amendment. Accordingly, believing as I do, in following procedures that lead to regularity in the General Assembly, believing as I do, that it could only lead to chaos if 177 Members of the House, each preceded along his own way, rather than relying upon the opinion of the Attorney General. The Rules Committee propose here today an Amendment to the House Rules that carry out the opinion of the Illinois Attorney General, applying Federal Substitutive Laws to the precise point involved, namely what majority is required to ratify Amendments to the Federal Constitution. The Attorney General says that 107 vote provision of the Illinois Constitution is not operated as being in conflict with Federal Laws. And the purpose of the Rules is simply to carry out the opinion of the Attorney General. Those who do not agree with the Attorney General will have every right to litigate this issue in the courts. But in the meantime it is necessary that we have a stable situation in which we can look to the duly elected official Attorney General of Illinois



for guidance as to the law of Illinois, and not rely upon the individual opinion of 177 or more different legal minds and different people who have different interpretations. Accordingly, it seems to me that this Resolution which was a substitute Resolution, to one that had proposed a simple majority. (this Resolution requires a Constitutional majority), it's something that can be supported by all who believe in a system by which the people of the State elect their Attorney General. It happens that the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, is from a different party than mine, but I respect the right of any officially elected Attorney General to enter legally binding interpretation pending the right of any citizen to contest that interpretation duly in the courts of this State. And if ultimately their view prevails, and if ultimately the high courts of the State and the Nation concur that the Attorney General is wrong, that will be the time that we will be called upon to follow some other voice and some other view. But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, democratic regularity with a small 'd', requires that we follow the opinion of the Attorney General of Illinois. That is the purpose of this Rules change, and I urge its adoption."

Hon! W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck."

C. J. Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I often thought that the General Assembly was a Body of laws and rules and not a body of men. What we're dealing with here, is just exactly what the Attorney General's opinion said on page 5. What he says, 'The issue here is one of power.' And that's exactly what we're dealing with here-- Power. The question, truly, is whether this House is going to suspend the Constitution of the State of Illinois. Now the previous Speaker brought up alot of Supreme Court Decisions. and mumbo-jumbo of the Federal Constitution. Well, let's look at it. And let's discuss what I consider a very political and specious opinion issued by the Attorney General who has been a friend of mine for sixteen years, but we happen to disagree here, and most lawyers, I think, would disagree with his ruling. The Federal Constitution provides that any Amendments offered to amend the Federal Constitution requires 75% of the Members of the Congress to pass such a proposed Amendment. Excuse me. 66%. The Constitution further goes on and says that an extraordinary majority of 75% of the State must ratify any proposed Constitution. The State of Illinois has a Constitution. It provides that only 60% of the elected Members of both House.. of both Houses are required to ratify any proposed Constitutional Amendments to the United States' Constitution. Let's discuss the Resolutions before us and let's look at Attorney General' Scott's poor poor opinion. His opinion is basically 21 pages



long.. 22 pages long. There are two issues presented to him. The first issue is whether a Legislature can delay action in ratifying any proposed Constitutional Amendment to the United States' Constitution. He spends 21 and 1/2 pages of his opinion trying to explain away why we can't require an extraordinary vote. He explains the first issue away that we cannot delay his action, because Congress in the Federal Constitution says that all ratification of proposed Constitutional Amendments will be acted upon by the General Assemblies of various States. That's all it says. The Supreme Court decision, which the previous Speaker alluded to, dealt with the issue that there was a further condition that he submitted to the voters for a referendum. The Federal Constitution said nothin' about referendums. They said the Legislature determines if we're going to ratify these Amendments. The question of 107 or 89 votes to ratify was, you talk about begging the question, he really begs the question in his so-called legal opinion. In 1/2 page in which the flurry of a fast-writing pen of one of his assistants, he simply says that the, in basic, 'because I helped, that the delay of acting on a Constitutional Amendment violates the Federal Constitution, I'm also going to hold that the Legislature can't require an extraordinary vote.' Now, it seems to me absolutely insane and ludicrous and unreasonable that if the Federal Congress requires 66% to ratify.. to propose



and pass a Constitutional Amendment, the Federal Constitution requires 75% of the Sister States of this Union to ratify the proposed Amendment, then if we come along and only request 60% to ratify, that we aren't unreasonable and I think its the height of lunacy to use the Attorney General's opinion to stand on as a legal precedence. There's alot of other lawyers in this Chamber. I don't think the Attorney General is God. When I was sworn into office, I was sworn into office to uphold the Constitution of this State. And the Constitution of this State is quite clear. It says that it requires 3/5 vote of the House and the Senate to ratify proposed Constitutional Amendments to the United States' Constitution. Now, if we're going to play the issue of power, let's be open and forthright and play the issue of power. But let's not play around with the rules and the guidelines that we're supposed to be run by. We're trying to suspend the Illinois Constitution and we're not trying to change any rules of the House. And to use this opinion, I think is probably the funniest excuse for suspending any rules that I've seen, to date. I urge every Member of this Body and I'm not a proponent or opponent to the Amendment which we're going to be dealing with. I'm not even sure I'm going to vote on it. But I know one thing. That we should be guided by laws and rules, not by whims, caprice, and power. And that's exactly what we're doing here now, and I urge every



Member to stand by the Rules, to stand by the Constitution of this State, and to stand by their oath and forget the Attorney General's opinion."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

T. J. Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, my objection to this Resolution is based on many reasons. One of which, I haven't seen this so-called opinion of the Attorney General ah.. that was ruled yesterday called S. 571. Nobody has provided most of the Legislature here with his opinion. I'd like to know what it was based on, and why, and who requested it. The Governmental Body, the Agency which requested it to the Attorney General to rule on this question. Number 2, it seems like political expediency to me that all of a sudden that we're a Body of men instead of a Body of rules and law. All of a sudden, for whatever reason, we are to drop everything else, drop all the peoples' business in this State, persons who are worrying about the Appropriation or tax relief, or all the other legal questions that are brought before this Body, to rule on a House Resolution 176, that at best, at best, is trying to implement a change in the Constitution of the State of Illinois. I don't.. I suggest this. That with the 'whereases' ah.. in the quotations in the House Resolution 176, that it is a phony opinion by a man who, a year ago, ruled on a question requested by a State Senator, on the opinion of whether



or not the House of Representatives and the State Senate would have to have an extraordinary amount of votes for ratification.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "One minute, please. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J. J. Wolf arise."

J. J. Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that discussing ah.. a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States or to suspend the State of Illinois Constitution is very important, and I can't hear. And I wonder if we could get the door keeper to clear out everybody who is not a Member of this House, including the side aisle, so we can hear everything that is going on."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right. Ah.. the ah.. All right. Let's take a minute here and ah.. clear the ah.. the door keepers clear the ah.. halls on each side of the Chamber and ah.. those persons that are not entitled to the Floor will ah.. please ah.. remove themselves. And ah.. All right. Ah.. "

T. J. Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I'd like to reiterate the fact that for political reasons possibly a candidate for State office, a Constitutional office, for political reasons made an opinion to.. to honor votes by a segment of our society, that he thought was necessary in order to enhance his chances of re-election, and that was the opinion



that the State Constitution that some of the various proponents of the Bill that we're going to hear later, if this Resolution passes, that the very proponents of the new Constitution proudly went around the State saying that we need a new Constitution, and full well knowing that in that Constitution called for a 3/5 vote for ratification of a United States' Constitutional Amendment. I suggest that political expediency is not the name of the game, that deliberation is the name. And the whole question should be put down with the resounding 'No' vote and this change of the Rules so that if the people of the State of Illinois by representative government want to ratify the Constitutional Amendment whatever it shall be, it shall be by a deliberative process, not rushed through with changes and rules, not put down our.. our State Constitution by whatever means, by opinions of any individuals, but by logical, reasonable approaches. Now the fact remains that we are going to somehow change the State Constitution by a majority vote of this Floor. I doubt if it could be done. I think what you're doing is offering to the courts of the State of Illinois questions that will have to be adjudicated years and years to come. If I were a proponent for the Equal Rights Amendment, I'd want to follow the dictates of the Constitution so that I would know I'm right when I pass it, not to allow a phony change in the



rules, a phony opinion to be allowed to be perpetrated on the audience here or in the newspapers around the State. That this.. I credit the Attorney General with pol.. political expediency, nothing more. The whole issue should go up or down on its merit within the provisions of the State Constitution which calls for a 3/5 vote, and I so urge the defeat of this Resolution."

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

S. Catania: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. My name was mentioned some time ago in debate. I would just like to point out that I did present my Amendments to the Rules Committee., I think on February 21st."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo."

H. Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been trying to get the Floor for first for making a parliamentary inquiry. I.. this may have been made, but I never could get an answer to it. At least, I couldn't hear it. I think the question was asked, or the point was raised, that this Resolution appeared today apparently as a work of the Rules Committee, and that we're now considering it for passage. What I was wondering is.. is how we got there if.. If the Rules Committee can bring a Resolution in, under Rule 73, by a 3/5 vote, and then have it considered, it would appear



to me that the ah.. Cities and Villages Committee could draft a Bill by 3/5 vote, bring it to the Floor and have it considered on Second Reading without ever being considered by a Committee. Ah.. if this is the posture we're in, I think we should all know it. And what I'm wondering is when a Resolution is first introduced, if it ah.. doesn't take 107 votes to have immediate consideration."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right. The Rules Committee ah.. met this morning, and pursuant to Rule 73-E which provides that Resolutions for Amendments to House Rules or Joint Rules may be initiated by the Committee on Rules. The Committee ah.. did.. ah.. pass ah.. by a 3/5 vote of the Committee. Ah.. This Resolution which is before us.. and ah.. there was ah.. a..a Supplemental Calendar then printed, and ah.. the Rules Committee, pursuant to the Rules, adopted a special order of the day, which does not take ah.. action by the House to ah.. ah.. ah.. establish that special order of the day. Once that ah.. happened, ah.. and the Supplemental Calendar ah.. is ah.. printed, ah.. the Resolutions ma.. may then be placed under that special order of the day, and the Speaker moved to that special order of the business ah.. for consideration of that Resolution. Now, there's no notice requirement with regards to Resolutions that are initiated by the Committee on Rules itself in ah.. ah.. where



we have proposals from the Membership with regard to changing the Rules. There are notice provisions required concerning that. That is.. that is operating under Rule 73. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo."

H. Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, then if I might speak very briefly to this issue.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "You certainly may, Sir."

H. Calvo: "Ah.. The Attorney General's opinion, which I understand is the reason we're considering the Resolution attempts to avoid a portion of our Illinois Constitution. I understand the Illinois Constitution to provide that it takes a 3/5 vote to ratify a U.S. Constitutional Amendment. Now, I think really the body in this State that is going to be able to make that decision is the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and four of those seven judges have already indicated through telephone conversations this morning, that this cannot be done. That you can't by an Attorney General's opinion and by 89 votes of this Body throw out a provision of the Illinois State Constitution. And I think every Member of this House should take that into consideration on voting on this Resolution. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from ah.. Lake, Mr. Deuster."

D. E. Deuster: "Ah.. Now Mr. Speaker, and ah.. Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, I would like to ah.. refresh the recollection



tion of each and every one of you. Ah.. for many of us who sought this High Office as a Representative of the people of the State of Illinois, we had to run long and hard. We had to spend money. We had to go out and see the voters. And what an exciting and thrilling day it was, Mr. Speaker, when each one of us assembled on January 10th in this Chamber and raised our hands. And I would like to remind every Member, male and female, on every side of the aisle, what you said. Each of us said we would support the Constitution of the State of Illinois. I've carried a worn copy of this Constitution with me to campaign meetings and everywhere I go and people ask me what's in it, and I think I know. Ah.. most every Member can read the plain language that's in this Constitution of the State of Illinois. And that language in Article XIV, and Section IV, simply says, and I quote, 'The affirmative votes of 3/5 of the Members elected to each House of the General Assembly shall be required to ratify a proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.' Now it may be there's some Members that said, 'Well, when I took my oath of office, I didn't mean all of this. I just meant that part of the Constitution that was pleasing in my sight.' Now, we are men and women of honor. And I think we all meant it when we said we would support the Constitution of the State of Illinois and of the United States. Now, I



have this Resolution which refers to two Attorney General opinions, one opinion, S. 571, and one opinion, S. 456. I also have on my desk, Mr. Speaker, and Members of this House, a third opinion by the same Attorney General. The same Attorney General of the State of Illinois has issued three individual different opinions on this subject. I have, for the purpose of trying to bring some clarity into this, marked them 'A', 'B', and 'C'. I would like to ask each and every Member of this House, when you took your oath of office on January 10th and swore to uphold the Constitution, did you swear to uphold it as interpreted by opinion 'A', or opinion 'B', or opinion 'C'? I think you took an oath of office to support that Constitution as it's written until some court tells us that it's invalid and ought to be thrown in the trash can. And I would like to close by saying this, Mr. Speaker, I hope that tomorrow morning every single Member, male and female, when he and she looks into the mirror to shave or put on his.. her face or lipstick, that Member will say, 'yes, I'm an honorable person.' Politics is a question of making your word be your bond. And when you said you will support this Constitution, what did you mean? Because the favorite subject of yours was coming along the track, and you wanted to deal with it, you wanted to adopt it the easy way, you threw the Constitution of the State of Illinois in the



trash can. I don't think we're going to do that. I think we're going to stick with the Constitution of the State of Illinois and reject this Resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Rep. K. W. Miller: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

J. R. Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "State your point."

J. R. Beaupre: "About a half an hour ago, I heard someone mention the fact that this very thing that we are debating, the opinion of the Attorney General, has not been placed before us. I understand that it was given by the Attorney General on April 2nd. Ah.. if we are going to debate the issue of whether or not the opinion is valid, it seems to me that we ought to have an opportunity to take a look at it. And I would ask you to see the copies of that opinion are distributed so that we might without taking an emotional approach or whether deciding this very very important issue, based upon whether or not we want to accommodate the gallery. Ah.. I would suggest that we get copies of that opinion before us. I would like to have one."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, is recognized."

B. B. Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for the Attorney General of Illinois, and in fact, I rise to his



defense in terms of motive. I am sure that he has proposed to us his opinion in the best of attitudes. And I have the greatest respect for the spirit in which this Resolution is offered. There are those who believe that the Constitution should be readily amendable. There are those, on the other hand, who feel that it should stand as a more abiding guide and protect in principle the minorities of many attitudes by requiring consensus, and not merely majorities. Let us not confuse, as I am afraid many have today, the emotions related to the Equal Rights Amendment which will be before us later. I am going to vote for that Amendment and I am going to speak for it if necessary. But the principle at stake in this Resolution is the protection of the United State's Constitution, and not my opinion or any one proposed Amendment. My fellow Representative from the First District suggests that we should follow the precepts of democracy with a small 'd'. I propose this at issue is a concept of a republic. There are many ways to direct a ratification. And in my opinion, the Congress, which in a higher standard than a simple majority, merely passed the buck in fact. They now seek to have this Body function on a simple majority."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "Just a moment, Mr. Duff. Let's get a little more order in here, if I might."

B. B. Duff: "I would urge you, my Colleagues, to consider the



day when the protection of consensus and Constitutional Amendments will be urgently before us and perpetually on some issue of particular interest to your minority that you would represent. In the history of our Country and of our State this had happened frequently. To reduce the 89 and then to lock in, as this Resolution does, that 89 with 107 votes is a contradiction of parliamentary intent. I think that even though I do support E.R.A. this is confused with this important Constitutional issue and this Resolution should not pass."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Day, is recognized."

R. G. Day: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the issue before us at this time, is not the E.R.A. It's the Constitution of the State of Illinois. And when the Sponsor explained this Resolution, he did not attempt to tell you that the Attorney General was basing his opinion of an interpretation of the Illinois State Constitution. This is not the usual case where he is called upon to interpret the Illinois Constitution. What the Attorney General has said in his opinion is that the Illinois Constitution is invalid. I submit to you that it's fundamental; that no Governmental official who holds his office by virtue of the provisions of the Illinois Constitution has a right to



invalidate the documents which put him in office. There are all kinds of precedents to establish the fact that there is a presumption always, a presumption in favor of the validity of a Constitution. The Constitution, adopted in 1970, came from the people of this State, and it created the Government and provided the framework for the Government for the State of Illinois. And we serve under that Constitution, and I submit to you that this Body does not have a right to deliberately violate the provisions of that Constitution. You don't have to be an Attorney to come to that conclusion. All you have to do is read the Constitution itself. It's very clear; it's very explicit. It says: 'the affirmative vote of 3/5 of the Members elected to each House of the General Assembly shall be required to ratify a proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.' Now, when a Sponsor of this Resolution cited to you some of the cases which the Attorney General had cited, in his opinion, he did not cite any case in which the Supreme Court of the United States passed on this question. And if you look at the Supreme Court of the United States, ah.. and their interpretation of the Constitution, you'll find that they have uniformly held that the Federal Constitution, when it called for a 2/3 vote of the Congress before a proposed ref.. ah.. Amendment can be submitted, you'll find that the United States' Constitution clearly provides that any proposed



ratification, any proposed Amendment must be ratified by 3/4 of the States, so there's ample, there's ample precedence in authority there to establish the fact that the people who drafted the Constitution of the United States and the people who drafted the Constitution of the State of Illinois, didn't want the same majority to approve Constitutional Amendments that they do to pass an ordinary statute. And, of course, this makes sense. The Constitution provides for the protection of the rights of minority, and for this reason the extraordinary majority that is required in the case of ratification of Amendments is necessary and certainly in keeping with principles of the democratic system as we know it. For these reasons, I would urge you to put yourself in the position so that you can go back to the people in your district and say, 'Yes, I voted in favor of your Constitution. I voted for 3/5 majority in order to ratify an Amendment to the Constitution because that is what your Constitution told me to do. Thank you.'

Rep. K. W. Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

B. B. Wolfe: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the question before this House today is whether or not the Illinois Constitution conflicts with the Federal Constitution. And I think that that question can be resolved by taking a quick look at both Constitutions. Now, the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Gentleman who preceded me, stated that we took an oath of office which I agree, we took when we were sworn in to assume the responsibilities of this House, and it's in Article XIII, General Provisions, Section III, the oath or affirmation of office. It's very interesting.. it's very interesting.."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "Just a moment, Mr. Wolfe. May I quiet it down for you?"

B. B. Wolfe: "Thank you. I'd appreciate that." Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's interesting to note that in our oath of office we said 'I do solemnly swear that I support the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of the Sa.. State of Illinois' in that order. Now, let's take a look at the Amendatory provisions of the 1970 Constitution that's being cited on the Floor of this House today. And that goes over on Section IV ah.. Article XIV, and of course, no one has read the full statement of Section IV, on Amendments to the Constitution of the United States. Apparently, the Convention wasn't satisfied with the Amendatory procedure because the last sentence of that Section says, 'The requirements of this Section shall govern to the extent that they are not in consistence with requirements established by the United States.' And now let's look at the 1789 Constitution, which was written a century and a half before the 1970



and see what that requirement is. Now, let's keep this in mind. The framers of the Constitution of 1789, the Federal Constitution were Members of Houses of Legislature and were knowledgeable in the area of what the State Legislatures required at that time. And in Article V, they only put two restrictions. (1) That the Congress of the United States by 2/3 of both Houses shall vote an Amendment to the Constitution and the other restriction was that that be ratified by Legislatures of 3/4 of the several States. And there was no restriction as to the vote required by the States. And all that the Attorney General is telling us is that no State can legislate in the area of this Federal requirement. Only the United States' Congress can change that Rule, and can invoke a restriction on the Legislatures with reference to the vote that's required. And if you'll look at the history of this State with reference to Amendments, and th.. and ratification of Amendments, you'll note that in a.. many times these Amendments have been ratified by a mere majority of those voting. And all that this Resolution implies is that we get a majority of those elected. I see nothing wrong with the Resolution. I think it conforms first with the United States' Constitution, which I was sworn to uphold, and it in effect, tells us that what was written in 1970 is unconstitutional, and this you can get from the

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

reading of both Constitutions and the history of each. And I would suggest that we support this Amendment and get this business over with."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "The Lady from Cook, ah.. Mrs. MacDonald is recognized."

V. B. MacDonald: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have seldom risen to talk about the new Constitution and as much as I realize that there is a broadening in this deliberate Body, an attitude of criticism at times. But at this particular time I would like to say that I did take an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States and the State of Illinois Constitution. I think that if we will look at the transcripts.. the verbatim transcripts of the Illinois.. 6th Illinois Constitutional Convention, we will see that there was some doubt about the agreement of what kind of a ma.. majority it will take to pass a.. a.. Federal Constitutional Amendment. And as Mr. Wolfe has so detailed.. has.. has said in such detail, the last sentence of that Section IV is indeed.. has indeed been put there to remind us that we should not be in conflict at any time with the Federal Constitution. And while I am not a lawyer, I do remember that there was vigorous debate about the kind of majority it would take to pass a Constitutional Amendment. I think that the General.. Attorney General has acted with



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

concern, and I believe that this Assembly should take some note of what that opinion was. So I urge you to think very carefully as you vote on this particular Resolution. Thank you."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "The Gentleman from ah.. Lawrence. ah..

Mr. Cunningham is recognized."

R. D. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, I thought that I distinctly heard a prior Speaker, Representative Calvo remarked that four justices of the Illinois Supreme Court had issued curb stone opinions that we could not do what is thought to be done by Resolution 176. I would gently inquire of the Speaker whether that statement had been verified, and if this is true, are we not in error in proceeding to adopt this Resolution? And if no determination has been made ah.. to this informal decision by the Supreme Court, would it not seem reasonable to stay our hand until inquiry could be made to that decision, less we waste further time in an act that will become a nullity if the status position is well bounded and correct? Would the Speaker reply to my inquiry?"

Rep. K. W. Miller: "Does the ah.. Gentleman ah.. from Madison, Mr. Calvo, ah.. desire to respond?"

H. L. Calvo: "Well, I don't know what there is to respond, except that the indication from the Supreme Court, and



a Colleague of mine is that four.. at least four of the seven Members feel that the Attorney General cannot by his opinion, or this House by 89 votes, suspend the provisions of the Illinois State Constitution."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "Ah.. for what purpose.. for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe arise?"

B. B. Wolfe: "On a point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "State your point."

B. B. Wolfe: "Now, ah.. my distinguished Colleagues are excellent lawyers and they know that corb.. curb stone opinions form no part of either a procedure in court or one in the gen.. in this particular Body. The only thing that we can be guided by is the Supreme Court opinion, and in the absence of the Supreme Court opinion, a written opinion of the Chief Legal officer of this State, the Attorney General. The only thing that's before us, as I understand from the principal Sponsor of the Resolution, is the written opinion that he has available to him of the Attorney General. And all of this other curb stone opinion, and off- the- cuff opinions, and telephone conversations certainly form no part of this Legislative process. And I would suggest it's out of order."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "We return now to the Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."



R. D. Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that the inferences of the lawyers have nothing to do with this. The question of the Supreme Court's position has been reaffirmed by the Representative. It would seem the heist of folly and a useless waste of time to proceed in the matter if we had, in fact, had an official declaration by the Supreme Court that our conduct is not in accordance with...with their Rules, and they would not approve it. By...and by a reversal, we should wait and then inquire of the Supreme Court's position."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Richard Walsh."

R. A. Walsh: "Well, Mr.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just briefly in stating my opposition, ah.. to this ah.. to this motion, it seems to me that the ah.. best explanation is to merely say that this Body cannot on its own hold the Illinois Constitution to be unconstitutional nor can we in any way suspend the Illinois Constitution. Ah.. it.. The argument in favor of so doing has been an opinion by the Attorney General. Ah.. the question is.. has been raised as to whether or not that opinion may have been political in nature. Certainly it is only advisory. I would like, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to refer to another opinion, one in which we Members of the Legislature have always followed to the best of our ability, and that is the opinion ah.. rendered



by the Legislative Council ah.. back in 1966. When questioned on this subject matter, not this specific case, but the question as to what are the number of votes required in order to ratify a proposed Amendment to the United States' Constitution. And if I may, to say two references therein, On page two of the first paragraph, the statement is made 'but, in the case of the legislature itself, it is com.. competent to prescribe its own procedure unless', and Ladies and Gentlemen I repeat, 'unless such is done forth by the State Constitution.' We have a State Constitution to which we must adhere. And the procedures of this State Legislature are that a 3/5 vote is necessary in order to ratify a proposed Amendment to the Federal Constitution. One other reference, Mr. Speaker, ah.. in the authority, Paul Mason, in his manual of Legislative Procedures. He states, and I quote, 'A majority of the legal votes passed, a quorum being present, is sufficient to carry a proposition, unless', and again, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me emphasize, 'unless a larger vote is required by a Constitution.' Such is the case here in the State of Illinois, and I would urge my Colleagues to vote 'No' on this motion."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "The Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew, is recognized."

S. M. McGrew: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, thank you. I would just like



to say that I have listened to debate, and I think it has been very excellent, It has explained most of the issues and I move the previous question."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "All right. The.. the previous question has been moved. All those in favor say 'Aye', opposed 'Nay', the motion is carried. Now the Chair will return and recognize the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, to close the debate. All right. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lauer arise?"

J. R. Lauer : "Mr. Speaker, I ah.. don't believe that anyone has asked the Speaker how many votes it's going to take ah.. on this Resolution that's before the House, the Resolution of the Rules Committee."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "It ah.. takes 89 votes to ah.. to approve or adopt this motion. All right. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz is recognized."

H. A. Katz: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we are here today on a proposal of the Rules Committee of the House on a matter that has been before the Rules Committee of the House for at least two months. Now, it was not a close vote of the Rules Committee of the House. As a matter of fact, the vote by which the Rules Committee recommended this change was thirteen to three, with one Member voting 'Present!'. Now, an attempt has been made to prevent this as an act of



defiance of the Illinois Constitution. Nothing could be further from the truth. What is involved here is a rules change brought about in order to bring our Rules into compliance with an opinion of the Illinois Attorney General. Now, I would like to point out to you that this is a matter that has been before us before. This is not a new opinion of the Attorney General's. He simply reiterated. There is a new opinion that was handed down on one precise point, but on Ap.. May 11, 1972, the Illinois Attorney General, almost a year ago, ruled that in matters of ratification to Federal Law, not State Law, was applicable. And, as a matter of fact, I recall that just this morning we heard that four Supreme Court Justices told somebody else about the matter, which I contest, is a rather unusual way to transact business for a high official of a judicial branch. I remember hearing about that opinion of May 11, 1972, when a Member of the House got up and said that he had spoken to the Attorney General, and the Attorney General disagreed with that opinion. I remember it very well. It was right here on the Floor of the House. And along comes another opinion of the Attorney General of April 2, 1973, that indicated very clearly that the Attorney General continued to adhere to the view that he set forth on May 11, 1972. Now, very simply, the problem is that it is not one Constitution we are sworn to uphold and



defend. It is two Constitutions. And one Constitution is the Federal Constitution that has a procedure for ratification of Federal Constitutional Amendments, and has a supremacy clause that says it shall be supreme over any other Constitution of the United States. And we have an Illinois Constitution which has its own procedure for ratification. And so the question is, shall the Federal Constitution supercede the Illinois Constitution? And the answer of the Illinois Attorney General is that it does. Now, if certain Members of the House feel that he was wrong in interpreting the Constitution, not singular but plural that way, the remedy is not to get individual opinions of individual members of the Supreme Court, because this kind of Body cannot get along on such ex-party comments made to individual persons outside of deliberative proceedings before the Supreme Court. But to litigate this issue, if the Attorney General was wrong, the Attorney General shall be shown to be wrong in a formal opinion of the Illinois Supreme Court. But until that time arrives, the Rules Committee by a vote of 13 to 3 solves that sound parliamentary procedure required that we support the opinion of the Constitutions of the United States and Illinois, as rendered by the Chief Law Enforcement official, the Attorney General of the State of Illinois. And so, we of the Rules Committee by a decisive vote, submit to



you here today, a change, which we believe to be found as sound procedure that the people of Illinois, having elected the Attorney General of Illinois, and he, being under the Constitution of Illinois, our Chief Officer and public official of Illinois, that we follow the opinion of our Chief Legal Officer of the State, unless or until such time as the Illinois Supreme Court, may have as to the following of due process of law determined that he may have been in error. And until that time.."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "Will you bring your remarks to a close?"

H. A. Katz: "...we must follow his opinion, and I will, therefore urge for the approval of this Resolution that comes from the Rules Committee of the House."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "And the question is, 'will House Resolution No. 176 pass?' This will take 89 votes. Those in favor vote 'Aye', and opposed 'Nay'. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino, to explain his vote."

W. S. Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the General Assembly, the eight people that came from this.. that came from the Illinois Constitutional Convention to sit at their.. to their.. at their seat today in this General Assembly. There were 116 Members at a Constitutional Convention in 1960 and 1970. It was the intent of the majority of those people that to change the Constitution in any way would not be done a simple way."



It's the law of the land is to.. to reserve documents by which we formulate our entire lives by. And I think you're misinterpreting remarks handed down by the judiciary, and I'd like you to remember that it took eleven months, approximately, to formulate the Constitution that you now exist under as a General Assembly. And I think we should follow those Rules that the General Assembly initiated in 1968, under which to form a new Constitution that was a hundred years old. We demanded a 3/5 vote to change the Constitution so that we could respect what we work so hard for. And I ask your support and a 'No' vote on this particular matter."

Rep. K. W. Miller: The Gentleman from.. thank you. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

R. W. Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, any man who acts as his own client, or his own attorney has a fool for a client. And I think we are indeed, being foolish in this particular matter. We have asked our Attorney, the Attorney General elected by the people of the State of Illinois, a Republican Attorney General, and a very good man. We have asked him some time ago for his professional legal opinion on this particular matter. Our Attorney has rendered unto us an opinion based upon the law. It would be.. it was beholding to us if we would follow the advice of our Attorney and listen to him. I think that this Rules change is entirely



in order, and I think that this Body ought to support the Committee. And I suggest that anyone who decides in the contrary, be allowed to take the case into the court, where we could get an official and not a curb stone ruling. Gentlemen, let us heed the advice of our Attorney, the one that we pay, and simply because we disagree with him, I do not think that we ought to have this kind of vote. Let's listen to our Attorney. That's what we pay him for. And I would urge an 'Aye' vote."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck."

C. J. Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of inquiry. I would like to know if it's permitted under the House Rules to have temporary pages lobbying for a measure? And if it isn't, I would ask the Speaker to remove any temporary pages who are lobbying."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "The Clerk informs me that it has already been done. Thank you, Mr. Fleck. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis, to explain his vote."

C. L. Davis: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was a Member of the Rules Committee, one of the thirteen who voted for this Resolution. Somebody would say in the Committee that we held up our hands and voted to uphold the Constitution of the State of Illinois. This is true. We did. But I would also remind you about the facts, that we also held up our right



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

hands and we made a pledge to support the Constitution of the United States of America. Some of us seemed to forget that we are duty bound not only to support the Constitution of the State of Illinois but also the Constitution of the United States of America. Now, what do we have here? We have an Amendment here to the Constitution of the United States of America. This is not an Amendment to the State Constitution. This is, I repeat, this is not an Amendment to the State Constitution, rather it is an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America. And the Attorney General has said that we, as a State Body, can act in our Federal capacity. There's no rule binding us. This is what he said, and I've heard him read. There's no rule binding us. We're not voting on the State Constitution. We're voting on the Federal Constitution. And if a simple majority, if a simple majority is a Rule of this House, if we vote 'Aye' and establish the fact that a simple majority, I tell you, I hear the Speaker and those who act as Speaker, say 89 votes, the Bill having received 89 votes, received a Constitutional majority. Is he right or is he wrong? 89 votes is a Constitutional majority, and I voted for that right. I'm not voting here and now to oppose the State Constitution. Can we impose on extraordinary votes on a Federal Amendment to the Constitution? I would say 'No'. This is what we would



be doing if we said that we had to get 103 votes. That would be an extraordinary vote, and.. and what we're doing now is saying that a Constitutional majority of 89 votes would be binding, and this is right. Now don't tell me about the 14th Amendment. I didn't go vote to get into that. I know all about the 14th Amendment. I was a victim of it, and my people were a victim of it long enough. A victim of it as much as these women are a victim of it, do you hear? The Equal Protection Clause that guarantees every man equal protection. Well, you know what happens? They substituted something else for that equal protection. And we were concerned, not now. But up until the Supreme Court, they substituted something else. Well, this is what you're trying to do to these women here now. You're trying to substitute some of the Rules. 89 is a majority, and I appeal to you, 89 is a Constitutional majority, and I appeal to you to uphold the Attorney General and give us this vote."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski, is recognized."

R. J. Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'No' vote, no matter what the issue, I reject the concept that if you can't muster the vote, you change the Rules. I vote 'No'."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question



there are 69 'Ayes' and 90 'Nays'. For what purpose.. And the motion.. the Resolution fails to receive the Constitutional majority and is therefore declared 'lost'. For what purpose does the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan arise?"

T. J. Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side on this question on House Resolution No. 176, I now move that that question be reconsidered."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck."

C. J. Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, I move that motion lie upon the Table."

Rep. K. W. Miller: "The question is 'on the motion.. the Gentleman's motion to Table.'. All those in favor say 'Aye', opposed 'Nay'. The 'Ayes' have it. The motion prevails."



Kenny Miller: "For what purpose does t' e gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham rise?"

Cunningham: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Are we correct in our assumption that this vote is the death now of E.R.A.?"

K. Miller: "I don't think that the Chair should rule on that point for the time being ah...Mr. Cunningham. For what purpose does the gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers rise?"

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I was just wanting to offer my services as one of the pallbearers."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, now.... we're going to go to ah... Constitutional Amendments, ah... Third Reading. There are about four, ah... this H.J.R.C.A. #14, which concerns itself with that matter that we just had, if we could get to that and address ourselves to it.....if the people that are the Sponsors of these others in order ah..... Mr. Hirshfeld, Mr. Skinner, Mr. Bradley, Mr. J.J. Wolf, ah... if that is satisfactory with them, ah... in as much as we've been on this issue, we can go right to the matter and let the ah... Sponsors address themselves to their proposal and we can get to a vote. If I don't hear any objection on the numerical order question, then I will go to that. Is there any objection to going to..... all right. I see the people who have those, and they are indicating that it's o'kay. Now, ah... Mr. Clerk, if you would proceed to read H.J.R.C.A. #14, a third time in full, as is required by Illinois Constitution."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional



Amendment #14, Whereas the 92nd Congress of the United States of America at it's second Session in both Houses by a constitutional majority of 2/3rds thereof, adopted the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America. Joint Resolution; resolved by House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States of America and Congress assembled 2/3 of each House concurring therein that the following article is proposed as an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intense and purposes as part of the Constitution and ratified by the Legislature at 3/4 's of the several states, within 7 years of the date of it's admission by the Congress. Article, Section 1. Equality of rights under law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on the account of sex. Section 11. The Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this Article. Section 111. This amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification, therefore be it resolved by the House of Representatives, 78th General Assembly, State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that such proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be in the same is hereby ratified. And be it further resolved that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State of Illinois to the Administrator of the General Services of the United States to the President pro tem of the Senate and the Speaker of



the House of Representatives, and the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative of from Illinois and the Congress of the United States. Third Reading of the Resolution."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, the lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, ah...

after that rather exhausting debate on the Constitutional question, I think you'll be relieved to hear that I am not going to harangue you with arguments at length, about the virtues and the possible drawback of the Equal Rights Amendment. We been piling literature on your desks for months, we've been thinking about this for a year, I suspect that each one in this room has made up your mind as to whether you are in favor or against this proposed 27th Amendment. So I'm quickly going to go through about four points of what exactly does the amendment say. What does it say? Very simply, equality of rights, under the law, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex. Now I ask you, isn't that just a matter of simple justice? But what does this mean? A policy under the law, does not mean sameness. There can still be reasonable classifications of people based on functions and capability, not just arbitrary distinctions on the basis of sex. Of course it's not going to wipe out all of the differences of ah... bases on sex. You can still be the very charming ladies and gentlemen that you are right now, after E.R.A. is ratified. It simply means



in a positive sense, that your daughter can be guaranteed under our Federal Constitution the same rights to fulfill her human potential as your son. And I ask you again, isn't that what America is all about? Now who is against the Equal Rights Amendment? I think we just now, a few minutes ago, to see the chance to see some of the people who are against the Equal Rights Amendment. Of the people who have come and talked to us about it in Springfield, some women who oppose the Equal Rights Amendment, mistakenly think that this means that they will have to provide 50% of the support of the family, and maybe leave their home and put the kids in a Day Care Center and go out and get a job. And of course you know, as Legislators, and being thoroughly aware of Illinois law, that that is not so. That the wife's share of care and support of the children can be to choose voluntarily to stay home and take care of those children. So should we let the fears, the groundless fears, of these women effect us when there are 6 million single women in America, who are responsible for their own support. There are millions of widows and divorcees, who are heads of families. And don't they deserve an equal chance in the education market and the job market to support their families? You know gentlemen and ladies, in America, we value independence and self reliance. We admire people who can assume responsibility for themselves and their families. How can we justify raising one half of our children to grow up into dependent and irresponsible adults?



Finally, who is for the E.R.A.? Well, to begin with, the President of the United States, the overwhelming vote in Congress, leadership of both parties of either side of the aisle of this House, both party platforms, most prestigious organizations you can think of in this country, such as the League of Women Voters, American Association of University Women, Y.W.C.A, Bnai Brith, and so on. Finally, we have the only two national organizations that are against it are the John Birch Society and the Communist Party. Now, we have one final ally who is not with us today. He's former Illinois legislator. He served in this General Assembly, and we have his picture in our gallery today. That is, of course, Abraham Lincoln, who reminded us that those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and under a just God, they cannot long retain it. So come on ladies and gentlemen of the General Assembly. 107 of you, if you will, join us, join Abraham Lincoln and President Nixon and Governor Walker and Mayor Daley and Speaker Blair and Representatives Choate and Shea, join us and make Illinois the 31st state to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "The Lady from Cook, I understand that you're going to close. Is that what your request is? Alright, if that is not objectionable, in as much as her co-sponsor, Mrs. Dyer, opened, Mrs. Chapman will close. Now, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and members of the House, if we were



to vote on the proposition today, that all men are created equal, we would, I am confident, affirm that principle so forcefully expressed in the Declaration of Independence. Today we have the privilege and the opportunity to vote and reaffirm another principle, which is deeply inbedded in our democratic heritage, and I say democratic with a small d. Today we have the opportunity and the privilege to vote for the concept that men and women have equal opportunity under law. And if our heritage is unclear to you on this point, I would invite you to vote your self-interest, and that self-interest, it seems to me, can be expressed in the thought that when women's rights are denied, men's rights are placed in jeopardy. We have an opportunity today, to liberate men and women alike by voting for E.R.A. And I would ask all of you to search your conscience, search your heritage and vote equality today by voting for this Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution. Thank you Mr. Speaker."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentlemen from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of this House, Edmond

Burke once said that a representative owes the people he serves not only his industry, but his judgement, and I agree with him. I rise to speak in opposition to this proposal because in my judgement it is both unnecessary and harmful. Unnecessary because it can give to women absolutely nothing they do not now have or have a way getting under existing laws and statutes at the Federal, at the State, and by independent statutes across this country.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I think this is harmful because it will take from women far more than it can possibly give to them. Harmful because it will take from the State forever the right to enact any legislation that recognizes a difference in the sexes no matter how reasonable these differences may be. It is harmful in my opinion, because it subjects women to military conscription and I want to talk to you colleagues today just a little bit on this particular point. One of proponents do not care to speak to, my colleagues, before you vote today, remember that if you vote yes you are voting to make it a national policy to conscript women whenever the draft is deemed necessary. There is no argument about this, both proponents and opponents agree with this. This is not scare talk, this is not emotionalism as some of the proponents claim, it is a fact. Do you really want to go home and tell your constituents that you favor conscription of women? And if so, why? If this was the sole issue here today, few of us, I believe, would vote for it. But in a fancy package, call it Equal Rights, and we lose sight of the fact that in that package is this military conscription provision. My colleagues, this amendment should be called properly the Equal Regimentation Amendment, at least in this respect. Our forefathers abhorred military conscription, they left Europe, in part, because of it. We have employed it out of extreme military necessity, and that should be its only excuse. We should not extend it, because it is retrogressive to individual freedom. We should not extend



because it will give benefits or G.I. privileges, or something of the kind to another segment of our population. This is not the purpose of the military. The purpose of the military, as I understand it, is national defense, and that alone. Can any one honestly claim that unnecessary conscription of young women is a step in the direction of liberty in this country? I don't think they can. Why buy this measure with this defect in it? Why extend conscription, which is the authority of our government over our private lives? Why extend it in exchange for protections women are now guaranteed? Or protections that they have a way of getting by individual statutes designed to cure specific ills? We can do this at state levels throughout this country and should do it at these levels. It's a bad deal, a poor exchange. A constitutional millstone. It is a patent medicine poured into a fancy bottle and given an attractive label and hoisted on an unsuspecting public. My colleagues, I urge you to think about these things. It is not necessary and it is potentially dangerous and I do, therefore, urge you, urge you to consider and to think and to vote no on this provision."

W. Robert Blair: The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Rayson."

Rayson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the House.

I appreciate the words of the last gentlemen, particularly, when he quoted Edmond Burke, because I've always maintained that this is a true responsibility of the legislators to exercise his best judgement. And I think that's what were



here to do today. Its more than conscience, I hope we have an over-all view of the problem, and I hope we can resolve it, and certainly in favor in support of this ratification resolution. Even to borrow the wisdom of the last speaker when he said there are enough laws in the books and enough constitutional firmament to suggest that we need anything more. Even if we were to suggest that that is true, and it might be, yet, if it is true, the government if they wanted to get into this rather unholy kind of consequence of conscription, can do so, and would do so, I might add, if there were a real, real serious draft to this nation. But I don't think anyone in the Congress, our President, or anyone is seriously considering this possibility. As a matter of fact, we don't even have the draft now. What is more apprehensive to me, is that we have a new Secretary of Defense, who goes to Senate Foreign Relations Committee and suggests new ways and rational to suggest the continuation in the bombing in Cambodia, and to suggest the possibility of rebombing in Viet Nam. A man-made decision. However, that's not before us today. What's before us today is are we or are we not going to be part of, I think the majority of people, the majority of legislators, the majority of people in the Congress, who really feel the need for this amendment? Even if the laws on the books were edited, we don't enforce them. The magazine, Psychology Today, had an article which said a woman is 5/8's or 58% of a man. That even suggests that she's less

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

than a slave was at the time of the Missouri conference, he was 60% a man. And I suggest in part, and this is what its all about, but I suggest further, and this is what displeases me, that even with passage of this amendment, that were not going to effect any great fundamental change, but it may make the courts a little more honest, and it may make them more willing to confront issues that come before them judicially, rather than rationalize them in a man's world. For example, we have had a duress of decisions through the years that suggests women are equals under the law. We talk in terms of a recent days out West, the Reed case, which says that a woman can be a co-executor with a man and not take a subordinate roll. Big deal! But this is the kind of decisions we're getting, trickled-down decisions almost tokenism. So I suggest we need this amendment? If it doesn't remove the problems of discrimination, we could go back and reiterate the amendment. Earlier today, and on Dr. King's assassination date, we passed a bill about a holiday for Dr. King. If it weren't for fragmentary sections of the 1868 Civil Rights Act, we never would have had decisions in the 60's in regard to civil rights. If it weren't for a fragmentary section of the 1868 Civil Rights Act, we wouldn't have a Supreme Court Decision on open housing, in 1868, an issue this legislature didn't really have the ...the fortitude to grapple with. So I'm suggesting along with Edmond Burke, and that's another distinguished gentleman, an ecclesiast, a poet,



who once said John Dillon, he once said everyone's life diminishes me. I say every person's right, which are erroded should diminish us as legislators. And I feel that we should support this resolution and get on with other business at hand. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "The Lade from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise to support the Equal Rights Resolution. For three years, I have listened carefully to the understandably emotionable debate that has been involved around this issue. As the only woman member of the Bill of Rights Committee in this Illinois Constitutional Conventional, I was particularly aware and interested in the intensity of opposing viewpoints regarding the equality of woman. Both in committee, and on the floor of the convention, I voted for inclusion of the Anti-Discrimination Section of the Bill of Rights Article. It was to me, then, as it is now, a matter of over-due justice. In spite of the dier predictions, not once in my District during the period in which we spoke to groups and individuals on behalf of ratifying the new Constitution, was any objection raised to the inclusion of the Equal Rights Section of the new document. It seems incredible that we should deny other women of the United States, the same dignity and equality that we have seen fit to provide for the woman of Illinois. It is particularly fitting that one of the last letters I received yesterday, before casting my vote today on this



issue, came from a male constituent who is strongly in favor of the amendment. He has stated it far better than I could express. some of the basic reasons for supporting this resolution and with your indulgence, I would like to read portions of the letter to you. It states: Dear Ginny, Just a note to let you know that I hope you'll hang in there with your E.R.A. support. I want you to know that this is one man who doesn't feel threatened by the potential of the Equal Rights Amendment. Furthermore, I am apalled at the extreme positions taken by a number of the male legislators who are opposed. They know since many of them are lawyers, that it won't really shift all child support to the wife or eliminate needed family support in case of divorce, or abolish rape as a crime. These are serious arguments. If it is true that E.R.A. is more symbolic than legally necessary, still I support it. I think my wife has the right to an equally protective position for the government and I can understand fullwell, the indignation who see the opposition correctly, as an attempt to put woman down. I'd feel the same, and I do feel the same. As a supporter and contributor to your election, I am proud that you are on the right side of E.R.A. It makes me feel strongly that I put my support where I should. What you must do is vote for what's right for the 3rd District, the State, and the Nation, and I think this means the support of E.R.A. Sincerely, Dick. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I also think a vote for Equal Rights



Amendment is a vote for this State and this Nation, I urge you to join me in voting yes."

W. Robert Blair: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Martin."

Martin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this resolution. I remember when I first started to run to come to Springfield, some 12 years ago, it took me five times to get here. The biggest part of that reason for my taking so long to get here, I'm sure, is because I am a woman. I not only rise so today for myself along, but also for the organizations of which I went back into my community and I talked to and held all day meetings. Some of the groups were the League of Black Woman, the Amalgamated Meat Cutters, A.F.L.C.I.O., The Chicato Urban League, and my own organization, Operation Push. After having met with the aforementioned organizations which represent hundreds of my constituency, I could and indeed, did become a co-sponsor of H.J.R. Constitutional Amendment No. 14. Which if ratified, would mean equality for women, men, and I beg and ask of you to please cast a favorable vote for this constitutional amendment. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentlemen from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, and members of the House. Passage of this resolution would signal the untimely and unfortunate demise of chivalry. Never again would man feel the need to raise his hat, open the door, yield his position, or even more importantly, in future generations, when the Titanic



sank, we would have the splended example of John Jacob Astor giving up his place in the lifeboat. No, not so, they would be racing the women for positions in the lifeboat. We ought to note in candor that there is absolutely no need for this bill, the language of the Illinois Constitution is very clear. Article 1, Section 8, wherever it is, if the exact words that are used there are not successful, bring the Utopia that the proponents of this amendment, how in the name of Susan B. Anthony do you think that it would make any difference to put it on a piece of legal parchment in far away Washington, D.C. Finally, we as representatives need to keep in tune with our voters back home. When I went back to the 54th District, I retook their pulse the last few days, and I would report to you and venture the opinion that your constituents feel the same as mine, and that is that these women remain overwhelming in their preference that they'd rather be loved than liberated."

W. Robert Blair: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Martin, asked for personal privilege."

Martin: "I'd just like to add to that, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen, we would like to be loved and liberated. Thank you."

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

Yourell: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. This is just a word of advice to my good friend, Roscoe. Are you listening over there? Word just



came down from the...word just came down from the press gallery, they forgot to put film in the camera and you gotta go through the whole damn thing again."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Miller."

Miller: "Mr. Speaker, and members of the House. The proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the Federal Constitution, leaves, in my opinion, many unanswered questions. In considering this proposal we must ask, what the gains and what are the losses? Proponents of E.R.A. tell us that our United States Constitution is defective and that it discriminates against woman. Unfair discrimination against woman is presently unlawful and unconstitutional. The 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution assures equal protection of the laws for every person. Beyond that, our Illinois constitution states that equal protection of the laws shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Equal Opportunity Act of 1972 now give women rights of redress for any sex discrimination practice. Whatever vestiges of inequality against women remain can be removed legislatively. Sound laws can get at specific problems, far better than the proposed amendment. Opponents of E.R.A. also seek the abolition of sex discrimination. Under the amendment, if the draft system were reinstated, Congress will have no choice, but to require female draftees equally with males. Why should we mandate such a system by Constitution? Constitutional



amendments are for keeps. Unlike a statute, they cannot be easily repealed. Proponents of E.R.A. want to leave many policy decisions, including insurance benefits, labor standards, and marriage laws to the Federal court. If the proposed amendment, is ratified, the legislatures of the fifty States and the Congress of the United States will abdicate their legislative responsibility to the Federal court. We have already permitted the pendulum to swing to far in that direction. Proponents say that the amendment is symbolic of the stature of women in our society today. Who needs constitutional symbols. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, members of the House. The losses clearly outway the gains. Passage of the Equal Rights Amendment is akin hunting mosquitos with an elephant gun and who is gullible enough to go on such a safari?"

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen. I rise to support the E.R.A. = I suggest that there were 354 Representatives who knew what they were doing when they voted to support E.R.A., there were 84 Senators who considered this matter and pondered long and they accepted the proposition that E.R.A. is right and just. We cannot cast aside the judgement of thirty States and say that they are all astray and wrong. Gentlmen, we must give some consideration to the considered opinions of these respected persons. There are those of you who argue, we want to maintain the privileges of women. What privileges? The privilege of being a



seven-day fruit picker? They don't consider them when they talk about privileges. We want to give them the right to be a ten-hour scrub women? That's fine. This is the privilege that we demand for your women. Again, we want to offer them protection. What kind of protection? When we talk about the laundry workers, working in temperatures of 120 degrees, where is our protection? And if you talk about a twelve-hour migrant worker, where is the considered love and protection that we would offer our women. Again, we say we want to support these women. We want them to be able to raise families, but I ask where are you gentlemen when the welfare mother comes up and then all of a sudden there is no obligation to support. We're not talking about anything for these women, but that which is right and that which is equal. We have benefits for you women we cry. What benefits? The benefits of happy slaves. Yes, I say to you in the days prior to the time that Lincoln freed the slaves, you could always find some slaves who said 'Master, we are happy', we like it here and we don't want to leave the plantation.' I reject..I reject that thesis and I say that there are women today who are not happy as household slaves for eighteen hours, that they want the right to make their own choice. I stand with these women because they stand simply for an issue of basic freedom, and if freedom is there, I shall be with them. I say to you that women, and our women, do not prefer a life of pampered elegance with nannies nursing their babies, but what they



would prefer is right of free choice, the right to participate, yes, and even the right to join the army if it meant the difference of living in a concentration camp or living in freedom. And I would ask for support of these women and their rights, Thank you."

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

Hyde: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I don't think any debate today is going to change many votes but by the same token, I think the case against the E.R.A. ought to be articulated so that those people who feel that we who oppose the E.R.A. are male chauvinists or anti-women could possibly grasp the fact that there is a very rational constitutional case to be made against what I consider to be essentially a mischievous amendment. Now first of all, all of us agree on the goal. Eliminate invidious discrimination against women. What we disagree with is the use of the constitutional amendment as the means. The United States Constitution should never be amended unless it's absolutely necessary. Now for political expediency and certainly not for symbolic reasons. There isn't one single benefit that the distinguished gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell just mentioned that isn't available to women now under statutes that already on the book. The Equal Pay Act of 1963. The Health Man-Power Act of 1971. The Nursing Training Act of 1971. Title 7, of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Equal Employment Act of 1972. The Fair Labor Standards Act, and millions of



dollars have been awarded to women who have brought their claims before the Equal Opportunity Commission and ah.... pointed out that they have been discriminated against. Now the 14th Amendment by it's terms, says that no person shall be denied life, liberty or property without due process of law. Nor shall any person be denied equal protection of the law. That word person includes black, it includes Jew, it includes Catholic, it includes Poll, and it includes women, and if you don't think so and you want to raise to the dignity to a constitutional amendment in sex discrimination, why do leave out ethnics discrimination? Why do you leave out religious discrimination? Why do you leave out all of the other discriminations that you say are not included in the beautiful language of the 14th Amendment? You drain from it it's meaning. So take the word person, 25 times it appears in the constitution, circle it and write 'women' after it, if you don't think it includes women. Now the courts have said that the 14th Amendment proscribes and bars invidious discrimination against women, but it still permits reasonable distinction to be made in labor legislation, in domestic relation, and in all of the complex manifold relationship that the law encompasses in men and women, and to permit reasonable discrimination is a good and healthy thing. So we don't need it, it's unnecessary, and I hate to hear the argument that we've only had one Supreme Court case say that invidious sex discrimination is proscribed by the Constitution. That's



Reed vs. Reed because ladies and gentlemen, the Supreme Court only has to say it once, they don't take cases to repeat themselves. But the lower courts, the U.S. Courts of Appeals, have said it time and time again, the law books bristle with opinions that strike down statutes that invidiously discriminate for reasons of sex. Now there is one other reason that I would like to point out and that is this; the Legislators of this country and Congress are that element of Government closest to the people. They are responsive to the people, they are accountable to the people, they run for reelection. And as far as I'm concerned the consent of the governed is still a basic commitment of our form of government. But the courts as soon as the Federal Judiciary becomes established in their robes, they mount Mt. Elimpus and they are unattainable. They are not accountable and they are not responsive to the people. But this amendment will transfer from the legislators, which now have the power to eliminate invidious discrimination, will transfer that power to the courts, because every action will be tested on what does the word equal mean. And the courts then will assume jurisdiction over an ever widening area of every day life. I don't propose to assist in this self-emasculatation by the legislators. The legislators have all the power they need to remove this discrimination where it is found. And if you think that is a peace-meal approach, watch when they go to court on every divorce degreee and every piece of legislation that is



passed. We simply transfer to the courts what ought to be a legislative prerogative. Now there is a very good case to be made against this and it isn't right wing kooks, it isn't radical and it isn't the Communist Party ah... that opposes this, as the viscious adds printed in the paper by now, E.R.A. said. I don't include the National Council of Catholic Women among the kooks, I don't include the A.F.L. C.I.O. nor for that matter the Hinsdales Women Republican Club, as a right wing radical organization. And so ladies and gentlemen of the House, I ask you reassent ah... these virility of the House by striking down this amendment.

Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harold Washington."

Washington: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, for patiently recognizing me. I support this amendment as I have in the past in every way I possibly can including voting for it. But in response to on of the remarks of the one of the previous Speakers, he cited quite a few Federal Acts that have been passed, some State Acts which have been passed and he cited the glorious 14th Amendment which has lead black people down the road for so many years. The mere citation of all these Acts, plus the 14th Amendment, simply proves the point that these people are making, that these women are making. That the Federal Government and the various states have failed to live up to the promise, which is implicit in the 14th Amendment and all these other Acts that have been cited. Their case is no better with those Acts then it



was without them. And what their saying to us is what is needed in this country is a clear cut statement relative to rights of women in this country as articulated by the women in this country and not be someone else. The previous Speaker also stressed the fact that in this amendment there was not elusion was made to ethnic groups. Well, we're not concerned about the lack of inclusion of ethnic groups in this amendment. We're prepared to fight our battle on a different line. But never let it be said that simply because we are not included, in a given piece of legislation, that we're going to put out heads in the sand or take a negative attitude to our other people who are attempting to articulate their desires and rights as they see fit. You may have noticed on the vote of the resolution which was presented, that every black legislator in the House supported that motion. There is no mysticism to why they did so. Mr. Speaker, I would like a bit of order. because every black legislator in this House understands that had not the women of this country supported this long 500 years to avail in this country, we might still be on the plantations in the south in this country. We understand that. I had a case to do a little reserch on this question, because when it came up last time I took the position that black people had the responsibility to help anybody in this country or out of this country, anywhere in the world, who was struggling for freedom and equality. We had that responsibility placed upon us his-



torically and just out of plan old quid pro quo. But it is very enlightening you might be interested in some of the movements in this country relative to black people that women in this country have been involved in. There was a tremendous movement in this country lead by women to abolish salvery even before it got placed into the Constitution. They lead the abolitioness movement, north as well as south. They were deeply involved in the underground railroad, millions of them giving their lives or reputations, their economic status in life to maintain and fight for people that could do nothing for them whatsoever, that is the black slaves in the south. They were involved in that movement. Women were the main ones in support of the freedom of schools in the south during the reconstruction period. They almost single handedly through a V.F. Cup Ovington, formed the National Association for Advancement of Colored People. They were involved in the marches in Salem, Alabama, and throughout the country. Every place you look throughout the long history of black people in this country, women have stood four square behind them and beside them in attempting to bring and ellévate their position in life. It follows then as night does day, that our position is with them. We're not concerned with all these legal niceties that have been trotted out, nor are we going to be victims of the air harridan about women in the army and sharing latrines and all that simple stuff that has nothing to do with this business at all. It's



not relevent and those who resort to that are doing a disservice to a very important issue, which effects alot of people. They talk about knocking out the statutory rape, well that's the most ridiculous thing I ever heard of. Rape has nothing to do with this Bill, drafting into the army has nothing to do with this Bill, sharing the latrines have nothing to do with this Bill. This Bill is simply a statement by American women to the effect that they want the National Congress and the people throughout the country, and the state legislators to pay attention to the fact that they are discriminated against, it's just that pure and simple. No statutes on the books are doing the job, the 14th Amendment can't take care of the job. They haven't taken care of the black question in all of these years, they're not about to take care of the female question. So let's stop playing games. If the women of this country want to say through an amendment that they want to be equal and free, than damnit, I'm with them. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman ah... from Rock Island, Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the General Assembly, A few years ago a Member of this Body once said: 'Four score and seven years ago, our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.' Today I will vote to give the women that same equality, Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Day."



Day: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I am for equal rights for everyone, but I must oppose this amendment, because I do not believe that the Constitution of the United States, which has been the backbone of American Democracy for more than 85 years discriminate against half of the people in this country, namely the women. If there are discriminatory laws on the book, then I think it's a legislative responsibility to repeal those laws. I have not heard any Illinois statutes, any local ordinances cited here today in Illinois, which discriminate against women. But certainly if there are any, I would be happy to be a Sponsor to those laws, or any Bills to repeal any discriminatory laws. The real issue before us today is whether we are going to give up our legislative right completely to pass laws which have some reasonable basis in sex. Laws which give women and mothers preferred treatment in divorce cases on the subject of whose going to have custody of the minor children. Weight lifting laws for women employees. Insurance rates that provide because single male drivers under 25 have a higher accident rate than females. Females don't have to pay as much in the way of premiums. I think these laws are good, I think that they are reasonable. But if there not, this legislature, in five days, with 89 votes in the House and 30 votes in the Senate and the signature of the Governor can repeal those laws. I feel that this amendment will transfer another segment of legislative responsibility to the courts. I think that we should, as



legislators, see that there are no discriminatory laws on the books, so far as women are concerned. I think that this is our responsibility. I hope that you stand with me to preserve that responsibility as elected officials, and vote against this amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

It has come to my attention through the mails that a great number of organizations, pro and con, on the Equal Rights Amendment have been quoting from the Yale Lawview article, which was co-authored by Thomas I. Emerson, Professor of Law, at Yale University Law School. Basically the statements out of context have been used in that document in order to show that all of the harridanous things that will happen to women in the event that the Equal Rights Amendment is adopted. I have a letter here from Professor Emerson, date is marked March 29, 1973, to the Editor of the Chicago Daily News, in which he points out the great amount of misrepresentations that are contained in that article. I would quote portions of that article, which I think are very relevent to his real position, and the real position of the article in the Yale University Law Journal. 'The Equal Rights Amendment is based upon a simple but deeply just principle. It requires that the legal rights and obligation of each citizen should be determined on the basis of his or her own qualifications, not upon the basis of being male or female. The amendment does not of course,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

eliminate sex from the American life. What it does is to guarantee equality of rights under the law. Further more under the area of legal rights and obligations, the Equal Rights Amendment does not preclude different treatments between the sexes where the law concerned with the physical characteristics as unique to one sex or the other. Thus, forcible rape laws would be unaffected. Nor does the Equal Rights Amendment override the constitutional rights to privacy. The Equal Rights Amendment is a morale and social reform and the best traditions of American Society. It is long overdue. Now Mr. Speaker, I would like the question of military conscription has come up time and again here today to show..... how the evil of this proposed amendment would do. I would say that this completely over looks the fact that military conscription is a form of involuntary servitude. I say to this that involuntary servitude only to men is wrong. I have a daughter, I have three sons, I don't think that my sons ought to be second class citizens. I think that.... when we say that women ought not to be required to serve their country in times of need, is wrong. I would say therefore that I plan to vote 'yes' because I have not heard any arguments of any justifiable cause for alarm for the passage of this proposal."

W. Robert Blair: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise to speak in favor of this amendment not because I was denied credit, which many women were denied, not be-



cause I could not get a mortgage from our house, which many women were denied, but in the effort of simple justice and equality. I'm an ex-service women. I have heard the arguments compounded today about the draft. I rise as an American who believes in God and in this country and if there is an necessity for my country to draft women, be it done, because my country comes ahead of myself. I rise to remind all of us that if a women is a lady she is not going to be changed by this amendment, not any more than a man that is a gentleman. A gentleman is a gentleman and chivalry is chivalry and I expect it to continue whether this amendment is passed or not. I rise also to answer one of the former Speakers who says: 'The Equal Rights Protection of the 14th Amendment is there.' Isn't it funny ladies and gentlemen of the House? The 14th Amendment was passed in 1868. And yet the women were not permitted to vote until the 19th Amendment was passed in the 20th Century. And when they talk about the Equal Opportunity Employment Act, who will find that one them does not refer to women working in establishments under 15 people. There is something more I would like to say. My Congressman, Robert McGlory, and I'd like to quote him, and he sent me this word today, quote: 'As principle Republican Sponsor of the E.R.A. when it passed the U.S. House in 1971, I urge Republicans in Illinois House to support ratification. After many weeks of testimony as a Member of the House Judiciary Committee, I was convinced that this Constitutional



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Amendment was essential for the best interest of both men and women. The 14th Amendment has not been interpreted to eliminate sex discrimination. Congressional Acts and followed leadership of Van Armstrong, Business of Professional Organization for Women, and other substantial and capable women too. Protective Labor Laws and possible future Selective Service Law was considered fully and were not urged favorable Congressional action. Illinois is identified with the principle of equality and deserves to become one of the chief states in final ratification of the E.R.A. Only 12 Republicans kept 'negative' votes in the House, the U.S. House. I hope Illinois House will back Equal Rights without discrimination based on sex. Congressman Robert McClory, Congressman of Illinois.' I might add that the other Congressman at the other part of my district, Philip M. Crane, also voted for this amendment in the United States House of Representatives. I might add that in my City of Zion, at a regular meeting of the City Council held March 20th, 1973, gave unanimous approval to the support of the Equal Rights Amendment and said, quote: 'It's an honor that the City of Zion to be supporting this Bill.' I might add that the American Congress Body is against this amendment. There are some good groups that are against this amendment also. But it bothers me, it bothers me when we discount the fact that the American Congress Party is against this amendment. I myself, have fought communism all my life, and I fight it

still. I do not feel that there is anything wrong with giving a woman a choice, just the same, I don't think that there is anything wrong with giving a man a choice. I believe in dignity, I believe in self-respect and I'd like to quote a letter, if I may, from one of my constituents. She says: 'On the National level, I would not want my daughter drafted, any more than I would want my son drafted, but since so many people seem more worried about their daughters than their sons, it would seem like a good way to prevent wars is to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment. Perhaps after it is ratified, these same people will continue to be more afraid to let their daughters go to war than their sons, and they will protect any efforts to involve our country in war.' Now ladies and gentlemen, my district, the mail from my district has been about 4 to 1 in support of this amendment. When I campaign, I campaign for Equal Opportunity for all. At this time, I'd like to make one final statement and I'll close with a quotation from Paul Constance, a Jew that was talking to the Galaxy and Circulation in Chapter 3. 'There is neither Jew nor Gentile, there is neither bond or free, there is neither male or female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. The support of the Equal Rights Amendment does not mean the support of sameness, I believe in the division of the sexes, it simply means the choice of opportunity and equality for all.'

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Von Boeckman."



VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I believe further debate on this issue would be repetitious, therefore I move the previous question."

W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor of the gentlemen motion say 'aye', the opposed, 'no', the 'ayes' have it and the previous question has been moved. Ah...those of you who were standing will be recognized on explanation of vote ah.. first. Now under our..... The lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman to close."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I just have a few remarks to make in closing. First I'd like to ask leave to thank the 69 persons who voted for House Resolution 176. We owe a debt of gratitude to you and I do thank you for myself and all of us who are interested in doing what is fair on this issue. Next, about the E.R.A., it is really only one question with which we should be concerned. And that is simply this: Are women entitled to full equality of treatment under the law? No other issue truly relates to how one votes today except this one question: Are women entitled to full equality of treatment under the law? Now I've heard a number of people say that is really isn't needed, and I'd like to suggest this to you. I think that is it weren't needed it would have have just gone through this House and this Legislature before we would have ever have chance to look at it or read it, but the fact that we have had this deep seeded kind of opposition inspite of this strong public support for the amendment really to me is



a testimony to the needs for this amendment. It's been suggested that we haven't pointed to the discrimination that exists in the Illinois law. Well, of course you know that we have an Equal Right Clause' in our new State Constitution, which we still need to get on with and implement. And I believe that you will find that there is legislation to implement the new State Constitution that will be introduced in the coming weeks. And I think that all of you on this floor indicated your willingness to vote for this peace meal kind of approach to correcting sex discrimination, and I hope your memory is long enough when we come to the vote on these measures, that your 'green' light will be on. What's going to happen if this day ends, and we don't have the required votes in the House? Or perhaps the required votes in the Senate Committee? Is the fight over? I'd like to suggest to those of you with these deep feelings of opposition to the amendment that we have only begun to fight. If you think that you've received a lot of correspondence and phone calls, this is just the beginning. Justice may be delayed, but justice will not be denied. You are testing a vote today which is not a state matter only. It isn't very often that we get to vote on a matter that has the potential to effect not only the entire United States, but also our children and their grandchildren and their children. The vote you cast today is a vote which will be long remembered. I urge you to vote on the side of fairness and justice. I ask you to vote



'aye' on the Equal Rights Amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is shall this resolution be adopted? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'nay', and the Clerk will take the record. Gentleman from ah... Cook, Mr. Fleck, did you have a question? O'Kay."

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to clarify how many votes does this require to pass?"

W. Robert Blair: "Well, the Chair is prepared to rule that the House Rules are the guide with regard to the adoption of this resolution and ah... as you recall we had a ah... a resolution concerning that matter, the House Rules as they now stand do require 107 votes, so that is what the Chair will have to ah... be bound by."

Fleck: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, now we're on explanation of votes. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I'm voting 'aye', and I wish that enough of our colleagues would join us to pass this resolution."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, the lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, as one who has studied the amendment and believes that that are enough laws already enforced that protect women and give them the right to be women, and mothers and work side by side with men, and that you cannot legislate feelings, I will represent the many women who believe as I do and have



told me so, and therefore I cast my vote as 'no'."

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

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it may be true that you cannot legislate feelings, but you can legislate on the basis of feelings. Since the E.R.A. came up for the first time last year, I have received 643 letters from my own district in favor of the E.R.A. and I have received 9 letters opposed to E.R.A. from my own district. Since no one else from my district has spoken today, I feel that those women and the tens of thousands others deserve to be represented. I think that this is not a question of legality. I get a little tired sometimes of the lawyers in this House getting on their feet, and talking about the constitution and the legislation from a legal point of view. Every once in a while, someone who is not a lawyer has got to stand on his feet and tell the lawyers that we're a little tired when a matter of such deep and sensitive feeling to so many hundreds and thousands and millions of people comes before us, that we have to legislate on the basis of our feelings. My feelings are that those women who don't want E.R.A. are satisfied with what they have. My feelings also are that there are millions of women justifiably fed up with the way in which they are being treated as human beings. My feeling also are that there are many men, many of whom are Members of this House, who like the way things are, who like to have their women sitting on their duffs in their homes, just doing what



women have traditionally done in American History, in Colonial Times, and my feeling is, that we deserve, and I'm somewhat uncomfortable with this myself, we deserve something better from alot of women who want to get out and have oppportunities of equality in our society. And on the basis of my feelings, the feelings of my wife, the feelings of virtually every women whose spoken to me from my district, I vote 'aye'."

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

Porter: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I have heard many arguments and predictions as to the effect of the proposed amendment. I have read and heard more mis-information, more groundless arguments, more gross exaggerations, than I have ever heard in relation to any matter. All of these predictions these fears, these discussions, the possible effects of the amendment, I think missed the point. We are not considering a piece of legislation to meet a specific problem. We are considering an amendment to the basic law of our land. As such, we must decide not what it may or may not do to the status quo, but whether the amendment in the language proposed sets forth a principal that we believe in, because that principal is to last as part of our basic law as long as we last as a nation. If the legislators of the several states were to have looked at the general language of the 14th Amendment of due process of law and of equal protection of the laws, and determined what effect these might have in the future,



these amendments probably never would have been adopted. For me, the question then, is whether equality of rights, under the law shall be denied or abridged on account of what should be a legal irrelevancy. Of course not. I say that if we cannot stand for this principal, our law stands for very little. I believe that it stands for a great deal, I vote 'aye'."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Madison, Mr. Kennedy."

Kennedy: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I've had considerable trouble with my conscience on this legislation, and I'd like to refer you for a moment to the picture, 'Fiddler on the Roof' where the main character there, I may pronounce his name wrong, Tee Vee, always talked to the Lord. Well, I've talked to the Lord in my own way on this and he told me to vote my conscience. And my conscience today tells my to vote for E.R.A., because I believe like Representative Harold Washington said, that abortion is no longer connected with F.R.P., the draft is no longer connected with E.R.A., and I have found considerable discrimination in my district. My own town newspaper discriminates against women. I've had male members of their staff tell me that. I've had female members of their staff tell me that, and I'm sure that I'm going to be quoted in the paper for what I say, but I think they do and I'm sure they do. The banks in my district, the employees of the bank are probably 75% female, their discriminated against. Nothing is done about it under the



present legislation. If the state has laws to protect these people they surely aren't being enforced, so I have to change my vote from two years ago and vote to support this legislation and vote 'aye'."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I rise not so much as a Member of the Illinois General Assembly, but that of a person who has had the privilege and high opportunity to spend the last ten years of my life serving on Capital Hill. It was my responsibility to represent the administration and I think that it's quite important in as much as the name of two presidents have been mentioned that the position of the Nixon Administration be clear. I have the highest respect for the House Judiciary, which as suggest that they are great evils in this proposal. For example, the Judiciary Committee says, and this is the distinguished Chairman, Emanuel Seller, a great liberal Democrat from New York, whose the author of more Constitutional Amendments than any other American, besides Thomas Jefferson. Mr. Seller and the Judiciary Committee said that this would mean that women and this includes mothers, would be subject to the draft and the military would be compelled to place them in combat units along side of men. Now this is just not emotionalism, this is not just alot of junk that's been set out on your desk, this is the Judiciary Committee that has drafted many many Constitutional Amendments. And the testimony of the Nixon Administration before the Judiciary



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Committee has set forth here, and that position is that this amendment is unnecessary. Mr. Wiggins, of California, asked of the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Renquist, whose now on the Supreme Court: 'Is this Necessary?' And his answer was. 'No'. I..... and the Judiciary Committee suggested a reasonable amendment, which was lost on the floor and I simply say that ah... as Will Rogers said sometimes as he makes a joke, 'It's funny, but when Congress does, it's the law.', but Congress made a mistake and I think that if Congress would have adopted a reasonable amendment we wouldn't be lost in this debate. The real motive to those of who do not want to subject women to the military, is that we love them so much we don't want to subject them to that, and there's no civilization that I know of, even the savage indians, have never sent their women out to be front line infantry soldiers, and so I vote 'no'."

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

Arrigo: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, before I cast my vote, I think maybe we ought to palliate the feelings, the hurt feelings, of the ladies in the House, and the ladies in the gallery. While the discussion was going on I jotted the names of a few women who have changed the course of history without the benefit of E.R.A.. Let us start with Greek Mythology. Pallas Athena, the symbol of the Womens Army Corp, sprang fully clothed and armed from her fathers head. Of course, we all



know that the Amazons were the bravest of all warriors of mankind. And the Amazons were women. We know the story Valkyries in Norse Mythology and the fact that they took the slain warriors to Valhalla. We know that the abduction of Helen of Troy launched a thousand ships that gave Homer the plot for his Iliad and the details of the Trojan War. Joan of Arch accomplished a liberation of France without benefit of a similar law. And of course, Betsey Ross sewed the flag that gave her historic immortality. We know that Abigail Adams showed her independence by hanging her washing in the public rooms of the White House in spite of her husband's disapproval. Jane Addams, who came into my district many decades ago and left her mark on social service. My own district produced St. Francis Xavier, a frail Italian immigrant nun, who became a fighter for social justice leaving a mark that lead her elevation as the first American Saint in the Roman Catholic Church. Florence Nightingale of course, founded the Women's Nursing Corp when she served in the Crimean War. And to our fellow Members of the Polish origin in the House, need I remind you all that the only person to win the Nobel Prize twice for Science was Madame Currie, a Frenchman of Polish origin. And may I also add that Dr. Maria Montessori left her mark in her innovations in education, all without benefit of the E.R.A. The list is a long and an honorable one and I think the ladies can continue to add to this long list that has saved mankind over the years. And I vote 'no' on



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

3100

the E.R.A. amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House in explaining my vote, I differ substantially with the Representative from Cook, who in her closing remarks, once again, confused this issue with the question of Resolution 176. I spoke sincerely on that Resolution about the need of consensus and the principle of protection thereby of all minorities on all issues, and in this instance, I speak equally sincerely when I support the Equal Rights Amendment and I ask my colleagues to join the consensus of the other States who have approved this Amendment. We are not denying the imbuity of the family, let the record show that we propose the enhancement of all life and not the denial of any, that we sponsor the protection of the innocent, to give to women a sign of fulfillment and encouragement to participate is in no way can engage the beauty of life and death can deny the values of masculinity, of courtesy, of gentleness, or of maternity. I believe that the fears expressed by the opponents are groundless and I say again, as I said last year, that this amendment is not negation of family or of womanhood, but a sign and symbol to the proponents that we joint their aspirations to fulfill our society. I vote aye."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I rise to explain my yes vote and ask all the legislators to



join with me in this vote. It has been mentioned that we are afraid. Some of the opponents have suggested that by passing this amendment, their daughters or grandchildren will have to serve in the trenches in the front line. I would suggest to those who oppose the E.R.A. for that reason that there's an easier way to stop our having our daughters in the trenches. We could examine the possibility of having no more wars. I would like to suggest....I would like to suggest to those Representatives who rose and argued that this Resolution is superfluous, that it is unnecessary and that it is meaningless, and that to them, it is unimportant. I would like to suggest that if half of those Representatives voted for this Bill or this Resolution, which is so important to many of us, it would pass and then we would move on the the real question of insuring equal rights for all."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook...er..Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House.

It seems to me that each and every one of us were sent to Springfield by approximately 250,000 people of our Districts and we really don't owe any allegiance to anyone else outside of our District. At least this is the attitude that I've taken and I just want to the people to know in the gallery, that although I appreciate the voluminous mail because it makes me look very busy as a freshman, I really try to listen to the people back home and make my decision according to what they suggest to me and not what people



from every place else in the State suggests. I therefore engaged in the process of locating and distributing a questionnaire to my District from 5000 questionnaires, and I'm sure to all of your delight you will find that the questionnaires indicated that the people of my District, on a random sample, wanted the E.R.A. passed, two to one, and I'm very pleased to see that all of the Representatives from the 31st District will be unanimous in supporting this. I would also like to point out to those people who have any question as to how the people of the State of Illinois feel about equal rights for women to look at the new State Constitution, because on December 15, 1970, the people of the State of Illinois ratified our new State Constitution and it does have such a provision in our Constitution. So as you cast your vote against the E.R.A., consider that you are voting against the majority feelings of the State of Illinois. I thank you and I vote for it."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Briefly, in answer to some of the opposition, I would ask the members of this House who were so vocal and so strong in their support of the Constitution of the State of Illinois, based upon the oath of office that we take to reflect very seriously and very carefully and to be consistent in your vote, because since 1970, as was pointed out by the previous speaker, we have had in the State Constitution and we have lived under Section 18, which, in effect says, the equal protection



of the law shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex by the State or its units of local government and school district, and we ask no more from the Federal Government at national levels than we have already adopted and have sworn to enforce and to uphold in the State of Illinois. Let's give this equal rights for men and women under the E.R.A. amendment and vote it out of this House today. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holloway."

Holloway: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I can truthfully say that I began this day without having any firm convictions as to what...what direction I would go. And I rise at this point in time in support of the Equal Rights Amendment. Before I came into the General Assembly, my job for two years with the Department of Labor, State of Illinois was to deal with problems of labor effecting women in this State. And there are statements that have been made today and in all the literature relative to the heavy weights that women will have to lift, so I can tell you now that the Supreme Court has said that a woman who bids for a job will have to do whatever that job calls for. So there's no argument about that. Any woman who thinks that she doesn't have to support her family, I suggest that she read Chapter 57 of the Revised Statutes of the State of Illinois. The obligation is there. I've heard statements that would indicate that ...a Constitutional Amendment of itself gives or takes away. That isn't true. A Constitu-



tional Amendment is a statement of broad principles as a guideline in regards to the specific laws passed...a subsequently. As a black man in the United States, I know that it was not the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States that freed the slaves, it was the Emancipation Proclamation. And ladies and gentlemen, I think that if the women want equal rights, they should have equal rights, and for that reason, I vote aye."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, in explaining my no vote, I'll be very brief, but it has been said that we should be representing the people who elected us from our Districts and sent us here and I also have been keeping a close tabs in my office on the mail that I have been receiving and it reflects to my vote up there. I would also like to call to the attention of the members of the General Assembly a couple of happenings in other States that I think what reflect what the people really think. It's been mentioned that radical groups are for and against this particular amendment. I call to the attention of the members that in a State wide referendum on this very issued, an advisory referendum in the State of Wisconsin yesterday. This issue was defeated by 60,000 votes, 470,000 to 410,000 against. In the State of Indiana, the Senate in the State of Indiana decisively beat this amendment yesterday. Other States that have passed it have attempted to recind, so I don't think



that itsa....matter of radicals. I never thought that. I thought it has been an honest, sincere attempt...a...to pass this...a....Resolution; however, as I stated, in my area, in my mail, the people that I represent have indicated to me that wanted a no vote on this issue and that is what I have cast. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentlemen from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow members of the House, in explaining my vote, I have never impuned the bravery of women, I have never impuned that they could stand the sight of blood as a man. But I happen to be in the Executive Committee, it was stated and agreed to that approximately 2% of soldiery are combat persons, combat men. I'm one of the surviving here that like some others here that I know of, am one of the surviving 2%. I have been in combat close combat with the enemy, really face to face. I think I'm experienced and I just want to say....may I have a little order, please. Based on actual observation of women in combat with the French underground, the French collaborationists and Germans, German women in combat, I know in my heart that women would be slaughtered. I would assure you, women in combat, any more than a random football team, that picked the boys and a number of girls, the boys would beat the girls, we have a different relation to our physical ability. That difference if the difference of life and death in combat. I do not want, I would never want women to be along side of me in combat. I couldn't



bear the thought of the responsibility and knowing from experience, what would happen. Many here in the galleries and here on the floor do not believe this, but from experience, and I repeat, from experience, I tell you they would never be able to survive the hardships, the battles and the troubles of a front line. It's impossible. Now in relation to my very good...I might close by saying that I am voting the way I am for my daughter and my granddaughters. I love them and value them too much and now for Representative Arrigo and his position, I would just like to say in memory of Ulysses and some of the Greeks, I believe in memory of them, I would like to quote to him...I believe it is, the Island of Lesbos. God rest their souls, the women were there."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Are you ready for this? Alright, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. The fact that the legal minds of America cannot agree on the ramifications of the Equal Rights Amendment, it is evident that the measure needs revision. The Resolution is nebular as a proposal. Duplicity in its purpose, ambiguous in its verbiage, and muddy in its eventual accomplishments. Thank you." I am sure that the legislative forms of the nation, such as the State of Illinois, can achieve a workable proposal which would erase the doubts and fears and would provide for equal opportunities without the possible consequences so



often voices. So therefore, on behalf of my wife and advice of my attorney, Henry J. Hyde, I vote no on this amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "The...a...Gentleman from...a...Cook, Mr. Dunne."

Dunne: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I feel obligated to briefly explain my vote. Before the election I indicated that I probably would support the Equal Rights Amendment. Since that time, I have received a tremendous amount of mail from all over the State. However, I also received a particularly tremendous amount of mail from my District. Any others have quoted how the mail has gone in their District, well, I'll tell you in my District, my mail have been overwhelmingly against E.R.A. I have been.. I was undecided on this issue through January and most of February, and last...a couple of weeks ago, last Thursday night, when I would have liked to have gone home, I stayed here for four hours and listened to the testimony before Committee of the proponents and the opponents. And I want to explain to those people in my District who are going to be unhappy perhaps because I have changed my opinion. I want them to know that it was based upon much deliberation and the listening of much testimony and I oppose...a this amendment for that reason."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I'd like to explain my no vote on E.R.A. I personally favor equal rights for women. In my District an overwhelming



majority of the ladies I have spoken to or who have written are opposed to E.R.A. and therefore I feel that I am honoring equal rights for women by voting no and honoring what they wish me to do and that's why I'm voting no on this amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Hunsicker."

Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House.

The mail from my District on this particular issue has been overwhelmingly in opposition to E.R.A. These people have elected me to represent them. Now a small group is making

a lot of noise in favor of this amendment and I personally can't see where the passage of E.R.A. will give women any

more rights than they already have under the law. You know that there is an old saying that after you get what you

want, you find out you don't want what you want at all. This holds true with a lot of people who voted for our new

State Constitution in 1970 and I know that if the election were held this year, and they now know...would have known

then what they now know, they would have voted the other way. If this amendment...is adopted, I am sure that this

will hold true, because I am sure that women will lose more rights than they will gain, and for that reason my

vote is going to be no."

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

Matejevich: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentleman of the House.

I know we don't have near 107 votes on this issue, but I



think its important that all of us are recorded on how we feel on this very important issue. I think, we, as a legislature, legislate for today and we also legislate for the future. I think every issue has its time in history and I think that if we really reflect we are going to realize within our own minds that the Equal Rights Amendment is imminent, its passage is imminent. It may not pass this year, but its time will come. And I think that Illinois ought to be in the forefront of those who feel that its passage ought to come quickly. Now, I think I've received much of the mail that all of you have, I think that we as legislators, have a duty and an obligation not only to answer our mail, but I think we have a duty and obligation to evaluate our mail. Much of my mail on the E.R.A. was very emotional. Many said that the womens' place is in the home. I think the womens' place is the same as a man's place. If its in the home or wherever. Wherever it can do the best for the family and for the person, that's where everybody's place ought to be. When I say we legislate for today and in the future, let us again reflect on what the future will be women and men. Many women have told me I'm concerned about my daughter and her future. And I say that wars and our traditional ethic the man being superior have placed a burden on women because there are less available men. Wars have taken care of that, and more men have been lost in traffic accidents, so many women have found it



necessary to fend for themselves. The divorce rate is higher. Without the E.R.A., the divorce rate is going higher and higher. And because of that, and it will be greater in the future, probably with no fault divorce it'll be greater so that more and more young women will find that they will have to fend for themselves to provide for their family, their family, and I think it will be more and more important that equality amongst women be given so that families can be taken care of. Now Leon Kennedy mentioned about his newspaper discriminating. You don't have to go that far. We are representatives of all the people. Look what's in State government and you will find case after case of discrimination against women in every facet of State government, so I think that we need this amendment, and some said that it is only symbolic. If it is only that, it has accomplished so much for everybody, women and men, and some say about the draft and I agree with my colleague Adeline Geo-Karis when she read that women I'm concerned about peace. And there may be two things in this life time of ours as legislators that will bring peace quicker than anything. And one was when we granted the right of eighteen year olds to vote because they have a voice whether there will be war in the future or not, and the second as far as I'm concerned, is the passage of E.R.A. because as far as I'm concerned, this can bring about peace quicker than any other action than we've done and I support an aye vote on this resolution."



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

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House.

I rise to explain my vote. I like Mr. Dunne, also listened to four hours of testimony here two weeks ago and I attempted before that testimony was given to wipe everything that I had previously heard about the E.R.A. To ignore the volumns of mail that had been gratuitously dumped on my desk and into my mail box and make up my mind based upon the testimony that was given, because I assumed that this testimony was probably the most expert testimony that would be available on both sides of this question because Illinois is considered to be one of the key States in the ratification battle. In doing this I found that direct questions were avoided by the proponents and that it was very easy for them to slip and slide around to a previously prepared position. The thing that impressed me the most though, was one section of this proposed amendment that I had given no attention to whatever. Those of you who have proposed a reverence for the People Rights Section in the Illinois Constitution should recognize the fact that under Section 2 of the proposed 27th Amendment, the legislature of this State would have no basis of making a law that would implement our own equal rights section. That power is reserved under Section 2 of this Amendment to the Congress of the United States. It seems to me that the States have abrogated their privileges of making law, of judging those



areas not forbidden to the people nor given specifically to the Congress by the Constitution and once again we are see a power grab on the basis of Washington as opposed to the legislatures of the individual States. It seems to me Mr. Speaker, that the people of this State have spoken and it seems to me that when we get legislation that will bring about an equality rights of women in this State that we should probably support it based upon the validity as we see it in law. But it comes to my attention Mr. Speaker, that it would be in consummate arrogance for the people of this State to oppose their will upon the people of the other 49 States and demand that they do the same thing that we have already done. I also recognize Mr. Speaker, that we do represent the people of our District and I have been rather careful to also keep a close eye on the mail. The mail from within my District not that, also gratuitously dumped on my desk. This mail has run ten to one against ratification. Mr. Speaker, I cast my vote no."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson."

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. I want to explain my vote. I want to explain my vote, but I think that's kind of where were at. You know, just as a great contradiction of language, it seems we all say what we mean, but do we really mean what we say. Dr. Bruno Bettelheim, in a lecture not long ago said that this great country believes in volatarian principle that we may disagree with one but defend that person's right to say it. But he said, we



don't really mean that. Now we pontificated, we've taken we've patronized, we've suggested what future speculations are to the tender classification of women, but I suggest we're also ignoring something in this, and this applies to all sex. Anyit even applies to men and that is important to. And I've always been an advocate that an women should have as many rights as men and to have the opportunity to be as miserable as men, but I would hope for those who haven't voted as yet, would as least vote, because even though we have this great ambiguous of language, and that is that we can all be against discrimination, but yet we can vote different ways, I would hope that we can at least vote one way or the other, but more importantly, I would hope that we could mean what we say because this ought to be an apple pie vote, not the kind of hangup we have and I would think that if we were really honest, we're male chauvinists, thank God we're not male chauvinists pigs."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Ladies and gentlemen of the House. A lot has been said on this issue and the debate has been beautiful. I simply think that because it is one of the most binding issues to face this General Assembly, that we all ought to be heard on it even for no other reason than to explain our vote on it. I think it's that important. Now, I'm a Methodist preacher and I know all of you have received from the Methodist church this letter. Dear Legislator,



We support and ask you to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment when it comes before the General Assembly. Was this out of Christian position which was affirmed at our general conference. It is evident we have reached a moment in history when we must give equal rights for both men and women with a clearly stated Constitutional amendment. Now ladies and gentlemen, seriously, I want you to hear this seriously. I'm against discriminating against any one, male or female, black or white, for what God made them he didn't intend for you to discriminate against human beings for what he made them. We've quoted here from St. Paul's great letter to the Galatians where it was said that neither male nor female in this life of Jesus Christ, but only one. Let me quote this to you and then I'm going to sit down. This is the first chapter of Genesis. Listen to this. The very first chapter of Genesis. So God made in his own image and created He Him, not male or female, created He Him, male and female created He them. We did the separation because of sin and you know that. Created He them, come here and look at the Bible, created He Him and He didn't take them when he created them, do you see? He created He them in His own image and they all were created in His likeness. Women was given an inferior roll in this ...and they were given that inferior roll by men, not by God. They were given that inferior roll and we here in this country certainly look upon them as inferior. Now, if you don't



know how it feels to be discriminated against? Then, you are really now qualified to speak on this issue. You've got to first...you see you've got to first know how it feels to be discriminated against. I can talk about it because I know in my early childhood how it feels. I'm not a female but I must know that when a women works in an office, breaks in all of the men who come into that office, stay there fifteen or twenty years, teach them where to put there hats, teach them where they get their supplies, teach them everything and then they say you cannot be promoted simply because of what God created. Simply because of what God created you. Let me tell you something it's not only wrong to discriminate against them for what God created against them, but it's sin, do you hear, for God did not intend that such a thing would happen. I'm happy to vote aye."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I would just like to say that I am for Equal Right-s for women but not for this amendment as the vehicle, I would like to be recorded as being present and not voting."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, will the Clerk show Mr. Ebbesen as present and not voting. Now...a...wait a minute...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker if I may explain my vote very briefly. The arguments pro and con on this resolution have been



framed in terms on what's good for women or what may not be good for women. The arguments have been on the basis of pro or anti-female, pro or anti-male. I look upon this resolution, an Equal Rights Amendment not concerning necessarily just the dignity of women; nor do I consider it a test of our manhood, but I think that a vote in favor of E.R.A. is a affirmation of our personalage. I vote aye."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Tazwell, Mr. Kriegsmann."

Kriegsmann: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to explain my vote, and repeat the natural superiority of women should not be demeaned by manmade laws. I therefore vote no."

W. Robert Blair: "Record the gentleman no. Have all voted who wished. Wait a minute. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "When John Adams was leaving to help write the Constitution of the United States of America, Abigail said to John, Don't forget the women, we hope that you'll keep us in mind. And John said to Abigail that he was not about to give away any power to women. We've been fighting this fight a long time and we still have a long way to go. One of the reasons that I'm here in the legislature is because this is one of the few jobs in the State of Illinois where women are paid equally with men. I spent two years standing in the unemployment compensation lines after experiencing seven years of sex discrimination in a job. I know whereof I speak. We need the strength and the grandeur of a



Constitutional Amendment to remedy the wrongs that we have in the United States of America. The Commission on the Status of Women has just found that in education in Illinois an area where women traditionally we think has been equal in their opportunities, but in education in the State of Illinois, and the colleges and universities faculties, women are grossly discriminated against. Some of you have said that you heard testimony for four hours to the Executive Committee on Equal Rights Amendment. I've heard testimony for thirty-one years on the Equal Rights Amendment. And I tell you that we have despairity in our physical education programs in the State of Illinois, such despairity that in some areas we don't have physical education facilities for girls. I tell you that my daughters come home from nursery school and tell me that girls grow up to be nurses and boys grow up to be doctors. I don't think that I can impart to you the pain and the frustration that one can experience being the women in the United States today. We've come a long way, but we have a long, long way to go. My claim with the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission has been filed for two years and three months. They have yet to consider it because they have such a backlog. We need the Equal Rights Amendment, we need this power. We're talking about ending discrimination on the basis of sex. We're not talking about ending discrimination on the basis of height or weight or the shape of our hips. We're talking about ending discrimination on the basis of



sex. We need 107 votes, I hope that you'll join me in voting aye."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. I hate to take up more time but I feel that I must put my two cents in here. First, I want to straighten out the record. I think that there were others who fought and helped win World War II, if that's what one of the Representatives was talking about earlier. I happen to be one who also saw combat. I met Russian soldiers, I met women Russian soldiers that would make Borchers run like hell. Now, I want to talk briefly about the merits of E.R.A. My mail ran two to one against E. R. A., but I'm voting for it. My mail ran at least five to one, much more than that against the income tax when it was up for election or up for vote here a few years back. I voted for it. I think there are things that we must vote for on principle and take the chances with the electorate. But I wanted to talk about why it is necessary in my opinion to adopt this amendment, the E.R.A. Amendment. First, I think that the 14th Amendment to the Federal Constitution has proven to be inadequate, insufficient, and second, it has required, as a result of that, a mass of legislation, both federal and state, to make up for the inequities that the women are experiencing. We note the Civil Rights Act that gives them certain rights but only in matters effecting federal employment and federal matters. We know that the State of Illinois



is more fortunate than most States because we have did adopt a 1970 Constitution that provided that there shall be no discrimination because of sex. But how about the people of Indiana, Maine, Kentucky, Nebraska, those who have not such a provision in their Constitution? Who is to protect them? The new proposed Equal Rights Amendment would protect them and that's why I am voting for it. I feel that the Equal Rights Amendment is a real affirmation of what the law supposed to be in this United States of ours."

W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will.. the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I too, have received much mail. That which concerns me from my District. It ran about two to one against the Equal Rights Amendment. I decided that it would be advisable to go beyond those who expressed an interest and make a survey which I did. Surprisingly, the telephone call survey which I made indicated two to one in favor. I therefore, feel that I have on balance, at least an equal weight. It is therefore up to me, as a legislator for my District, along with my two colleagues on the other side to cast my vote. I feel that there is certainly no fault with the Equal Rights Amendment. I think that is the State of Illinois in its Constitution and the framers of the Constitution of the State of Illinois, saw fit to pass such a Constitutional provision that the United States of America



can do no less. I therefore am proud to cast my vote aye."

W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook...Mr. Borchers says personal privilege."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I admitted at a previous time that I, too, had met the Russian women soldiers. One look was enough; Representative Bluthardt is absolutely right, I would run like hell."

W. Robert Blair: The Gentleman from Ogle, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House. Very briefly, I'd like to comment about the letters that I have received ...the news media, the toils I've read and the conversations that I've held in relation to E. R. A. One thought that constantly runs through my mind, and that is the similarity of the arguments of today's opponents of E.R.A. to the arguments that were presented some fifty years ago by the opponents of womens' suffrage. There is a great deal of similarity, there. I suggest to you that a green light up there is a progressive vote, its a vote that history will judge to be the right vote. I vote aye."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, now have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Walters."

Walters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Rather than explaining my no vote after having voted three times on this issue I rise on a point of personal privilege. I'd like to tell you all in this gallery, a story about equal rights in Alton, Illinois. Yesterday, we had a non-partisan election for mayor in the City of Alton. Mayor Paul Lynde versus



Clyde Wiseman, Jr. The race by most political experts was considered a very close race. Last week, there was an article in the Alton paper which said the people's candidate for mayor of Alton for the first time in the history the Governor of Illinois has endorsed a downstate candidate for mayor. Governor Dan Walker urges the people of Alton to elect Clyde Wiseman, Jr., the man who will serve the best, and I'd like to tell you what happened yesterday. In 1969, Paul Lynde was elected Mayor of Alton by 1,300 votes. Last evening after receiving this endorsement for his opponent he was reelected by 2,600 votes. I would like to tell the people to give the Governor a little message. I think that for those who want equality and equal time, I'd like to inform you that the Governor's aid also said in his news release that other endorsements will be forthcoming where the Governor knows the candidates and feels their principles are alike. So I think you should rush down to the second floor and get in line for his help. If Governor Walker plans to fly to Alton to explain his endorsement, I hope he will look at the flood, the water's getting pretty high down there. It appears to me that Governor Walker is having trouble with mayors from one end of the State to the other. In closing, for you hockey fans who may be interested in tonight's game, back home the Alton voters are saying Mayor Lynde scored a great goal with a big assist from Governor Walker. I hope the Blues beat the Blackhawks tonight andwait a minute Mr. Speaker,



and I hope that Governor Walker endorses the Blackhawks.
Thank you very much."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Redmond."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House,
I am not yet ready to give up on the new Illinois Constitution. I'd like to wait a few years and see whether or not we have to amend the Federal Constitution to give the women the rights which they so justly deserve. Therefore, I'd like to be recorded as voting present."

W. Robert Blair: "Record the gentleman as present. Have all...
the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. I was sitting here listening to the various arguments on this question and I was sincerely hoping that I could cast the 89th vote Janie, for the passage of this constitutional amendment, but due to some things that happened earlier today, that is just not possible at this time. But it seems to me in explaining my vote that many people have talked about what the 14th Amendment does for the women. And it seems to me that the 14th Amendment was ratified somewhere back in the 1860's and I can attest to being one that walked some dusty pathes with Dr. King in 1964 and 1965 to bring about the Civil Rights Act of '64 that some speakers have mentioned here today and the Civil Rights Act of '65. So if we were walking down dusty pathes to implement after 100 years what was offered in the 14th Amendment, I



hope that women will not have to suffer that long period of time to get their equal rights under the law. I am proud to cast an aye vote for you and in sitting here on this day I was trying to bring to mind what Dr. King would have thought about what were talking about here today. You may not win today, women, but I think he would have said, walk together, children, don't get weary, because you will win in the long run. I vote aye."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, have all voted who wished? For what purpose does the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matejevich rise?"

Matejevich: "Mr. Speaker, I've explained my vote, but I sat here and I remembered the debate two years ago, and I think its fair to all of us who were here two years ago. I remember Elmo McClain sat at my desk one morning and he had a little trouble. Everybody knows about that and some of us said, Elmo, you ought to go home. And Elmo, said to me, John, I've promised that I'm going to stay here and vote for the E.R.A. amendment. A man who literally gave up his life for the E.R.A. amendment, and I think the women here ought to at least meet his sone, Mike McClain, who is now representing him here in the General Assembly. Mike, I think you ought to stand up for everybody here."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, now, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to briefly explain my vote. Mr. Speaker, I think that in many ways, we ought to rejoice



at the debate which we have witnessed today in this House because in a democracy you are constantly called upon to reaffirm your belief in some of the basic principles which make a democracy work. In this country, those principles have always been equality of opportunity, an equal chance at doing an equal job. The Equal Rights Amendment is so consistent with our Constitution, both Federal and State, so consistent with all the platitudes that we constantly mouth about ourselves, about the differences that we take such great pride in when we compare ourselves to other countries and other nations and other philosophies that I stand absolutely astounded when I look at that voting scoreboard, I'm going to make a prediction, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to predict that any issue which is so powerful that bring together the Mayor of this State...of this City of Chicago and the Governor of this State and the President of the United States, and you, Mr. Speaker, any issue that has that force will some day surmount and win in this State. And I'm going to make one more prediction, I think we're going to have a lot of contests in legislative districts across the State, Mr. Speaker. I think a lot of gentlemen who are voting against this Speaker are going to be called upon to defend this vote. And, Mr. Speaker, when that occasion arises, when you have to confront the men and women of your District and explain why you are for women but when it came to voting for them, you couldn't, I don't think that is going to be enough to preserve your seat,



gentlemen, and I would hope that, and I would hope that there would be enough persons on that vote...on that board enough people to reconsider to put this bill over the top.

We need it, all of us need it, now. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record." For what purpose does the Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld, arise?"

Hirschfeld: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

W. Robert Blair: "Yes."

Hirschfeld: "Now Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, we have been I think very patient this morning, whether you are for or against the amendment, and maybe its not a point of order, maybe its a point of personal privilege, but I frankly deeply resent the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Chicago, Mr. Mann, because what he's done is saying basically, if you don't support his view on this, then you are going to have a contested race and so forth and so on. And I might add, Mr. Speaker, that we have always had a rule about the decorum in this House. And one of the rules of decorum is people in the gallery are invited guests of the General Assembly and they are not expected to applaude when they happen to agree with a particular member or to boo or hiss when they disagree or call for silence when somebody is speaking their side of the issued is talking or to console each other if someone on the other side is talking. Now I was going to say this before, but I didn't want to say this while the



vote was being taken because it would be misinterpreted, but I would ask the Speaker to exert his authority and remind the ladies and gentlemen of the gallery that they are invited guests and they should conduct themselves likewise."

W. Robert Blair: "On this question there areFor what purpose does the Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Schisler, rise?"

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

W. Robert Blair: "How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Schisler: "Please record me as aye."

W. Robert Blair: "Record the gentleman as aye. Alright, Mr. Clerk, what...on this question there are 95 ayes and 72 nays, 2 present. And...a...this resolution having failed to receive the vote required under the Illinois House of Representatives Rules is hereby declared loss. For what purpose does the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, rise?"

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side of this question before the House, I now move to reconsider the vote by which it failed."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, I...just a moment, you know we've been by comparison of the last time we had the issue up I think it has been fairly mouthed today. A...the Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer, wants to move to table the Gentleman from McHenry's resolution...or his motion to reconsider and...a...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis, ask for a roll call and if he joined in that by Mrs. Geo-



Karis and Mrs. Dyer and Mrs. Chapman and Mr. Palmer. Alright Mr. Davis is entitled to a roll call on the motion to table. Alright, alright, now the question is on the Gentleman motion to table the motion to reconsider. All those in favor will vote aye and the opposed will vote no. The lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman." A...Mrs. Chapman, no. Mr. Matejevich."

Matejevich: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. Because ...maybe I should wait until you get this roll call...and then I'd...I'd like to be recognized, Mr. Speaker." Mr. Speaker, after this roll call, then I'd like to be recognized."

W. Robert Blair: "Okay. Alright, have all voted who wished? Alright, the Clerk will take the record. Alright, one of these questions there are 74 ayes and 71 nays and the Gentleman's motion to table prevails. Wait a minute, the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matejevich."

Matejevich: "Mr. Speaker, and ...I...I do this with, with no personal reflection on how...how anybody voted before or the resolution, but I do this because I feel that there may be some judicial action taken on what we've done right now and pursuant to Rule 70, we, meaning, Catania, Chapman, and myself do respectfully dissent to the action taken by the House of Representatives on Wednesday, April 4, 1973, when House Resolution 176 to amend House Rule 42 was defeated in that such action was injurious to the public of the State of Illinois and I'd like to have that entered on the House Journal, Mr. Speaker, I think in addition to that, Mrs. Chapman would like to take some action in the same vain



in declaring this particular....resolution defeated, but I would like my particular defense entered on the House Journal Mr. Speaker."

W. Robert Blair: "Well a... under 70 members, it takes two members and I take it now Mrs. Chapman is joining with Mr. Matejevich and under that rule their dissent may be entered upon the Journal..... and Mrs. Dyer, and Mrs. Martin, now is there any further question. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania, wants to be added on that, alright. Now that'll be done. Mr. Rayson, he will be added to that Journal entry and Mr. Mugalian. A...any...a well, Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Harold Washington, Mr. Mann, oh Mr. Mann wants to be recognized?"

Mann: "I'd like to be added to and I'd like recognition on a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman from Champaign, mentioned my name in debate, which is a..."

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

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman from Champaign did not mention the man's name in debate, he mentioned the Gentleman from Chicago and he did not say his name at all."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Gentleman from Champaign, whether or not he mentioned my name. If he did...a if he didn't, I'd be glad to sit down."

Hirschfeld: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I frankly don't remember, but I'm always elucidated by what Mr. Mann has to say and I think we should let him get it off his chest."



W. Robert Blair: "Alright, that satisfies Mr. Juckett, hopefully."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the man did mention my name in debate and...a...which is a prohibited activity on this floor.

I didn't engage in any prohibited activity, I just made a prediction which was based on some hard facts derived from a lot of people who indicate that they are taking a sudden and new interest in politics, and that was the basis of my statement, Mr. Speaker, it was not intended as a dart in the direction of the distinguished gentleman from Champaign."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, for what purpose do you rise?"

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, might my name be added to the dissent?"

W. Robert Blair: "Oh yes, add Representative Barnes and Mr. Davis and Mr. Emil Jones, Mr. McGrew, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Holloway, a Robert Holloway. Alright, now there are about four items because of the thirty day rule, we have to get out of the way today. Alright on second reading then, 188. I'm going out of order these are matters that are running out of time. 188.

Fred Selcke: House Bill 188. A Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. Second Reading of the bill. One committee amendment. Amend House Bill 188 on page 1 and so forth."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, its read? Committee Amendment, Mr. Katz's handling it? Alright. Wait just a moment, Mrs. Chapman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to call to the attention of the..a Representatives that we have been honored today by the



delegates from the State Convention of the League of Women Voters in an unprecedented action, the State League of Women Voters adjourned this morning from their Biennial meeting at Holiday Inn East in order to come to the House of Representatives to be a part of our action today on the Equal Rights Amendment. Many of them are gone now, but I did want to call to the attention of this group, whom many of the 450 people who were appearing in the galleries. Thank you, sir."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, Mr. Katz on his amendment."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House.

Committee Amendment 1 inserts into a bill that has to do with making curbs in the State usable by the physically handicapped. The use of the word with non-slip surface.. a...and it also includes another technical definition as to the length of the matter that is put on the curb. All of that will be explained on third reading, its a technical amendment approved unanimously by the Committee and I would move the adoption of Committee Amendment 1."

W. Robert Blair: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I tried to hear Representative Katz's explanation of the amendment, and Mr. Speaker I would hope that we get some order while the galleries are being cleared and if the Representative would kindly explain his amendment again?"

Katz: "House Bill 188 is the bill that provides that on newly



construction or reconstructed curbs in the State, it will be designed in such a way that there will be a little ramp put in so that people in wheel chairs will be able to embark or disembark at the intersection, be able to navigate around in their wheelchair. The Committee Amendment is one that provides that the ramp which shall be built into the curb will have non-slip surface. It's simply a way of having the concrete in such a way that someone won't fall. The second item of the Committee Amendment simply specifies the standard length which has been generally accepted by cities and villages and engineers, a twelve inch length, and those are the technical amendments which were animously approved by the Committee to House Bill 188 and I move the adoption of those technical amendments."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, all those in favor of the adoption to the Amendment say aye. Oppose no, the ayes have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment No. 2, Katz, amend House Bill 188, or page 1 and so forth."

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

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I will move to table Amendment No. 2. We will have an Amendment No. 3 that will replace Amendment No. 2 which I simply move to table."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, likes to be heard on that?"

Shea: "Is Committee Amendment is yet a Committee Amendment No. 2?"

Fred Selcke: "Floor Amendment No. 2."



Shea: "Alright."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, now the gentleman is moving to table Amendment No. 2. All those...does the gentleman have leave, okay. Alright, its tabled. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment No. 3, Katz."

W. Robert Blair: "Oh, okay."

Fred Selcke: "Amend House Bill 188 on page 1, line 13 by inserting immediately and so forth."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright."

Katz: Amendment No. 3 makes clear that the provision of the bill will only be applicable in business or commercial areas that in residential areas. That in residential areas curbs will not have to be built this way. It does limit the bill to the urban business commercial area and I would move the adoption of Amendment No. 3."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor of the amendment yield to questioning?"

W. Robert Blair: "Yea, he indicates he will."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Representative Katz, in the business and commercial areas, will there be designated definite locations, where these curbs are to be put in so that there will uniformity? In case a person is driving an automobile, he could know exactly, maybe at the beginning of the intersection of that specific area? That this..this a apron would be available?"



Katz: Representative Lechowicz, let me say to you that the way these are designed the ramp doesn't protrude out on the street, its built into the curb so in no way would it interfere with the way they are designed with traffic that would be going around the intersection. Certainly, they would be put at the intersection in a standard place, in fact, in the City of Chicago, some are found already, but there is not the problem the way they are designed of their being, anything that motorists ought to know about."

Lechowicz: "I was just thinking from a uniformity standpoint."

Katz: "I can't hear you."

Lechowicz: I was thinking from a uniformity standpoint."

Katz: "Well, I'm very sure that they would form uniform standards in any city or village, this is a...a...but it would be left to the local area and the local engineers, I'm sure that they would have uniform provision that they would follow. The specifications are actually built in to the wording of the bill itself, but as not as to exact locations, I mean we could not specify. There might be good reason that a particular intersection ought to be at one spot rather than another. I think that is something that the local engineers would have to locate the exact spot where they would go. I think it would be a mistake to encumber it with a lot of rigid requirements that would interfere professional judgment."

W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? Questions is on the adoption of Amendment No. 3. All those in favor say aye."



Opposed, no. The Ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted.
Further Amendments?" Third reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 189. A Bill for an Act to amend Section 2 of the Facilities of the Handicapped Act. Second Reading of the bill. One Committee Amendment. Amend House Bill 189 on page 2, line 1, by deleting may inserting in lieu thereof shall, and on page 2, line 4, by inserting immediately after the word may the following, at any time."

Katz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Committee Amendment 1 is a amendment to House Bill designed to make public building usable by the physically handicapped. It adds to the section under the amendment a requirement that the Attorney General shall investigate any complaint or a reported violation of the Act and where necessary, the Attorney General may bring action. All the Amendment does is simply make it mandatory on the Attorney General to investigate. It leaves discretionary whether the Attorney General will bring any action. It is an Amendment suggest in Committee and I think unanimously approved in Committee, I would urge the adoption of Committee Amendment 1."

W. Robert Blair: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was wondering why the recommendation is to the Attorney General, who has the



responsibilities of actually the house keeping of these buildings now? Is it the Secretary of State, some other offices?"

Katz: A...the background of this particular legislation is that it is applicable not only to State owned buildings but even to privately constructed buildings that are used by the public, so that it would go beyond the question of a State building which would be under the control of the Secretary of State. All that the amendment in question does is that it adds to a new provision, that assigned the investigation of complaints of non-compliance to the Attorney General. The non-compliance might be either by a State agency, it might be the Secretary, or someone else, some State building, or it could be a private building. It puts a little piece in the law that we passed about two or three sessions ago that was a pioneering buildings usable by the physically handicapped, so the answer to your immediate question is that it is not confined to simply buildings that Secretary of State might manage. It would be any public building or any building used for a public purpose, but it only covers new construction. It would not require anyone to reconstruct a building that is already up or put anything into a building that is already completed. It will only apply prospectively in the future if anyone doesn't comply, then they can go to the Attorney General and complain that the public body has not complied with the law."

Lechowicz: "Harold, who's responsibility is it to inform the



contractors of these new laws?"

Katz: "The way the bill, the original bill has been on the books for several sessions now. It says that before the building department issues a building permit, plans have to be in accordance with the architectural specifications set forth in the bill and promulgated pursuant to procedures set forth in the bill. By now, of course, all the building departments are aware and, in fact, the City of Chicago has incorporated in their own basic ordinances, the same basic provision. The builders, generally, if they go into get a building permit, would, of course, be told by the building department, if they are not compliance with the provisions. All architects know about it already. "

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "Are we finished with the discussion? Alright, the question is on the adoption of the Amendment No. 1. All those in favor say aye. Opposed no, the ayes have it, the amendment is adopted. Further amendments, third reading. Now we've got to go to third reading and we've got two bills here that will be running out of time tomorrow. The first is 28."

Selcke: "House Bill 28, Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois income tax act, third reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and members of the House. House Bill 28 is an exemption on the Illinois income tax form to allow that children who are defined as handicapped



under the School Code and those who are too severely handicapped to be included in that as well as those who are institutionalized to benefit from an exemption that amounts to \$25 per person. The total cost of the bill for those of you who are going to ask that question is 5 and one-half million dollars. So that the amount is not as large as some of the exemptions which have passed through the House in the previous few weeks, including one that deals with exemptions for students in private schools. Now, what I contend in this bill, is that we are beginning to recognize that institutionalized care is not the absolute solution to many of the problems that involve children in the State of Illinois, so I think that we undertake with this bill and hopefully, pass, is the notion that perhaps an exemption can demand from the parents to a small degree some kind of accountability in this ...a...concern for the handicap by allowing them this additional exemption. The bill, as I said does cover June 20, School Code and also those who are institutionalized. I solicit your support on the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Miller."

Miller: "Will the Gentleman yield to a question?" Mr. Schneider, I read this bill a couple of times and the amendment and I am disturbed because I'm not sure that the sections referred to in the School Code. My question is this, is a parent entitled to an additional exemption under your proposal, even though the parent is not contributing to the



support of the child? My interpretation would be that he would be entitled to the \$1000 exemption even though the State, for example, was picking up the tab if the child was in an institution. Can you enlighten me please?

Schneider: "Yeh, well what the State picks up, in many cases, in not adequate in-the first place and I think you ought to be eligible for the exemption."

Miller: "They would be?"

Schneider: "Yeh."

Miller: "Well, I think the philosophy is wrong. Mr. Speaker, may I address myself to this proposal? A Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I think it is absolutely wrong if the State of Illinois would allow an extra \$1000 exemption to the parents of a child who are not any out-of-pocket money, who are not supporting that child. I also might say, Mr. Speaker, and I think every member on this House floor knows that I, in addition to that, I have opposed eroding State income tax. I think we're wrong if we continue to amend the Illinois income tax law in such a way that we are going to have a monstrous State income tax form with all the problems that we have on the national level. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I oppose this legislation."

Schneider: "Mr. Speaker, you might note that on that Kenny the parent still picks up \$50 a month on the child when he is institutionalized, so your not saying he's never out of pocket money, you know, he still is concerned with



that. And also remember on line 17 on the 1040 for the Federal income tax we are still concerned about an area that is below 3% which is not picked up by the parent or the provider in this case, so I think there are times when the individual will be out of money and this is a small exemption that only amounts to \$25 per individual."

W. Robert Blair: "Further...a...t-he Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz:"

Katz: "I regret to rise in opposition to my colleague's bill, but I confess this House is certainly the accountant's best friend in Illinois. We start out with an income tax act which was reasonably in compliance with the Federal law, very easy to administer and we keep coming in with different amendments, all of which seem to be well designed for fine organizations and groups, but the end result is that we will have an income tax law that will only help the accountant. I think that we would be well advised that if people want to grant special privileges with reference to the taxes, let them go to the Congress and incorporate it in the Federal tax. It ought to be so that all an individual in Illinois has to do is to simply send in a copy of his Federal income tax form to the State of Illinois and that's all he needs. As it is, we're having a full employment bill passed for accountants with all of these handy little things that we add to our own laws that complicate the problem of the tax payer and, hence, I have to vote no."



W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House.

I concur with the previous speaker totally in reference that this is special legislation. There is no question that possibly these people should have additional consideration because the burden that they concur on a day to day basis, but also throughout the life of that child. They for sure need special education and in turn, the State should provide this to the best of their ability and our ability. But I would hope that the sponsor of this measure would in no way, impune any member of this House, when he votes against this measure because, one, it is 5 and one-half million dollars out of the general revenue; two, I agree with Representative Katz, that if any changes should be made in the State income tax formula, that we should submit a copy of our Federal tax, we proposed this to George Mahon when it was first initiated to eliminate some State employees in conjunction with the certification with your Federal returns. I would hope that the members of this House would look at this bill and in turn, consider the ramifications of it. I ask for a no vote."

W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? Well, Mr. Lundy wanted to say something."

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. This is indeed a difficult kind of a bill to get up and oppose. Just as the income tax deduction bill last week for tuition payment was a difficult kind of bill to get up and oppose."



But, we must be be clear in our own minds... that in opposing exemptions or deductions for certain kinds of expenditures, we are not opposing the making of those expenditures, nor are we opposing the groups on whose behalf the expenditures are made, it would be absurd in my view, to say that if you oppose this amendment to the income tax act, you oppose handicapped children. This would seem absurd to me to say that if you oppose the bill last week, you opposed sending children to school and paying their tuition. The point that we must keep clear in our minds is that the income tax code is not the place to put subsidies for otherwise desirable sociable behavior. If we want to subsidize this behavior, let's do it directly let's put it out in the open where we can see the cost and balance it against the other kinds of appropriations that we have to make for the State. Let's us not turn our State income tax into what the Federal income tax has long since become, a monstrosity which only a tax lawyer and an accountant can manage. Let's keep it simple, let's put our subsidies into the law directly and overtly where they belong and leave the income tax alone."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, to close."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. As in some of the previous comments, perhaps it would be interesting to note that the State has a responsibility to control the amount of revenues it can gather in disbursements. It seems to me that the



last term, when we dealt with property tax relief, when we talked about circuit breakers, homestead exemptions, we were all too willing to answer into that area of regulating the flow of income, but to great extent, from the local municipalities, and other local governing bodies. So I think we are making an adequate test at this point, to suggest that the State ought to take a good look at the way it controls its flow of money and I solicit a vote on this issue, which is minimal, its amount in dollars that it is requesting and that its attitude in the way we deal with the handicapped is more important. I solicit your support once again."

W. Robert Blair: "The question is, shall House Bill 28 pass? All those in favor will vote aye and the opposed, no. Have all voted who wished? Ah....Mrs. Macdonald votes no, she says her switch is not working. Record Mrs. Macdonald no. Brinkmeier is going to vote aye. Alright now have all voted who wished? Clerk...the Clerk will take the record." Choate, aye. Holloway, present. McCourt, aye. The question...there are 52 ayes, 51 nays, and 1 present, and this bill having failed to receive a Constitutional majority is hereby declared..is hereby...failed. Yeh, it's been a long afternoon, Yeh. 122."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 122, a Bill for an Act to regulate the distribution, sale and delivery of eye glass and sun glass frames and lenses, third reading of the bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentlemen from=Cook, Mr. Maragos."



Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. House Bill 122 prohibits the distribution of glasses not fitted with heat treated glass lenses, plastic lenses, or other lenses laminated lenses. It also prohibits the distribution of frames containing cellulose nitrate or other highly flammable material. After hearing the Committee, this bill was also amended on the floor, with an amendment stating that many other modern that are being used now in the industry to result in the same effect, can still be used and its a good bill for the safety and welfare of our industrial workers, of our children, and for everyone who uses it, who uses glasses. It also applies with the Federal regulation, in the respect, that the new laws that were passed by the Federal government and regulations are now fulfilled also in our State level in our own State Government, State laws, therefore I ask for your supportative vote."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the discussion? The question is shall House Bill 122 be passed. All those in favor vote aye, and the opposed, no. Say aye. Brinkmeier, aye. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Geo-Karis, aye. There are 19 ayes, no nays, this bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Alright, Senate Bills first reading...a..

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 32, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act, first reading of the bill. Senate Bill 33, a Bill to amend the Juvenile Court Act,



first reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 35, an Act to amend an Act concerning the abuse of children, first reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 36, an Act to amend an Act relating to the abuse of children., first reading of the bill. Senate Bill 92, a Bill for an Act to amend the Anti-Trust Act, first reading of the bill. Senate bill 104, an Act to amend the Banking Act, first reading of the bill. Senate Bill 110, an Act to amend an Act relating to human blood, first reading of the bill. Senate Bill 111, an Act to amend an Act relating to State finance, first reading of the bill. Senate Bill 118, an Act to amend the Election Code, first reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 119, an Act to amend the Public Aid Code, first reading of the bill. Senate Bill 122, an Act to amend the Criminal Code, first reading of the bill. Senate Bill 127, an Act to amend an Act relating to nursing homes, first reading of the bill. Senate Bill 133, and Act to amend Sections 1, 2, and 5 and the title of an act to create a commission to examine State institutions, first reading of the bill. Senate Bill 134, An Act making a Commission to examine State institutions, first reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 160, an Act to amend an Act in relation to criminal identification and investigation, first reading of the bill. Senate Bill 171, making an Act making appropriations of legislative counsel, first reading of the bill. Senate Bill 260, an Act to amend Section 1,



4, 12, and 21 of an Act to provide foreign relation, first reading of the bill. Senate 261, an Act to amend an Act relating to recorders, first reading of the bill. What about this, do you want to advance this? Senate Bill 302, an Act to amend an Act relating to the Secretary of State, first reading of the bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Craig."

Craig: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. I have talked with the leadership on both sides of the aisle, the Majority Leader, the Speaker and the leadership on this side. Senate bill 302 is the same bill has House Bill 633 which we passed last week and I'd like to ask for the leave of the House to advance this Bill to second reading without reference to Committee."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, this requires 107 votes. He's asking the Senate Bill 302 be advance to the order of second reading without reference to Committee. Okay, take the 107, all those in favor vote aye, and the opposed no. Have all voted who wished? Clerk take the record. Jake Wolf, aye. Piotrowicz, aye. Washburn, aye. Robert Dunne, aye. Kempiners, aye. Sevcik, aye. Tom Miller, aye. Hudson, aye. Porter, aye. Griesheimer, aye. Palmer, aye. Geo-Karis, aye. Robert Holloway, aye. Boyle, aye. On this question there are 144 ayes and 1 nay and the gentleman's motion to advance prevails. And the bill will go to second reading. Now...a...just a minute, we'll get there. On consideration



to postponed, Mr. Ewell, doesn't want his called. Mr. Juckett says he wants to take his back to second, 421. Is there leave for him to take it back to second for the purposes of an amendment? Alright, take it back to second and you want to table some of them? You want to table something or are you gonna?. ..."

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, and members of the House. A...when we were in the debate on House Bill 421, it was brought to my attention that there were some inconsistencies in the drafting and we have proposed an Amendment No. 1...a... am I ahead of time, Mr. Speaker?"

W. Robert Blair: "Read the Amendment, is it out on the desk?"

Juckett: "Yeh."

W. Robert Blair: "I got it back there now. Is it out on the desk then?"

Juckett: "It should be."

W. Robert Blair: "Is it on the desk? Is it on the desk?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment No. 1, Juckett, amend House Bill 421 lines 22 through 24."

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

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, this would give the third alternative for mailing a ballot to a location outside the county which was inadvertently left out when we drafted the bill and also would provide for a voter, if he's confined in a hospital, mailed directly to that hospital, and I would urge the adoption of amendment No. 1 to House Bill 421."



W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion on the gentleman's amendment? Mr. Shea?"

Shea: "Will the sponsor yield for question? Bob, this is the bill that you pulled out of the record the other day and as I read this amendment it will allow people that are sick to have the absentee ballot mailed to the place of their confinement. Is that correct?"

Juckett: "That is correct."

Shea: "And that is all that it does?"

Juckett: "And also for, it corrects the language of omission of mailing it outside the county to someone who is going to be out if he wants to mailed outside the county."

Shea: "In other words, it leaves that portion just as it is now?"

Juckett: "Yeh."

Shea: "Alright."

W. Robert Blair: "Is that it? The question is on the adoption of the amendment, all those in favor....The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leon."

Leon: "I have a question for the sponsor, will he yield for questioning?"

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

Leon: "Mr. Juckett, would this mailing to a person who is ill, necessitate a doctor's affidavit or not?"

Juckett: "That is presently being taken by other legislation, you ask me that when we were discussing it, I check the record and there is provision for somebody who is incapacitated to get on a permanent rule of that one, and



so we did not feel that it would be proper to put it into this bill when there was already a bill concerned with that situation."

W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? All those in favor of the adoption say aye. Did you want Mrs. Macdonald on this issue? Okay, I didn't ask for the no's, but Mrs. Macdonald is recognized."

Macdonald: "I just wondered, Mr. Speaker, where this bill is going to go after this consideration. Will it go to third reading to postpone consideration?"

W. Robert Blair: "It will be advanced to third. That's its normal course, you can also postpone consideration, you can go back to second reading...a...its already been read a second time, so there is no purpose on its staying on second. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh on that matter."

W. Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, since it was taken from postponed consideration through the order of second reading, and amended, it seems to me that it should go to postponed consideration."

W. Robert Blair: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea rise?"

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, are not the House Rules that a bill can only be put on postponed consideration one time? That that bill having been postponed is now, goes to the order of third reading and get called in the normal course of the events and it either goes up or down the next time its



called?" I think the rules prohibit from going to postponed consideration for the second time."

W. Robert Blair: "Right, well, the procedure that's been followed in the House has been when a sponsor has a measure on postponed consideration, gets leave, which was done here to go back to the order of second reading for an amendment to be addressed to it, that then after the House addressed itself to that question, it is advanced to the order of third reading, it is not as a matter of practice that... we have not as a matter of fact, gone to third ...postponed consideration. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, they have indeed, gone from second reading to postponed consideration and this I can recall considerable debate on. And the reason that I'm making the point is, that a bill on postponed consideration, stands much less chance to pass, than a bill being called from third reading, because there is a tendency to forget the previous experience with it, postponed consideration brings to mind the experience that we had with it before. But, in answer to Representative Shea, I'd like to point out that according to the rule, if a bill is called from postponed consideration, a strict interpretation of the rule, if a bill is called from postponed consideration and brought to second reading, the action on second reading, then according to the rule, defeats the bill. That's the end of it, so I suggest, Representative Shea, that that's not the purpose of the rule. The purpose is to give a bill just two shots and no more than two."



As you can recall, we have in the past put bills on postponed consideration continually and it became onerous."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "I don't....might I just direct this to the Majority Leader. I don't see where the language says that the action on second reading defeats itself, it says that a bill taken off postponed consideration shall not be placed there again or language similar to that. I think that was our intent and could you point out the language in that rule? Where is says that our action on second reading defeats it?"

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

Walsh: "I call your attention to the last sentence in Rule 38 which says a bill may be placed on the order of postponed consideration only once and may be called only once thereafter, now we have called it to second reading, that's the end of it, we could not call it on third reading accoring to this rule."

Shea: "Well, I think only called once means once for passage but you certainly have pointed out to us the deficiency in the rules and I think next time the Chairman of the Rules Committee, we ought to amend that section to be called once for passage, but I think under that rule it clearly prohibits us from putting that back....bill back on postponed consideration."

Walsh: "Jerry, I suggest that you have pointed out the deficiency in the rules and that the intention of that rule is not



to put a bill on third reading after it has been on postponed consideration and amended. But the intention of that rule is simply that it cannot be called for passage except one more time and cannot be postponed after an attempt to pass it."

Shea: "Now that the sponsor has amended this bill, he could I assume, right now move it to third reading, call it and attempt to go up or down with it, is that correct?"

Walsh: "Well, if that were the order of business, but I suggest that he would have to put it on postponed consideration and then call it."

Shea: "Well, its gotta go to third reading before it goes to postponed consideration no matter what we do."

Walsh: "Postponed consideration is the same as third reading. We have an order of business postponed consideration."

Shea: "If you remember, the Speaker ruled last time that we had postponed consideration second reading bills."

W. Robert Blair: "Well, rather than get embroiled in a lengthy argument here...a...I think from a technical standpoint, Rule 38, which is postponed consideration....a...does not address itself specifically to the question....a...as a matter of practice we have always allowed a person who has a bill on postponed to move it off to move it off of postponed, ask leave to move it off of postponed consideration back to the order of second reading. Now technically, if you go to ...a...a...Rule 35, it says after the second reading of the bill, the Speaker shall order the bill and



and amendments transcribed typed and advanced to the order of third reading. Technically. And that's...that's what the rule says and I ...Mr. Walsh is raising a good point, he's really saying that in cases where it has gone from postponed to second, you should give it back to postponed, but technically, I can't find that in Rule 35. In other words, it says after you come back, it's being read now a second time as amended with this amendment, 35 says that it shall be advanced to the order of third reading, not third reading postponed, and I think...I think technically, that what you're saying is what we ought to do but I'm not...I'm not sure technically done that in the past. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Well, when we amended this bill on second reading, it makes it a new and second bill, the rule requires that you take it from second reading after all amendments and go to third reading."

W. Robert Blair: "The literal reading of the Rule 35, right."

Shea: "Now I find nothing in the rules to get it a new bill from third reading to postponed consideration without some action being taken by this House."

W. Robert Blair: "Well, that's right and we...we...we took House Bill 421 from the order of consideration postponed by leave of the House back to the order of second reading, and that's been a standard practice. Leave was given for the purposes of an amendment on second. Then the question



was asked by Mrs. Macdonald, what will happen with the bill after the amendment was considered? And I said the normal practice had been to advance it to the order of third reading under Rule 35. A...Mr. Walsh makes a good point that the matter has been on postponed once, may be its on third reading, it should be considered off of the postponed calendar, but its about the Chair's recollection that's actually the way we proceeded. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I think that the Chair's point is that there is no technical answer in the rules, it's very pertinent and I would suggest that that being the case, perhaps this is one of those rare instances where Roberts Rule would apply, there being no technical a...a..point in the House rules on that and since the motion was a limited motion, a motion to take back to second reading only for the purposes of amendment, would it not then properly go back to postponed consideration automatically?"

W. Robert Blair: "No...no, I think, the only way you get back to second reading, as we've done it, is by leave of the House and when were back there, and once you're back there the bill has been read a second time, previously, but it has not been read a second time with the amendment that is going to be put on it, so now it's being read a second time with the amendments being put on it so it meets the Constitutional requirements and the only rule, as the Chair



sees it, that applies in that situation is Rule 35, which says that after the second reading of a bill, which is what we're are doing now, that the amendment is adopted, the Speaker shall order the bill and amendments transcribed and typed and advanced to the order of third reading. Not to the order of postponed consideration. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

Berman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I think that not only is the Speaker's ruling fortified by the wordin-g of a Rule 35, but also by the custom and usage that we have followed in the House. I think that the Majority Leader's point may be a good one, but I think that really to be fair to the sponsor of this bill, that our past practice has deemed that after it's amended, it goes to third reading, and that if there ought to be a change, I think it ought to be brought up in front of the Rules Committee and discussed there. But I think our past practice has always been that it goes from second to third."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, now is there any further discussion on the matter or on the amendment? Alright, all those in favor of the adoption of the amendment say aye, opposed no. The ayes have it, the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Now third reading. Alright, were on motions, Mr. Shea wants just a couple of fast verbal motions here."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, on the calendar is House Bill 483, which is



a local government tax study commission bill. I would move with leave of the House that this bill be sent back to the Committee on Reassignments so that it could be sent to the Appropriation Committee. There are two appropriation bills that are companion to this that have not been heard yet and I would not want to move this bill without knowing the appropriation was there. So, with leave of the House I would like to move that this bill be sent back to the Committee on Assignments."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, this is on a ...a an unusual procedure, but the Gentleman is asking leave to have a bill of his taken off of the calendar on where it is on the order of second reading and put in the Committee on Assignment of bills for reassignment by them. Alright, is there objection? Alright, hearing none, then that bill will be put back in the Committee on Reassignments. The Gentleman from Wills, Mr. Kempiners has a similar motion." No, not yours."

Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would also like to have leave of the House to have House Bill 406 reassigned, or sent to the Committee on Reassignment of bills so that it could be assigned to a committee on put on the interim calendar."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the gentleman is asking basically now that the same thing that Mr. Shea asked for. Does he have leave to have that bill taken off the calendar and placed back on the Committee on Reassignment for handling



by this? Alright, hearing no objection, then that will be done. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, rise?"

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I arise for a point of personal privilege. The gentleman from Madison, at an earlier point in the day, made a point relative to the Governor's endorsement, which I can hardly take umbrage. On the other hand, he referred to a hockey team...a...t-hat is going to be involved in a contest soon with the Chicago Blackhawks, and I may have in the gallery in the Speaker's gallery on the right, four loyal Blackhawk fans who I'm sure would take great offense had I not responded. Blackhawk fan, Brian, Kevin, Robert Danny are sitting up there and...I know how they felt about that remark."

W. Robert Blair: "Is yours a similar request as Shea and Kempiner's? Juckett? No."

Juckett: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I have to ask a parliamentary inquiry on 421. Do we have a new time limit starting? I'm sorry I did not hear the request for referring back to the committee on Assignments."

W. Robert Blair: "nobody addressed themselves to 421 after you finished with it."

Juckett: "It was a different bill? I'm sorry I was informed it was 421."

W. Robert Blair: "Your source is wrong. Now, where are we here? Oh, Conference Committee report on that S.J.R. The Gentleman



from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House.

This Senate Joint Resolution No. 25 if you'll recall was the Senate Joint Resolution which the House did not concur in because...a..they...the resolution to begin with requires the the transportation study commission be directed to give consideration of providing, to suggesting a mass transportation authority in the form of legislation by May 15 of this year. The Senate however, added the words, with taxing power, which would have required that the authority have taxing power within that area. A Conference Committee was appointed and the Conference Committee agreed on language and the report is on your desk but the language generally removes with taxing power and provides that the transportation study commission be directed to do this and that the legislation that they suggest, he...a..have in it that it be financed in part by local sources, and I move the adoption of the Conference Committee Report."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the discussion, Shea?"

Shea: "I just to go along with the Conference Committee Report, it is signed by all ten members of the Conference Committee and its been unanimous on both sides of the aisle of the House."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Would the Majority Leader yield for question, please?"

W. Rober Blair: "He says he will."



Tipsword: "I should have been listening more closely, but what is the import of the language that says it should be financed in part by local sources? What does it mean?"

Walsh: "Well, I'm not too sure, but it does not mean, that there will have to be a levy, that is, there would have to be a real estate tax levy or that there would have to be a gasoline tax or a utility tax or some specific tax for the purpose of financing the Regional Transportation Authority. I think that probably what it means is that local government, the City of Chicago, the County of Cook, for example, can contribute in much the same way that they are contributing to the operating subsidy now."

Tipsword: "Is there any possibility that it means something else in part, that perhaps they should be looking someplace else, perhaps the legislature for the other part of financing, is that what the purpose of it is?"

Walsh: "Well, well I can't really say, whether it does or not. It in part could mean that it would be from the fair box of financed from contributions from ah... from a carriers, it could mean almost anything including, I would think financed by the state, in part."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is on the adoption of the Conference Committee Report. All those in favor.... All right, this is just 'yes' or 'no'. All those in favor say.... it's a resolution, so it's just 'yeas' or 'nays'. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the resolution, Conference Report, with respect



to S.J.R. 25 is adopted. Now are there any announcements?
Mr. McAvoy."

McAvoy: "Mr. Speaker, Banks and Savings and Loan and Members of the Committee....Banks and Savings and Loan Committee will meet immediately after adjournment in Room M4.

W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, subject to an individual Chairman having some difference with this, Committees will meet..... 2:00 Committees will meet immediately after adjournment. Teh 4:00 Committees will meet an hour and a half after adjournment. I know that Representative Bluthardt has a change in rooms or..... I beg your pardon, he does not have a change in rooms. But if any individual Chairman with a scheduled meeting would like to differ with this, he may do so and make the announcement at this time."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, there's been some small amount of confusion that has come to my attention because of the fact that the Senate Executive Committee met in 212 today and the Judiciary Committee was supposed for 212 today. The Senate Executive Committee has vacated the room so we will meet in Room 212."

W. Robert Blair: "Are there further announcements? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J.J.Wolf."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there seems to be an error on the calendar. The ah... Veterans Affairs Personnel Attention Committee ah... is listed as meeting



today. It is normally on Wednesdays and will be tomorrow at 2:00 P.M."

W. Robert Blair: "Further announcements? Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Blades."

Blades: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, to all of the Members of the General Assembly, the Agricultural Group of the State of Illinois, through the Department of Agriculture invite all of you to breakfast in the morning, that is April the 5, at 7:45 A.M. at the St. Nick Hotel."

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

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, perhaps I missed something in all of the things we've done today, but ah... since the Committees were all postponed one day, and since the 6 1/2 day rule applies to Committee Meetings next week, and Bills which are postponed in Committees today will only have 5 1/2 days to be posted ah... if there has not been a motion made, which I might have missed, would it not be appropriate to make a motion that the 6 1/2 day rule be suspended in order to allow posting of Bills, which will be postponed in hurriedly in less than a week?"

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

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I think that this would just go to defeat the purpose of our rules. And I feel that any Bill that has to be posted again, I think we ought to know what Bills, instead of all Bills. So that couldn't the Committee Chairman come in tomorrow with a list of the Bills, rather



than just make a blanket statement, all Bills can be posted one less day this week?"

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

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, ah... we'll be not meeting for a week, two weeks from now, and ah...because of that, it seems to me with the two unusual circumstances..... and I don't know that there's been any motion made as to whether the 45 day rule will toll during the week we're gone, and so it seems to me in all fairness to many Sponsors who might have been making their plans, that to have the side by side a postponement of Committees to less than a week effecting the 6 1/2 day rule, then follow immediately thereafter by a week off, could put a number of Bills in jeopardy. I understand the Minority Leader's point interms of particular Bills, but ah... it would seem to me that considering the general confusion that ah.... result, it might be fair to everybody to allow that motion to have a 5 1/2 day posting rule, and the suspending rule to do it."

W. Robert Blair: "Well, I think the gentlemen's point is that all the Chairmen who are meeting this afternoon, they'll be ready to post their Bills tomorrow and if they will get their postings ready, and list on their postings the Bills that they are going to set for next wee, then bring those up in ah.... our meeting tomorrow on the floor and move and ah... I would assume then that the notice rule could be waved and those Bills could be heard next week."

Duff: "I understand that, Mr. Speaker, but there is also the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

situation that a individual Member ah... most Committee Chairmen have not posted next weeks Bills ah... and consequently somebody who might have wanted to come this morning to ask for a Bill to be posted next week ah... who did not, recognizing the fact that the Committee would not meet tonight, ah... would then be in jeopardy on his Bills. Not only a postponed Bill, but a Bill that might have been posted within the 6 1/2 day rule this morning and was not."

W. Robert Blair: "Well, ya, ... wait... the Committees are all meeting that are set for a meeting today."

Duff: "Yes, but that is not the point, Mr. Speaker. Ah...."

W. Robert Blair: "Now wait a minute, the Committee Chairmen ordinarily post their Bills ah... for the following week following their Committee Hearing."

Duff: "Right."

W. Robert Blair: "Well, so that's all we're saying. After you have your hearings in your Committees this afternoon, ah... you will then get your posting reading for tomorrow and the Assistant Minority Leader is indicating that at that time ah... they will support the ah... notice being 5 1/2 days or whatever it is for the Committee to meet next week to hear those specific Bills."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, let me make this clear because....."

W. Robert Blair: "No, I'll tell you what you do, I would yousuggest that what you want to do you move and see if the votes are there to do it."



Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances I'll not make the motion..."

W. Robert Blair: "All I'm suggesting is that the Minority Leader is indicating he would ah.... like to have the specific Bills that are going to be set, included in the motion in as so far as the notice is concerned and not the blanket it in. I don't think that's an unusual request, I've tried to make that clear and ah... now if you want to persist with your motion as a general matter to suspend ah.... the rule for 5 1/2 or 4 1/2 whatever it is for next week, your certainly entitled to do that."

Duff: "I'm too tired to swim up stream, Mr. Speaker."

W. Robert Blair: "I thought so. Gentlemen's all right, then if you will get your postings ready, Mr. Duff, and any of the rest of the Chairmen will report tomorrow why' we'll certainly weight the rule tomorrow. I'm sure the Minority Leader will be going along with us up here, he said he would. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

W. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, Chairman Neff of the Transportation Committee suggested to me that 45 minutes after adjournment for the meeting of the 4:00 Committee Meetings would be alot better than an hour and a half. I agree with him. The 4:00 Committees will meet in the rooms assigned to them at 6:15 this evening."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, I mean does everybody understand that? Well, now the Majority Leader is saying that the



2:00 Committees meet at what 45 minutes, Bill? Well, wait a minute we're trying to what? The proposal is that the 2:00 Committees meet when?"

W. Walsh: "Immediately after adjournment."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, immediately after adjournment. And that the 4:00 Committees meet?"

W. Walsh: "45 minutes after adjournment."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, 45 minutes after adjournment, so what we're saying is that the 4:00 will meet at 6:15, in essence and the 2:00 will meet at 5:30, which is right now. All right, is there any question about that then? Any further announcements? Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker, the Transportation Committee Meeting will be moved to M1 instead of M4, as it is right now."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, the Transportation Committee will be meeting in M1 rather than M4. All right, anything further? The Minority Leader moves that we adjourn, with the concurrence of the Majority Leader, all those in favor say 'aye', the opposed, 'no', the 'ayes' have it and we stand adjourned until ah... 9:30 tomorrow for Perfunct, 10:00 for Regular Session."

