

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SECOND SPECIAL SESSION - FIFTH DAY

JANUARY 6, 1973

10:15 O'CLOCK A.M.

THE HONORABLE W. ROBERT BLAIR,

SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A Roll Call for attendance was taken and indicated that all were present with the exception of the following:

- Representative John B. Brandt - no reason given;
- Representative Charles W. Clabaugh - no reason given;
- Representative Otis G. Collins - illness;
- Representative Lawrence DiPrima - illness;
- Representative Dyer (Mrs. Robert C.) - no reason given;
- Representative John C. Hirschfeld - no reason given;
- Representative James D. Holloway - no reason given;
- Representative Thomas R. Houde - illness;
- Representative Henry J. Klosak - no reason given;
- Representative James G. Krause - illness;
- Representative Wilbur H. Lauterbach - no reason given;
- Representative Edward Lehman - illness;
- Representative Robert E. Mann - no reason given;
- Representative James D. Nowlan - illness;
- Representative Matt Ropa - no reason given;
- Representative David C. Shapiro - illness;
- Representative John W. Thompson - no reason given;
- Representative Jerry Corbett - no reason given.



W. Robert Blair: "The House will be in Session. The invocation will be by Dr. Johnson."

Dr. Johnson: "We pray. Almighty God, Merciful Father, You create and complete all things and on this, the seventh day of the week when Your people of old rested and recalled all of Your manifold mercies, we ask you to direct us as work, direct the progress and bless the accomplishments of this day that our work may be pleasing in Your sight. We thank you for the gift of this day, for the calling of our daily life, for health and strength of mind and body and for the assurance of your presence in our midst. Grant us now Your protection also this weekend whether we travel or remain here so that as the dawn of a new week breaks upon us, we may greet it in gratitude for Your preserving power and in anticipation for new opportunities for serving. Let each of us confess this day with a psalmist: The Lord of Hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge. Amen."

W. Robert Blair: "Roll call for attendance. Gentleman from Lake, ah.. Mr. Pierce.."

Pierce: Absences..

W. Robert Blair: "Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bill 1."

F. B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1. An Act to amend Section 1 of an Act concerning fees and salaries in the classified of several counties in this State with reference thereto, Third Reading of the bill."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Philip."



Philip: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave of the House to consider Senate Bill 1 and 2 together. They are companion bills."

W. Robert Blair: "Is there objection? All right. Hearing none ah.. read Senate Bill 2 a third time."

F. B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 2. An Act making supplemental appropriations for pay of certain officers of state government. Third Reading of the bill."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Philip."

Philip: "Yea.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1 is the pay raise for the constitutional officers. Senate Bill 2, if Senate Bill 1 would pass, would make up the increase in those constitutional officer's pay raise for the next coming physical year. So, it's very difficult to put a price tag on what an elected official is worth. And I'd like to just read to you what the increases are. For the Governor of Illinois will be going from \$45,000 to \$50,000. The Lieutenant Governor from \$25,000 to \$37,500. Secretary of State from \$30,000 to \$42,500. State Comptroller, from \$30,000 to \$40,000. State Treasurer from \$30,000 to \$40,000. Superintendent of Public Instruction from \$30,000 to \$42,500. Attorney General from \$30,000 to \$42,500. Trying to compare some of the elected offices with the comparable field in business, it would seem to me that some of state officers are grossly underpaid. If you try to compare a president of a corporation and



take a corporation that does 80 to \$90,000,000 a year and has about 5 to 7,000 employees.. Their average salary for the president of that corporation would be anywhere from 100 to 125, \$150,000 a year. Our Governor who has in the area of 100,000 employees has over a \$6,000,000,000 budget a year is compensated to the tune of about \$45,000. Yet he has to deal with the complicated problems of the State where the president of the corporation generally speaking deals with his other officers and stockholders. If we look at the Attorney General of the State of Illinois and let's compare the ah.. Attorney for Montgomery Wards which annually receives \$116,000 a year. The Attorney for the State of Illinois at this point receives \$30,000 a year. And in my judgment has many more problems and certainly is greatly underpaid. If we don't pass a pay raise for the constitutional officers and they haven't received a pay raise in seven year.. If we don't pass one this time that will be 11 years the constitutional officers of Illinois did not receive a pay raise. I want you to note also that some of our department heads in the State of Illinois receive more money than our elected officials. And I might bring up the point that the Department of Transportation, he receives \$40,000 a year. Most of our other state officials receives \$30,000 a year. It would seem to me that these increases are justifiable and I would certainly ask for your support."



W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. Further discussion? All right. The question is shall these two bills pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no' and the Clerk will take ah.. two records." Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I owe it to my constituents to explain my vote. When the demand for public funds is insatiable and when the supply of public funds is as narrowly limited as is true today, the solemn responsibility of the legislature is to establish priorities. And our priorities are all wrong when we fritter away the taxpayers' money on the unnecessary frills of public salaries instead of giving that money to education, transportation, mental health, conservation, the areas in which people live. I ask you to reexamine your sense of priorities in this value and I ask you to remember that there are things in life besides money. Public officials above all ah.. all others should cherish the high honor of serving in public office and being entrusted by their fellow men with the responsibility of government. That is immeasurable by money. The people that are getting these salaries, they have no.. no priority here in comparison with the other needs of government and that's why we should all vote no."

W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? The ah.. All right. Borchers no. The Clerk will take the record."



Katz 'aye'. Hanahan explanation."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I was just wondering if the few people who are absent would remove their names off the roll call. I hate to have to ask for a verification but I'll be damned if I like to see people voting for favors for newly officials because they said they were here voting for a pay raise. I think in all honestly, people who are not here should not be recorded on these roll calls. And I suggest in lieu of asking for a verification that we take the roll call again and get an accurate roll call. Otherwise I hate to take up the time of the House asking for a verification."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. The Clerk advises that the machine was not totalling properly on that last roll call and he's got it fixed now so the question is shall these two bills pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Gentleman's point from ah.. McHenry, ah.. Mr. Hanahan's point is well taken and those ah.. members who are not here should not be appearing on the roll call. Gentleman from ah.. Macon, Mr. Borchers, no. His key's locked. And now have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Now on each of these questions there are 114 'ayes', 28.. 29 'nays' and each of these bills having received the required vote under the constitution are hereby declared passed. What purpose does the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms raise?"



W. T. Simms: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker having on.. having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the action ah.. which we ah.. just recorded."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Hallaren."

O'Hallaren: "Mr. Speaker, I move that that motion lie upon the table."

W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion to table say 'aye'."

Members: "Aye".

W. Robert Blair: "Opposed no. The 'ayes' have it and the motion is tabled. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Simmons, raise?"

Simmons: "Ah.. Point of personal privilege."

W. Robert Blair: "Proceed."

Simmons: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I raise on a point of personal privilege. Ah.. to inform the House that the article that appeared in the Illinois State Journal written by Toby McDaniels, I believe it was about Christmas, around the later part of December listing me ah.. as being amongst a number of lawmakers that have failed to pay tickets for parking in Springfield. I ah.. I got a letter from the police department in Springfield about September stating that I had a couple of tickets that weren't taken care of and they gave me the dates. And I wrote back to them and said that it would be impossible for me to get tickets in Springfield in that I did not have my car down in





Springfield because I was fortunate enough to belong to a car pool of Mr. McGah, Mr. Bill Walsh and Mr. Dick Walsh and they think that I drive too slowly so this year they've been transporting me down here. So it couldn't be me. I thought that would be the end of it. But then when this article appeared I ah.. went into the Illinois State Journal Office here in the press room and asked somebody of the paper to have a denial printed. Well, it was never printed. So yesterday, Bill Walsh and I went over to the Police Department and they found that instead of these tickets being issued to House Official Number 27 ah.. which would be me in a Mercury, it was actually issued to Official 27, a Buick, which probably belongs to a Senator. And ah.. so I.. I.. have kind of given up the idea that I'll be able to get a retraction from the newspaper. But I did want my colleagues to know that if I get a parking ticket, I'll pay it."

W. Robert Blair: "Senate Bill 3."

F. B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 3. An Act to Amend Sections 1 and 2 and the title of and an to add Section 4 of an Act to provide for and fix the compensation of the Members of the General Assembly, the State of Illinois. Third Reading of the bill."

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

Miller: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Senate Bill provides that each Member shall receive an



allowance of \$32 per day for lodging, meals and for other incidentals. It also provides for \$10,000 a year for staff, services and office expense. Now, all I want to say is that this has been a long time coming. And two years ago, I introduced a bill to allow per diem. And it passed out of the Exec Committee after having a hearing. I also want to add that 36 other states are now receiving allowance of food and lodging. I want to go on saying that two years ago there was some opposition. But now in our Chicago area the four Chicago newspapers have editorially endorsed and support this request. I also want to add that if we want high calibre, high quality legislators as we have here you have to pay to keep them here. You also know that I will not be a beneficiary of this increase. I also happen to feel that in order to be more effective, a district office is a convenience for your constituents. They know what's going on, you can serve them, they don't have to come here to see you. And under the new constitution you're going to be constantly in session and you have your office man staffed in Chicago, you're going to have to pay for it. I believe what's fair is just. I've been here many years. I don't think that we should have to delve into our salaries to pay. And I know the City of Springfield's never had a recession or depression to my knowledge. It's because of this General Assembly. We've been treated very fairly here.



And I'm only saying this because of an article that appeared here in one of the Springfield papers opposing this per diem. The cost of risen expenses has gone up. We even have a tax on our hotel rooms here in Springfield. I don't say it's unjust. It goes for a good cause. And I'm willing to pay it. I believe that every member here knows the time is at hand. There are 36 other states that have this increase and I ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. does the Gentleman desiring leave to have 4 and 5 ah.. read.."

Miller: "Yes 4 and 5 should be. And I explained 5. And Senate Bill 4 is the appropriation bill."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. Is there objection to ah... having those heard? All right. Would the Clerk please read Senate Bill 4 and Senate Bill 5."

F. B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 4. An Act making a supplemental appropriation for expenses of the General Assembly. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 5. An Act to amend Section 1 of an Act making appropriations for the furnishing of legislative staff, secretarial, clerical, research, technical, telephone, and other utilities, services, office equipment and office rental costs to members of the General Assembly. Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. The ah.. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. P. J. Miller has explained 3, 4 and 5. And ah.. now is there further discussion? Gentleman from Livingston,



Mr. Hunsicker."

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

It appears to me that this General Assembly is not interested at all in trying to help stop the inflation spiral. Here we're going to pass increased expenditures which will pour more fuel on the fire. Why don't we give the taxpayer a little thought. He needs relief badly. No. We just give tax relief more study and keep right on spending more tax dollars without much study whatsoever. I can't for the life of me understand why the members of this body who scream the loudest for more money didn't give the salary, mileage and living expenses while serving in Springfield some thought before they offered themselves a candidate. Not after they're elected. They knew what the salary was. They have served before. They know what is costs to live in Springfield. Not what they want to make it cost. Nobody forced them to become a candidate. They did so of their own free will. I daresay that almost every member of this body has other income besides the salary received for the office. I have always taken the stand everyone should be public-spirited enough to serve their government without demanding the top salary. We talk tax relief but keep right on spending. So let's think of the poor taxpayer once in while. Now I understand that we as legislators are the second highest paid in this



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

1-6-72

country of ours. I well remember the session a year ago when we were 50th on an implied consent bill and almost had to talk our heads off to pass such a bill. So here we are within one of the top and we're still not satisfied. I hold in my hand here, Ladies and Gentlemen, 124 letter and cards and petitions I received a year and a half ago when the \$32 per day expense bill was introduced. It made one of the papers in a heavily populated area in my district and within two weeks I had received all this mail. Not one in favor. I have also received a number of letters and cards in opposition in the last two weeks and I'd like to read three of them to give you an idea of what the tenure of the people is. It says, 'In regards to the proposed \$32 a day pay increase for expenses are you guys out of your mind? You're already receiving more for your expense accounts than many of us are getting for a yearly income. Use your common sense and start cutting some corners including your own. How much longer do think the taxpayers can stand this?' Here is another one. 'I've written.. I have never written opposing a piece of legislation before, but this \$32 a day expense increase for each member of the legislature has shaken me and everyone else to sheer panic inside. My God. Give a little thought for your state. Who else in this country gets a few pay raises the



first five months of the year. We have raised four children. Two married and two in college on \$12,000 and less. Politicians don't know the meaning of sacrifice. It seems all they want are these jobs to fill their pockets while they're in. What defense does the ordinary family got when election comes around and they're all for the same type of candidate. Let's vote this extravagant bill down and put the money to a better use. Lord knows there are plenty places.. starting with education'. That's just two of them, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'm certain that my constituency feels that I've done job representing them because of the large majority of votes every time I run for re-election. I also feel that they think that I am adequately paid for my services. I try to represent them to the best of my abil.. ability and in a way I think they want to be represented. So let's be satisfied for a few years. During the recent session, we heard a lot of hot air if you please on the tax freeze. It needs more study. It's political. It's got holes in it. We cannot pass tax freeze because the local governments need the money. We could have more hearings on it. I ask you in all sincerity, is any legislation we pass perfect? You know it isn't. Now you're going to pass an expenditure bill. And has there been any hearings on this outside of a few by Blue Ribbon Committee? Are you listening to the wishes of the



people? Are you concerned about what they think about your voting more expenses for the dilly-dallying tactics performed by this body instead of doing a good job for the people you represent? You know you're not. You know what each legislator will be costing the taxpayers of Illinois if this bill passes along with the 4,000 increase for expenses in the legislative districts? Do a little figuring. \$17,500 salary. \$2300 as each share a secretary at \$6900 a year. \$10,000 for the district. \$3200 for a minimum of 100 days while serving in the General Assembly and this comes to \$33,000 for legislator not counting the fringe benefits of insurance, retirement, mileage, mileage per week of attending session, needs and incidentals for attending commission meetings. Let's tell the people what each legislator is costing them. I'm certain that it would come between \$35,000 and \$40,000 a year. And when the fringe benefits amounts to what the salary amounts to there's something wrong. There have been numerous statements made that the \$30,000 is inadequate for the Comptroller. The Comptroller elect has been a member of this honorable body for several years and I use the word honorable loosely drawing an annual salary of \$17,500. It appears to me that an almost doubling of this salary to \$30,000 should be satisfactory. In my humble opinion, a



salary being paid our judges and this bill's coming up next to all of whom I'd like to made these remarks and that's all the time I'll take of the House. In my humble opinion, a salary being paid our judges is also ample for the serves rendered. Supreme Justices are furnished living quarters and I understand food while they're down here in session so I think they are receiving an indirect increase in salary. It would make alot more sense to me to give the jurors that serve on the trial a few more dollars a day instead of taking them out. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House it all boils down to this as I see it. Do you want to help control inflation. Do you want to help pull government expenses down or do you want to keep on with everlasting programs spending tax and tax and spend? The decision is yours. I'm voting no on this series of bills.

Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I will benefit from these two bills and I intend to support them ah.. for the simple reason the voters of our state are asking for better service from their legislators including service in the district. My constituents are over 200 miles from Springfield. They want to be able to reach me in the district. The raise from 6 to \$10,000 of home office expense has been completely misrepresented by the press and I might say by





the previous speaker, the gentleman from Livingston, as part of our remuneration or part of our salary. It is not. It is paid directly by the State for rent up to a maximum of \$200 a month, for secretarial assistance, or for telephone or research assistants in the home office. This is the kind of bill that makes the individual legislator a stronger, a stronger member of this body both in his home district and down here. When the Governor adds one secretary of ten secretaries to his staff, the press doesn't say or neither does the Gentleman from Livingston, that that's part of his salary. That we've increased the Governor from \$45,000 to \$100,000 because they hired five secretaries and ten press aides and ah.. 15 people to send out press releases. That's not part of his salary. Why are we tagged.. why are we tagged by the press and sometimes by the public and sadly enough sometimes by our members with being charged that part of our income from the legislature is the money paid out for rent or for a secretary or for a telephone. You don't say the mayor of your city gets his salary and a secretary's salary and if he hires a second secretary you don't say that that is increasing his salary. These are direct payments to the recipient and must be declared on the recipients' income tax. And they better be. As to the per diem expense, every traveling salesman, every member of the press that's in Springfield receives reimbursement for



lodging and meals on the road away from home. And we should also. When we come down here when there's no session we get reimbursed now for ah.. two days in Springfield during a month. When we come down for a Commission we get reimbursed. The only time we don't get reimbursed is when we're here representing our constituents in a Regular or Special Session of the General Assembly. The \$32 a day is reasonable for lodging, for meals and incidentals. We shouldn't be ashamed to receive it and we should deduct.. show it on our income and deduct it on our expenses. The home office expense from 6 to 10,000 is not our income at all and it's misleading to say that it is. I intend to support these bills and vote for them."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Thanks ah.: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah.. first I want to say that I take this floor very seldom. I try not to utilize extra time if it can be avoided. But on this package and I'm talking about the whole package that we have here this morning. I feel so strongly opposed to them that we're doing something wrong that I must say a few words. It was only just a short time ago when we were all running for office. That includes the state officials that were elected as well as the legislators. And at this time before the election I heard no one make the remark that they ah.. was going to vote themselves a pay raise or



even expected a pay raise. I think that what we're doing here is showing contempt to the voters of this State of Illinois. Now what we're doing here is no doubt legally right. But I think we must all agree what we're doing here at this time is morally wrong. I think that the call of this special session was ridiculous and should have never been called. Everyone that ran for office at the time he announced himself knew what the salary was. We ah.. I don't think any of us including myself, I had no one put a gun up to the side of my head and said you run or else for this job. I ah.. I ah.. picked this job and I run and morally I told the people that I was willing to accept the salary. And I feel that everyone that ran for office when he announced himself was morally bound to stay with that salary that he indirectly agreed to accept. I ah.. I strongly oppose any pay raises between the time a person is elected for office and the time he takes office. I think this is.. Again, I want to repeat. What we're doing here may be legally right but it certainly is morally wrong. And ah.. again, I am speaking on all of the bills. I'm speaking of the judges bills. I don't think there's any judge that's going to be hurt by waiting a couple of years for a pay raise. I don't think they're that financially pinched that they cannot wait for at least two years for a pay raise. Now, ah.. I personally have seen very few ah.. newspaper reports,



editorials and so forth supporting this package of bills. Ordinarily I don't always go along with newspapers. But this time I think they're speaking the voice of the people in their opposition to this whole string of bills on pay raises which is going to cost the state before we get through millions of dollars. We're talking about millions of dollars here when we total it all up. But people are fed up with ah.. this kind of tactics and will definitely I'm sure show it when they go to the polls in 1974. Ah.. I do hope that each of us will stop and think before we ah.. make a final vote on this issue ah.. just stop and think that what the people are going to think. What they're saying right now. I talked to quite a few of my people and I'm sure each and everyone of us have. I have found nobody that I have talked to that is in favor of these raises at this time. Doing such things as these is why the people have lost confidence in our government.. on our elected officials. And I think we can understand why. Why shouldn't they lose confidence when we do such deals as these? I would urge strongly that everybody oppose.. that everyone oppose these bills and they should definitely be defeated. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Fary: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker. Brother Murphy was over here and Murphy says that he and I and Venetta and Capuzi are going to talk to Lechowicz and the Appropriations Committee."



And we decided that Lechowicz is going to buy some army cots for the offices across the street so we can save the taxpayers some money. Anybody that wants to join us will come over to see either Murphy or Lechowicz or myself."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think again that we have to recognize the fact that rather than our constituents degenerating the public opinion that is going to affect our vote on these issues one way or another I think again it's the news media who have generated the public opinion because one, I have received just one letter ah.. regarding these bills and that was from outside my district. Now it would be interesting to note as we did with the other bills of similar nature some years ago, how many letters did these members of this present general assembly receive in opposition to these bills. In speaking to the previous speaker, Representative Neff, who blanketed in a direct indictment all members of this General Assembly on campaigning and not saying during that campaign of recent months whether they were going to vote for or against the pay raise or a per diem allowance. Now Mr. Neff, Representative Neff, I for one will tell you that I made 178 campaign appearances and in each and everyone of them I told the people that attended that I would vote against a pay raise for myself but would most



certainly vote for a per diem allowance. Because if you know it or not, most of your constituency already thinks you're getting an expense account and expense allowance. So Representative Neff, please don't include me in your blanket indictment because I did inform each and everyone in my constituency who I had the opportunity to meet that I would vote against a pay raise for myself, a pay raise for the constitutional officers, a pay raise for the judges and most certainly an expense allowance for myself. Again, recognize my fellow colleagues that the press is generating the opinions that are being heard on the floor of this House today. How many of you to date have received letters from your constituency objecting to these bills? I daresay it would be less than 100. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "The ah.. Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Gene Hoffman."

Gene Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move the previous question."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye'."

Members: "Aye:"

W. Robert Blair: "Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question's been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Miller."

P. J. Miller: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I didn't think I was going to have to explain any



further. However, the State of New York pays expenses, \$5,000 to each legislator. The State of Louisiana pays \$1,050 per month or \$12,600 annually for expenses. State of California pays \$26,013 per month or \$31,356 annually to provide for an administrative assistant, a secretary, janitorial service, part-time help and other office expense. And you know that California is rated as a number one legislative state by the citizens who evaluated the various General Assemblies and it amounts to over \$50,000 per legislator a year in California. And that's why they have the high-type calibre legislator that we're going to have here. And I hope that.. and I'm not speaking for myself, again, but I hope that you'll remember that you must pay for good government. Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask for an affirmative roll call."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. The question is shall these three bills pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. The Clerk will take three roll calls. Gentleman from.. Wait a minute. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Richard Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker. I'd like to be recorded 'aye' on Senate Bills 3 and 4 and 'no' on Senate Bill 5."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. Record the Gentleman as he requested. Gentleman from Cook,.. Mr. William Walsh has the same request. Gentleman from McClain, Mr. Hall."

Hall: ".. be recorded 'aye' on 3 and 4 and 'no' on 5."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the Clerk will so indicate. The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded 'aye' on 3 and 'no' on 4 and 5."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, ah.... The Clerk is indicating it might be easier for us to take separate roll calls, Ah.... rather than having one with copies, so I think that's a preferable procedure. Let's dump this one and start all over again." All right, we'll start off with three. Question is, shall Senate Bill 3 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. By way of explaining my vote, I've listened intensively to the debate. The truth of the matter is some people might not be worth anymore than what we're getting and others might be worth more. You cannot, as a Public Official, you cannot as an elected Public Official run for public office and run from criticism. I respect the right of the press to criticize whenever they feel that we should be criticized. I also respect what the distinguished gentleman just said a few minutes ago, the people think we are receiving these expenses. They think we get our lodging and our board and our meals. The people I talk to say well you know, you get that. It isn't so. But finally, let me say this and this hasn't been touched on. Let me say this - that the cheaper the politician comes, the more he costs the tax-





payer: "

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, 'no'. Ah.... gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Gibbs."

Gibbs: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my vote. This Bill here calls for a per diem allowance of \$32 a day and it says and I read from the Bill, it says 'each member shall receive \$32 a day for lodging and meals.' Now I'm from Springfield here. Basically I'm in favor of a per diem allowance but I'm not certainly in favor for this Bill. Certainly being from Springfield, ah.... I couldn't accept and I will not accept any allowance for lodging and meals. Not so much because of the problem I would have with my constituency, but the problem I would have at home. Ah.... my wife would certainly be in favor of not preparing another meal, but if I have a motel room here in Springfield, I'd be in trouble. We don't have to pass this Bill today. We can pass it another time. I think the form should be that we should voucher these. For instance, if one of the member's is away on business or is sick, the way I interpret this Bill, he will automatically receive this \$32 a day. I think based on that, I will have to vote 'no' on this Bill."

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

Miller: "Perhaps I was in error. It says 'while in attendance at sessions of the General Assembly'. That's the only time you will receive, and that will make sure that some of the members will be here."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. This question, there are 110 'ayes', 37 'nays' and Senate Bill 3, having received the required vote, is hereby declared passed. Now we'll take the roll with respect to Senate Bill 4. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Borchers 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 105 'ayes' and 39 'nays' and Senate Bill 4, having received the required vote, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 5 now. Question is, shall Senate Bill 5 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, 'no'. Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I realize that nothing is going to be said here that will change anybody's opinion on these Bills, but I do think we should set the record straight as far as the media is concerned. I tried to follow very carefully, particularly what's been said by the Chicago media concerning the Bills for the legislature. And it's my understanding that there's been no out and out condemnation of the legislature for recommending either pay increases or expense increases. As a matter of fact, ah... one of the papers suggested that we ought to be paid \$25,000 a year which I certainly think would be more appropriate for the circumstances. But I believe the complaint that has come from the media is actually a reflection of the complaints



that are coming from our constituents; namely, it's not a case of improper action, but poor timing. In other words, we've got a lame duck legislature coming back here and voting expense accounts for ourselves, pay raises for others when we could go into session next Wednesday, January 10th, and do the same thing. I frankly favor an expense account for legislators. I favor staffing, because I think we'll be a more confident group, and I would support a reasonable increase for the State officials and the judges. However, I think the media is right, when they say the timing is improper and therefore, I feel obligated because we are a lame duck legislator to cast a 'no' vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 91 'ayes', 51 'nays', and this Bill having received the required vote, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 6."

F. B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 6. An Act to amend Section 3, 3.1 and 3.2 of an Act concerning fees and salaries and classified in several counties in this State with reference thereto. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Carroll: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to have Senate Bills 6 and 7 heard together. They are a package."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there objection? Hearing none, read Senate Bill 7."

F. B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 7. An Act to make a supplemental appropriation for pay of certain officers of the judicial system of State government, authorizing payment thereof



from specified funds of the State Treasury. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bills 6 and 7 deal with the salaries and appropriations for our Supreme, Appellate, and Circuit Court Judges. The Supreme Court Justices, the 7 of them will go up to a salary of \$42,500. The Appellate Court Justices, the 30 of them will go up to a salary of \$40,000, and the 346 Circuit Court Judges, full circuit, will go up to \$30,000. That's a \$2,500 dollar increase across the board, from the circuit level up. It does not in any way touch the Associate Judges. It does add the single county supplement to the DuPage area. I would ask for a favorable roll call. Senate Bill 7 is the appropriation for that."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Juckett."

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I realize that these Bills apply to the State judges, the State Supreme Court, the State Appellate Court, the State Circuit Court. But I think it would do all of us some good to read the papers today and where we see an individual, a former official of the City of Chicago, who stole over one hundred thousand dollars and a Court, even though it be the Federal Court, decided that he was worth fifty thousand dollars a year, because a Federal Judge gave



him two years for stealing one hundred thousand dollars of the people's money. Not only that, there was nothing about repayment of the one hundred thousand dollars in that sentence. I think the people are getting disgusted with the judiciary at their leniency on criminals and had this been a poor working individual, he probably would have been sent away for twenty-five years. And he would have had to make restitution. But here is an individual who served in high circles, who was given a post of honor and because, I guess because of that, he gambled away the money, he lived a high life and a Federal Judge, a member of the Judiciary .....

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "One moment please. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, rise?"

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if I could have a ruling from the Chair whether this is pertinent to the Bills on hand? I thought we were considering Bills 6 and 7 as a package dealing with the increases. I want to know if this is germane to the Bills, Mr. Speaker. I think we've all read the newspapers, but, in turn, I would ask a ruling from the Chair."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, the gentleman should confine his remarks to discussions concerning Senate Bills 6 and 7. I'm sure he will do that."

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, I think the action of the Judiciary has so alienated the People of America, as well as the People of the State of Illinois, that they are concerned



with their own safety. They are concerned with the fact that criminals are out on the Street. They are concerned that the sentences that are being handed down do not fit the crime and it's those that are not in high places, are the one's that are being locked up and keys are being thrown away. I don't think that they have any animosity toward the many hardworking judges, the people that they come into contact with every single day, but I think that the thread of irresponsibility in the Judiciary has got to be corrected. I am just thankful that it was not a State judge that gave this ridiculous sentence, that considered a thief was worth \$50,000 a year, and I would hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who are always quick to jump up and distinguish between the white collar crime and the blue collar crime, would join me in this decent, but I would urge that we would take a long and hard look at the action of the judiciary at what their decisions are, at how much turmoil they have caused the American public, and that we would look at the decent of the American public, at such decisions as were handed out yesterday to the former alderman. It does not concern this pay Bill, but we must review the actions of the judiciary, we must not take them as God Almighty. We have effectively removed them from the People in the elective process. Even though they do stand for election, as soon as they put their name on the ballot, it is tantamount to their election. I think we have to review the retention system. We have



to review their decisions and I would urge that we would take this into consideration, when you vote on these Bills."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Williams."

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

I rise this morning in opposition to these two Bills.

I am at a loss to understand how we could even consider giving someone a pay increase who's already making \$40,000 a year in salary. When we live in a State and a Country where there is people going hungary, there's people not even making, Mr. Speaker, what there increase calls for.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, this morning as I stand here, if I could persuade you and my good friend, the Minority Leader, from the other side, to persuade the newly elected Governor, when the flag has been flown 30 days in respect to our former great President, Harry Truman, if you could get the new Governor to extend it for 30 days more, for the taxpayers of Illinois, because this is a sad morning for them. Just a few days ago, this General Assembly refused to freeze real estate property taxes. They refused to say to the property owner of this State that your taxes will not be increased the next two years, but yet this morning, we are willing to give a raise to people who are already over-paid. I don't know of anyone in our society who draws the kind of salary they do for the little amount of work that they do. They are long over-paid, Mr. Speaker, and I fully realize this morning, that I'll probably be the first



citizen in Illinois that will be sent to the penitentiary for jaywalking because I voted against their payraise. But they can do whatever they like, Mr. Speaker. They don't earn a payraise. They are getting all kinds of expense accounts, everything furnished. They have robbed and looted the taxpayers of this State. They told us when we passed the Judicial Article, oh how much better the court system was going to be, how much more work the judges were going to do. I say to you, they're doing less work, and it's costing the taxpayers of this State over fifty million dollars a year to keep these judges in the manner they like to be kept in. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, this morning, and the Members of this General Assembly, we need to look at this thing. There is no emergency about this Bill. This Bill could be passed in any session and go into effect immediately. What's the rush? I say let's make the court system, let's make the judges in this State, earn a payraise. Let's make them earn it. Let's make them do something, for the People of this great State. They're the same judges that put the Personal Property Tax back on the taxpayers. I can understand why they feel this way, because they want more money from themselves. That's the reason we've got it, and I say to you, Members this morning, I urge you to vote 'no' on their payraise."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. R. A. Carter."





R. A. Carter: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, if you'll hold that for just a moment.... for one Member who has been seeking recognition ah.... for a few minutes, Mr. Carter. The gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Blades."

Blades: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll make my talk short on this. I must rise in opposition to this Bill for various reasons. During the campaign, that just ended in November, I contacted many people in my district, and there were many who expressed themselves as having lost confidence in Government and more particularly, having lost confidence in our judicial system. The Court Reform Bill that was adopted a few years ago by the People has been a farce. The caliber of judges we have been getting since that time is no better than it was ten years ago. We have elevated previous county judges to judicial judges with the great increase in salary each time. Now we are proposing by this Bill that they be paid a salary of \$30,000 a year. There is and has been a fight to curb inflation, ladies and gentlemen, and if we are ever to curb or even slow down the inflation of the dollar, that movement must come by government itself. And.... and we will have to make the initial move and that is not being done here today. I must move in opposition to this Bill. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Now the gentleman from Cook, Mr. R. A. Carter renews his ah.... ah.... motion on the previous



question. All those in favor, say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the previous question has been moved. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Carroll, to close."

Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, to answer but a few of the points that were raised. I agree with Representative Juckett that we have to look at the Federal Judiciary, and I for one, wish we had some control over them by way of salaries, to get them from stopping legislators and acting in their proper capacity, and I think that is a criticism of the Federal Courts and not of our State. This is another area of government that has gone for at least four years without a cost of living increase, any type of increases or increments, that any of the union members of this State have enjoyed, and any of the other employees of this State, non-governmental employees have enjoyed. If we want the type of government that is able to govern, we must have three strong, but equal branches of government. The Judiciary is an equal branch to our's, it's an equal branch to the Executive. They should be as well compensated and as strong and as equal, with the proper checks and balances. And my final point, I would just like to ask the Members of the House. This is my last series of Bills as a Member of this House, and I would therefore ask for a favorable roll call."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is, shall these two Bills pass? All those in favor, will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no', and there will be two roll calls. Gentleman



from Macon, Mr. Borchers, votes 'no'. Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, proceed."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm voting 'no' for many of the reasons that were described before, This unconscionable waste of the taxpayers money, but it also preserved the inequity that's very unfair to downstate judges. They get \$7500 less than their wealthy brethren from the Northern part of the State. Our judges are no less wise, no less dedicated, nor no less needy than their brethren. The ISBA and other professional organizations have suggested that inequity should be corrected. And I think that we should take that into consideration. There are other reasons for voting 'no'. If we vote 'no' and defeat this Bill, we could give the Governor the strength to veto all these Bills and give us all a time to start over. Finally, I would say that almost twenty-four hours have passed since the remark was made that somehow the Governor-elect would save the taxpayers of Illinois, and all we've had is thunderous silence from the gentleman who could have raised his finger and protected the taxpayers. A second time, when it came time to stand up for the taxpayers of Illinois, he has struck out just as he did on the tax freeze bill. We all should vote 'no'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Barry."

Barry: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as 'present' for the same reasons basically as recited by Representative



Roscoe Cunningham. For many a year now, I have been suggesting, as did the State Bar Association of Illinois, that all Judges, both upstate, and downstate, and as a Democrat downstate, most of my judges are Republican, all judges should get the same kind of pay and the same class, and that's exactly what the Bar Association recommended and that's exactly what we're not doing here. We continue a \$7500 difference between Cook County and other single county circuit judges and Downstate judges and I.... I.. I just don't want to be any part of it. I have to practice law for a living and I'm not going to be a darn fool and suggest that ah.... I don't think that judges who are good judges deserve even more pay than some of them are getting now, so I would like to be recorded as voting 'present'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? Gentleman for Peoria, Mr. Day."

Day: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, n explaining my 'no' vote, I want to point out that I am not the least bit motivated in casting this vote. By an article which appeared in the Chicago Daily News, on Wednesday, January 3rd, which in my opinion, libeled not only every Member of the Legislature, but also every Member of the Judiciary in the State of Illinois. Let me read to you from that Article. The writer says 'Judges may have their payraise during their terms, but many Legislators and State officials are anxious to raise it as soon as possible. They feel they might lose fewer



private law cases and have less legislation declared unconstitutional if the judges got a raise! Now for any Member of the Legislature that is involved in any kind of litigation in this State, for every Member of the Legislature that practices law, this is libel. This is irresponsible journalism. It passed its credit on the entire Judicial system of this State and if the writer of this article has an ounce of decency or pride, he will either publish the names of the legislators or the judges he has referred or he will make a public apology. His failure to do this, will not only pass discredit on him, but also on the Chicago Daily News and the journalism profession in general."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Pappas."

Pappas: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my 'no' vote, I would briefly like to say this, that instead of considering this series of Bills, what we should be considering is a constitutional amendment to do away with the Judicial Article, and put the Judges back on the ballot to where they would be responsible to the People of the State of Illinois."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Johnson, Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to inform you, I would like to have the roll call verified at the end of it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any..... Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. All right, there's



been a request for a verification. We have 96 'ayes' and 40 'nays', at this time, so the Clerk will..... 41 'nays' with Mr. Borchers. Jake Wolf 'aye'. All right, the gentlemen will be in their seats and the Clerk will proceed to verify the roll call, starting with the affirmative."

F. B. Selcke: "Anderson....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "You want to poll the absentees first. All right, I'm sure the gentleman from Johnson, Mr. Williams, will accede to your request. It's the normal procedure, so first we will ask the Clerk to poll the absentees."

F. B. Selcke: "Bluthardt. Borchers. Borchers is 'no'. Calvo. Carrigan."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "One moment. Calvo 'aye'."

F. B. Selcke: "Chapman. Clabaugh. Otis Collins. Corbett. DiPrima. Douglas."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Douglas 'present'."

F. B. Selcke: "Holloway. Houde. Jacobs. Janczak."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Jacobs 'aye'."

F. B. Selcke: "Kahoun. Keller. Kleine. Klosak. Krause. Lauterbach. Lehman. Mann. Kenney Miller."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Kenney Miller 'present'."

F. B. Selcke: "Nowlan. D. O'Brien. Palmer."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer votes 'present'."

F. B. Selcke: "Ropa. Shapiro. Jack Thompson. Washburn. That's it."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, now proceed to verify the affirmatives."

F. B. Selcke: "Anderson. Arrigo. Barnes. Berman. Boyle. Brandt. Brinkmeier. Burditt. Caldwell. Calvo. Capparelli. Capuzi. Carroll. Jimmy Carter. Richard Carter. Choate. Colitz. Phil Collins. Conolly. Cox. William Cunningham. Davis. Downes. Duff. Epton. Ewell. Fary. Fleck. Flinn. Garmisa. Giorgi. Glass. Graham. Granata. Hall. Hamilton. Hanahan. Gene Hoffman. Houlihan. Hyde. Jacobs. Jaffe. Karmazyn. Katz. Kennedy. Kosinski. Laurino. Lechowicz. Lenard. Leon. Londrigan. M. Madigan. Maragos. McAvoy. McCormick. McDermott. McDevitt. McGah. McLendon. McPartlin. Merlo. Meyer. Peter Miller. Murphy. North. O'Hallaren. Phillip. Pierce. Randolph. Rayson. Redmond. Scariano. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Sevcik. Shea. Simmons. Timothy Simms. Ike Sims. Smith. Soderstrom. Stedelin. Stone. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. R. Thompson. VonBoeckman. Wall. R. Walsh. W. Walsh. Harold Washington. R. J. Welsh. Frank Wolf. J. J. Wolf. B. B. Wolfe. Yourell. Zlatnik. Mr. Speaker."

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

Graham: "Aye."

Hon W. Robert Blair: "You're already recorded 'aye'. Questions of the affirmative."

Williams: "Ah.... Representative Barnes, is he on the floor?"



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's in his seat."

Williams: "Representative Caldwell."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's back there."

Williams: "Representative Burditt."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's there."

Williams: "Representative Bill Cunningham."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's right here."

Williams: "Representative Ewell."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ewell's here."

Williams: "Representative Giorgi."

Blair: "He's back in the back."

Williams: "Representative Jacobs."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Jacobs. Yeow, he's back there."

Williams: "Representative Laurino."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's back in the back."

Williams: "Representative Laurino."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's back in the back."

Williams: "Representative Madigan."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's right here."

Williams: "Representative McLendon."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's here."

Williams: "Representative Philip."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's behind you there."

Williams: "Representative Schoeberlein."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's here in front."

Williams: "Representative Timothy Simms."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's down here."





Williams: "Representative R. Thompson."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's there."

Williams: "I guess they've got a payraise, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, we'll announce the vote."

first before we give it to them. On each of these questions, there are 99 'ayes', 41 'nays', and 4 'present' and each of these Bills, having received the required vote, is hereby declared passed. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

Berman: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I now move to reconsider the vote by which these three Bills passed."

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

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I move that this motion lie on the Table."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor of the gentleman's motion, say 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the gentleman's motion to Table prevails. Senate Bill 8."

F. B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 8. An Act to amend Section 12.1 of an Act concerning fees and salaries and classified in several counties of this State with reference thereto. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill No. 8 deals with the salary of the Clerk of the Supreme Court. It would increase his salary



presently from \$20,000 to the sum of \$25,000. I'd ask for a favorable roll call."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? All right, the question is, shall Senate Bill 8 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speak.... is this working? Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House. I just merely want to say by tomorrow, that this is a sort of a gray day in Illinois history. Actually, this is a lame duck legislature. We haven't a damn bit of business doing what we're doing right now. You should have the guts to do it when you should do it, next spring, for example. That's just number 1 part I wanted to make. Another part is, we are giving raises to people who have ah.... added to the permissiveness of our society, which is getting ready to kill us and I cannot go along, of course, with any of these Bills, and I just want you to know why. So since my ah.... voting device is not working, I would like to vote 'no'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 103 'ayes' and 40 'nays' and Senate 8, having received the required voted, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 9."

F. B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 9. An Act to amend Section 3 of an Act to establish Appellate Courts. Third Reading of the Bill."



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

Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill No. 9 deals with the Appellate Court Clerks and it's a raise of \$3,000 to a total of \$23,000 in the First Appellate District and \$21,000 in District 2 through 5. I would ask for a favorable roll call."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "I would like to ask the sponsor if ah.... this applies to the ah.... the Clerks that are now elected ah.... or will it be applicable after their terms are over?"

Carroll: "It's my understanding, Representative Hart, that these are to take effect according to the Bills on February 1, 1973 and it was the feeling that these could be effective, and I guess they are going to wait an opinion on that to make sure that they are. They would be effective on February 1. Both these and the Judges payraises would take effect on February 1, opposed to immediately."

Hart: "Well, I understand about the Judges, but I mean, is that ..... the fact that they take effect February 1, I mean are you saying that their salaries will or will not be increased during this term for which they were elected?"

Carroll: "It's my understanding that they will be."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion?" Gentleman care to close? O'okay, the question is, shall Senate Bill 9 pass? All those in favor, will vote 'aye' and the



opposed 'no'. Borchers 'no'. Ah.... Mr. Barry, gentleman from Bureau."

Barry: "I would like to be recorded 'present' for the same reason as I indicated before. There is a variance between the upstate and downstate clerks."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The ah.... Record the gentleman as 'present'. Mr. Washburn 'present'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. This question, there are 101 'ayes', 41 'nays' and 2 'present', and this Bill, having received the required vote, is hereby declared passed." Resolutions." Oh, just one minute. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Phil Collins."

Phil Collins: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Proceed."

Phil Collins: "I.... Because we're in special session, it would be impossible to introduce a resolution until next Tuesday; however, I would like to call the attention of the House to the tragic fire that took place in the City of Chicago last night, ah.... in which three firemen died and 25 others were injured, and only by the grace of God did some escape that might have been killed, so I think it important that the House do take note of this tragedy and pay some tribute to these brave men, not only those that ah.... gave their lives, but those throughout this State who every day of their lives are risking their lives to protect us. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Ah... point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. Ah...

Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in 1968, when the \$3,000 pay raise was under consideration, I offered an alternative of \$2500 per year for expenses of the legislators when they are in town, but it said on the old Constitution, that was completely unconstitutional, so I said that the only way that they could receive their ah.... expenses would be by salary raise and I would support the salary raise, but that I would not be entitled to it, because I only live 8 blocks from the State Capitol. It's a matter of record that I did refuse a \$3,000 portion of my paycheck. However, I will not...However, Likewise, rather, I will not be accepting the \$32 pay expenses passed by the previous Bills for the very same reason. I voted for their passage because I believe that those from out-of-town are entitled to it, and they do spend their money in Springfield, but I will not accept it for myself for the same reason that I did not accept the \$3,000 at the time it was up in 1969. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, Resolutions. Agreed Resolutions. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

F. B. Selcke: "Senate Joint Resolution No. 1."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "It's agreed, so, you want to explain it, Mr. Regner? Yes, Senate Joint Resolution 1. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Regner."



Regner: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, By the Constitution, the Illinois General Assembly is not allowed to appropriate more monies than we have in estimated revenues, and what Senate Joint Resolution 1 does is ah.... state this that ah.... the appropriation would not exceed the revenues. This is the same resolution that we passed at the end of the last session, regarding all those appropriation bills passed in the first six months of this year, but now with the Bills we just passed this morning, which will be more than our appropriations as necessary, in order to comply with the Constitution, that we pass this Resolution."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, and then SJR 2, which is the Adjournment Resolution. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 2 is the Adjournment Resolution, which provides that when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, January 6, 1973, they stand adjourned signe die, and Mr. Speaker, I now move that we ah... concur and adopt Senate Joint Resolution No. 2, and that this Special Session, stand adjourned signe die."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, now, if we can separate that, I think ah... Mr. Hunsicker has a comment, and I have one announcement. Ah... also, Mr. Regner's SJR 1 is included in the motion on the agreed resolutions list. So all those in favor of the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions, which are SJR 1 and SJR 2, say 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The



'ayes' have it, and those Resolutions are adopted. The gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Hunsicker."

Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to call attention to the Members and the Speaker a unique experience I had last night. Yesterday afternoon, after we adjourned, I went over to my office in the State Office Building across the Street, thinking I would be back in time before the doors closed. I left my hat and coat in the locker. I was in my office until about 6:00 O'Clock, walked down to this end of the tunnel. The door was locked. Had to walk back. Asked the Guard to let me out the east door, because I had no hat and coat. He said 'no', he had to go out here, so I had to come back without a hat and coat. I think somewhere along the line, when we come back, there ought to be different arrangements made. I see no reason why three security guards or however many there are, have to set down in the rotunda. One could stay at the west door to see that nobody went down the basement, unless it was a Member of the General Assembly to get in the tunnel to get to the office building, and I suggest that some arrangement be made somehow that the tunnel remain open."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Your point is well taken. All right, ah.... we've been asked to announce that ah.... on Monday, ah.... up until the hour of 12:00, ah.... the ah.... Chambers here in the House, will be reserved for the swearing in ceremonies for Attorney General Scott, and



Controller-elect Lindberg. And of course, Members will be admitted to attend those activities, if they are here, but they did want the Chambers cleared to start with, so I just passed that on. Now, ah.... the ah.... one final Regular Session of the 77th, which is for 4:00 O'Clock on Tuesday afternoon, which is the time we adjourned the last Regular Session to. And the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde, has moved that this Second Special Session, do now adjourn signe die in accordance with SJR 2. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and ah.... this Special Session No. 2 is adjourned."

