

Speaker Redmond: "Supplemental Calendar, Number 1; with respect to House Bill 2568, in which we have an Amendatory Veto, there's .... 2569, there's a motion number 1 with respect to that House Bill by Representative McPike. Representative McPike is recognized. Representative Hanahan, please sit down. Read the motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion, I move the House Bill 2569 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change. Representative McPike."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it's indeed unfortunate that we had to return to Springfield to address ourselves to a question that has been before the General Assembly for some nine years. I think the Governor, who has been known in the past as 'Big Jim', is certainly going to have to change his name to 'Big Business Jim'. There have been a number of concerns as we have addressed ourselves to this issue. The Democratic party in coming up with a replacement, a compromise replacement, looked at some very legitimate concerns. One was school districts, park districts, and other local units of government have sufficient revenue to operate on in the future commiserate with the revenue they had in the past. Two; if the burden was not picked up by the business community as it was in the past, ... Mr. Speaker, could I have some order?"

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order, please. Please be in your seats. I see some Members that are not in their seats. Representative Collins sit down."

McPike: "Alright. The second concern was that if the business community did not pick up their fair and equitable share of the burden, then the only other individual who always pays, the homeowner, would be forced to pay. The Governor's concern it seems like his overriding, indeed, perhaps his only concern all along, has been how little can business



pay and get by with it. There were a number of Democrats within our party who thought that 3.5 was absolutely and essentially necessary to replace lost revenue. Indeed, in Cook County local real estate property taxes will increase substantially next year because we will not have a 3.5 rate. But in a true sense of compromise we agreed to 3.0, thinking that perhaps that in itself given the growth of the income tax may suffice. The Governor came to us and asked us to allow him to save face to please get it below 3% and he would sign the Bill. We did that. We amended it to 2.85%. There were a number of us who thought that that would not generate sufficient revenues but perhaps with the growth we could live with that as a compromise also. When that was done the Governor came back and once again said, it's too high. Now the Governor has vetoed this Bill and has forced us into a very difficult position. We all recognize that an excess of \$500,000,000 are going to be needed by units of local government during the coming year and that the General Assembly will have to provide that to the units of local government. It is understood that we cannot leave here empty handed. But from the Democratic point of view, I think it is essential that we stand up for the principles for which we were elected. Those principles are sticking up for the poor and the middle class who have borne a too large tax burden in the past and will also bear the same unfair burden in the future unless changes are made in our taxing structure. We attempted to that with this Bill. I might note that the Governor has agreed with every, with nearly every position that we have taken on this. One; there should be no cap. That was agreed to. Two; there should be no exclusions or deductions from taxable income sought by individual corporations. That was thrown out. Everything that was brought up by the opposition one at a time was thrown out until the compromise Bill, put together by the



Democratic party, was seen as a good and just and equitable compromise. Even in the last minute now, the Governor has agreed that a 2.85 rate is necessary. He's agreed that that is necessary to raise the revenue that we need during the next year and indeed has given us that rate for eighteen months. The Governor was looking at two suggestion packages. One was 2569, it was 2569 that called for a rate of 2.85 effective July 1st. The other package was his that called for a rate of 2.5 effective last January 1st. Big business opposed the January 1st effective date. Big business opposed the 2.85 rate. I think the Governor was able to appease big business in both instances. He chose our effective date and he chose in the long run his lower rates, both the things that big business sought, neither of the things that local schools and park districts and units of local government have sought. They want a fair replacement. There's not enough votes here to override today since this Bill passed originally with 89 votes. It's very likely that there is not enough votes to override. I think it should be pointed out that during the 8, next 18 months we will have the rates that the Democratic party sought. We will have the rate that we said was absolutely the minimal amount necessary all along. The 2.5 rate will go into effect when the next General Assembly convenes. If this override is not successful, I hope for the sake of local units of government that the next General Assembly again addresses itself to this very problem. And that is, raising the rates that the Governor has reduced by 14%, raising that rate back up so that we will have sufficient revenues from corporate entities to pay, to help pay their fair share of local... for local problems. The Governor has reduced this starting January 1, 1981, by 14%. Our calculations show therefore that instead of having an increase, a real money increase, in fact, instead of having any increase in those future



years, 1981 and possibly calendar 1982, that your units of local government will be, will have no increase during those periods, none whatsoever. In the past, down-state counties average 7.1% growth. A hundred counties in down-state had an average of 7.1% growth. In 1981 they will have no growth and then the Governor's compromise. And perhaps in 1982 they will have no growth under the Governor's compromise. I hope that you, when you go before the Electorate next November, a year from this November, having reduced the corporate by rate 14%, I hope that you're willing to take the responsibility for raising the real estate taxes a comparable 14% in the coming two years. Because everyone knows that that's what you're doing. All year we've said the same thing, there is no such thing as a free lunch. Someone must pay. Either the corporations are going to pay their fair share or the homeowners are going to pick up the burden. If you fail to support this motion, that then is your choice. The Governor has chosen to reduce the rate that is necessary for 18 months. He's chosen to reduce that for 14%. If you think the burden should be picked up by the local homeowner, then I suggest that you vote against this motion. Otherwise, I think that if you believe that the corporate entities in this State should begin to pay their fair share and should pay at least what they have in the past, then I hope that you will support this motion. That's it. I move that House Bill 2569 pass, notwithstanding the specific, specific recommendations for change."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of Representative McPike's motion to override the veto of the Governor. In regard to this motion, I think it is extremely important that the Membership fully understand the economic consequences of failing to override the Governor in this instance. According to reliable figures



which have been supplied to me, when the rate does decrease from 2.85% to 2.5 the difference in collections in that year, which will be 1981, will be a total of \$55,000,000. The change in the rate from 2.85 to 2.5 will result in a short fall of \$55,000,000 for local government and school districts throughout this state. I say to you that in light of that short fall those districts, those governments, will have only one alternative. They will be required, once again, to go to the local real estate taxpayer to raise the real estate tax rate in order to raise sufficient revenues to support their operation. .... attitude is that in order to avoid those dire consequences for local districts we ought to over-ride the Governor today on this Bill. And for those of you who do not wish to vote to override, please remember, in 1981 when local school districts and local governments travel to Springfield asking for relief because of the absence of the money which they expected from the replacement of the corporate personal property tax, you will be required to share in that burden of responsibility. Secondly, throughout the Governor's message, there are constant references to the impact of this Bill without his Amendment upon the business climate of the State of Illinois. Please understand that today the Illinois corporate income tax rate ranks in the bottom five in this country, the bottom five, without action on this particular Bill. If Mr. McPike's motion carries, if the Bill is passed to the Governor notwithstanding his recommendations, which means that the Bill would pass at a rate of 2.85%, even then, Illinois would only be ranked #22 as far as corporate income tax rate. In my view, and I'm sure many of you share that view, a corporate income tax rate which today ranks #5 from the bottom, and if this Bill is passed because of Mr. McPike's motion would rank #2, is certainly not oppressive upon the business community of this state. And take into consideration further



that if the Gentleman's motion carries we will be one of five states in the nation which do not have a corporate personal property tax imposed upon business operating within our borders. Ladies and Gentlemen, the evidence is clear. The Governor's action short changes local governments and school districts. The impact will not be felt immediately, but come 1981 it will be felt for those of you who are still Members of this Body. You will hear from those districts, those school districts and local governments and I would highly recommend to you today, avoid that embarrassment and vote 'aye' on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, I rise in opposition. I feel we must consider the fact that business is leaving Illinois. I hate to say and I was told not to give any names, but there is one of the leading factories in Decatur is building elsewhere based upon the very fact, the very things that we're talking about here. I don't want to see this great industry of my community build elsewhere, but they're being forced to build elsewhere because of what you're doing here. Now you're talking about the big business. You're forgetting also the little businesses that are corporations that help provide. But you talk about it as if it were a sad thing, that the little person, the little man is the one suffering. Well, actually it's the big business or the little business that is providing the money of the salaries and the jobs upon which this state depends. We have to think about these things. So, I certainly think we should override, not override, but to...should defeat this motion and consider the Governor's, the Governor's suggestion for the change in the rate from the present Democratic proposal to the one that the Governor of the State of Illinois is proposing. So I urge the defeat of the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."



Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, despite the rhetoric from the other side of the aisle, we're not here today to raise taxes and that's exactly what we would do if we go along with their motion to override the veto. We're here today under a Constitutional mandate to replace the corporate personal property tax and that's what the Governor's Amendatory Veto would speak to. Not only that, but he comes to us in a spirit of true compromise. He admits that we wasted some time this year where tax collections have not been made. He admits that the 2.85% may be necessary for the 18 months that are coming because we have not collected since January 1st, as his original proposal would have suggested. And he admits that we're in a period of economic uncertainty in his message, whereby the 2.85 for this 18 months may give us a little built-in protection as to securing additional replacement revenues. But it's quite obvious from all figures that have been projected that if the 2.85% was left on, this would result in additional taxes and instead of replacement it certainly would be subject to Constitutional test and probably rejection. Now, to classify this kind of Veto message as pro-business I say is utterly ridiculous and without any substance. It's fair business, I admit and we have been more than unfair to business in this state. The people on the other side of the aisle gave us unemployment and workmen's compensation laws that make us the highest taxed business in this state, and to add additional taxes to this business would only accelerate the flight of business from the State of Illinois. But this is a consumer proposal because who bears the cost of corporate taxes? Corporations don't pay taxes. We all know that. That's passed on to the consumer and the consumer ultimately will pay the cost of anything we do here. And to say that you're anti-business, say that you're anti-economics and anti-economy of the State of Illi-



nois. It's only because business remains in Illinois that jobs are created and it's only through jobs that people support themselves and it's only through jobs and business that taxes are collected in the State of Illinois. But the fact is that this, this, or this Veto message, this Veto proposal, will provide adequate funding for local government and for education and for schools and this is what we need today and it will allow us, it will allow us, assuming that normal growth rate and income tax revenues to hold the line on real estate taxes and perhaps reduce them. Any increase in real estate taxes is not going to come from what we do here today. It's going to come from local impotence. And even Mayor Byrne in Chicago has admitted that there is waste and mismanagement that she intends to address herself in the city of Chicago. We all know there's waste and mismanagement in the Chicago Board of Education and I don't mean to single out Chicago because in every governmental unit there is waste, there is mismanagement, and there is a possibility to hold down taxes at the local level. As I said, the Governor has come to us in a spirit of true compromise. I think he's found a middle ground here that we can all be comfortable with. This is not unnecessarily anti-business. It is pro-consumer. This will create jobs in Illinois and it will provide more than adequate funding for state and local government. The gross ratio in the income tax has been 13 to 14% as opposed to a 4% rate of growth in the corporate personal property tax. His message only makes an assumption of a 10% growth allowing for economic uncertainty. We have adequate funding, more than adequate funding for our schools, for our local governments, and in the final analysis, maybe one of the most important features of this is that it holds out the hope that finally we can put the lid on local real estate taxes. And this is something that everyone of us has campaigned for, has worked for in the



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



past. I say this is a reasonable compromise. It's an opportunity to everyone of us to join together to do something for the taxpayer of the state, for the consumer, for our local governments, for our schools. This Veto message is something that should be sustained by every Member of this House and, Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member to reject this motion to override the Veto of the Governor and then on a subsequent motion, I hope we'll all join to sustain the Amendatory Veto of the Governor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, the Members of this General Assembly can be very proud indeed that House Bill 2569 was passed by the General Assembly. The Bill was drafted by the Democrat task force on personal property tax replacement and was approved by the House Revenue Committee. If we go along with House Bill 2700 that the Governor had at 2%, and that was his Bill that came out of the Revenue Committee at 2%. The schools of this state, the local government units of this state, would have been far, far short of personal property tax replacement and it would have been necessary to impose a greater real estate tax on homeowners as well as on business. Luckily, for the people of our state, this House of Representatives passed House Bill 2569 at a 3% rate. In order to save the face of the Governor who promised Caterpillar Tractor and his other big business contributors, he'd get the rate below 3%. The Democratic Senators agreed to 2.85% and we in the House, we in the House, concurred in the 2.85% and sent the Bill to the Governor. The Governor now admits, now admits in his Veto message that 2.85 is a reasonable amount for the next year and a half to provide for adequate replacement of the personal property tax. The same Governor that was advocating 2% last April and 2½% in June, now agrees that 2.85% is needed to replace the personal property tax in the next year and a half. Now what happens if we enter into



a recession? We don't have the growth in corporate income tax that many of us hope for and expect. And then if we drop the 2.5% in a year and a half, we're going to find our local school districts and local governments are short. They're short of funds, and where is that money on the hold harmless going to come from? From the real estate tax payer. Now is the one chance we have to assure...to assure that the recession will not cause a short fall in personal property tax replacement in a year and a half at a 2.5 rate. The Governor was wrong in 2700 when he said 2% would do it. He admits that. He was wrong when he said the 2.5% would do it. He admits that. Now he says 2.85% is needed for the next year and a half, and believe me, if there's a recession... there's a recession, the 2.5% will be far short in a year and a half, and therefore, I'm advocating that this Legislature stand up...stand up and be proud that it passed House Bill 2569 and override the Governor's amendatory veto. He's been wrong before. He's wrong again, and I will support Representative McPike's motion to override the amendatory veto of House Bill 2569."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Monroe Flinn."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Monroe Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt the great debate but I have a question of the Sponsor if it is appropriate since this is final action. I'd like to ask the Sponsor..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Will the Gentleman yield? He will."

Monroe: "Representative McPike, on page 43 of the Enrolled and Engrossed copy of the Bill that we've had on our desks today, I read from line 6, 'that no property lawfully assessed and taxed as personal property under this Act prior to January 1, 1979 shall be classified as real property subject to assessment and taxation under this Act after January 1, 1979'. It's the end of that sentence and my question is simply, does this provide that assessors cannot, on a wholesale basis, change property that was formerly taxed as personal property and suddenly put it into the real property, if that would be allowed? Of course, this would cause this whole Bill to be a tax increase rather than a replacement tax and I would like an answer to that question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've tried to clarify that in the debate before it first passed out of the House, and what you have just said is true. This was meant as a replacement and not as a new tax. And, therefore; any property lawfully assessed as personal property under the Act prior to January 1st, could not be reclassified as real property and also any property not, or any property lawfully assessed and taxed as real property prior to January 1st could not then be reclassified as personal property. We don't want a wholesale switched back and forth. There may be some isolated circumstances where indeed a piece of property was unlawfully classified. In that case it could, the classification could be changed, but I think it would be challenged in court and they would have to show that prior to the reclassification that it was



indeed unlawfully classified."

Flinn: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one previous Speaker on this matter made a reference to the short fall of the taxes by the reduction which the Governor is providing. I think this is an important point and one that must be brought out here today and should be answered. In the figures that I have before me, I see no place where the money which will be raised by the Bill as amendatorily vetoed would ever get below that which could be projected from the old personal property tax on corporations. How can you have a short fall if you never get ahead? I think that should be kept in mind in voting against this proposal. Secondly, we have referred to the ranking of Illinois as concerning its income tax on corporations. Illinois now can rank very proudly at the bottom of those states who tax corporations. We're going to move to the middle of that ranking with the passage of this legislation. I see no way to avoid that. I don't think that we can hold it down though as any great attraction to bring business and industry to this state, and, particularly, you can't hold it out when you consider the total tax picture on business. I think both of those need answering. I felt constrained to rise and answer the previous Speaker who put forth those arguments. I think we must defeat this motion to override. We must have this Bill and we must approve a later motion to approve the Governor's Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser. "

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the debate on this very complex somewhat dry subject is quite interesting. I find it hard to believe that the Democratic Party wants to be in the forefront of raising taxes. One of the Members from the other side of the aisle who spoke



earlier this afternoon made it quite clear that this was a Democratic party program. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there's no question in anyone's mind but that if 2569 becomes law that it will be a tax increase. That legislation would generate funds far in excess of what was collected under the old personal property tax system. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that I don't believe the rank and file Members of the Democratic party want to have the responsibility of increasing taxes. The day is long gone my friend when any Member of this Assembly can try and fool the people by making it appear as though we're going to tax big corporations and big business and save the taxpayers money. Everybody in Illinois knows full well that when companies are taxed they pass those increased costs on to the consumer and the consumer will pay those taxes. And Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I heard a Member from the other side of the aisle saying how low Illinois's corporate tax rate was and how if this Bill became law the rate would still be far down among the 50 states in the Union. But what the Gentleman conveniently forgot to mention is that we rank among the highest among workmen's compensation costs and unemployment compensation costs. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this debate, this debate has been clouded with half truths, with partisanship, and with statements which never had to have been made. It's taken us 9 years to come to this point. The Legislature has acted very, very slowly. But, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that Governor Thompson has recognized the differences among the principles in this great debate. Governor Thompson has sent back to us an Amendatory Veto which is a compromise. It's a compromise which everyone of us ought to accept. The media in this state, in my opinion, is supporting that compromise. I would also like to point out that this Bill and this motion to override ought not be



used as a smokescreen for those units of local government who are planning today to raise local real estate taxes. I say to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the real estate taxes may very well shoot high. They may skyrocket, but to try and pass the blame onto the State Legislature is foolishness. And the people of Illinois and the people of those local units whose taxes are raised are not going to buy the arguments. Those people know where those tax increases come from and they come from those units of local government and, in all likelihood, the largest increases will come from Chicago to keep the machine oiled. The mayor of Chicago has said it herself. She has seen payrollers. She's walked the streets of Chicago and pointed them out and to her credit she's fired them. Why do the Members of the Legislature on the other side of the aisle want to protect that kind of payroll padding. I don't know. Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2569 is not going to be a smokescreen for partisan politics that may take place with units of local government. Governor Thompson's Amendatory Veto is a compromise. Everyone's point of view has been taken into consideration. I say to you we ought to support Governor Thompson's Amendatory Veto and we ought to vote against the Gentleman's motion to override on House Bill 2569."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is shall the main question be put. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. John Matijevich says now we hear the truth. Well there have been a few silly statements made so far in this debate. I think, I think it, to be as brief as possible and yet to set the record straight, we are passing a tax replacement and not a tax increase.



The Governor has agreed with that, a 2.85 is not a tax increase. It's a tax replacement. It doesn't affect the business climate in this state because the business corporations were supposedly paying that much to begin with. It doesn't put us out of line with other Midwest states. Ohio has an 8% tax and they have a corporate personal property tax. Iowa, a 10% tax. And they have a corporate personal property tax in addition. Wisconsin, a 7.9%. Indiana, 6% and all of these states have in addition to this a corporate personal property tax. The business climate in this state has measured by the income tax, has measured by unemployment compensation, is extremely competitive with every industrial state in this Union and especially with those states in the Midwest. But we are not changing the business climate, this is simply a replacement tax. What the Governor has attempted to do, 18 months from now, or rather 17 months from now, he wants to give the business community a tax reduction, to change what they have been paying to a lower rate so that the homeowner can then pick-up that difference. The one question before us was really not answered and that is, 'What will happen the second year when the Governor's 2.5 rate goes into effect and there's a short fall?' The answer by the opposite side of the aisle is that that can't happen. Well, of course it can happen. The Governor's . . . the Governor's budget book this year called, or projected a 5.6% decrease, a 5.6% reduction in corporate income taxes for Fiscal Year '80. Economic and Fiscal Commissions, end of June, revised that to a 0.6% increase. Now we are facing a recession. Indeed, there could be a decrease in corporate income taxes in Fiscal Year '80 and again in Fiscal Year '81 which will leave us with a short fall at 2.5%. The answer to the local school districts is, 'Well, that can't happen.' Well, when that does happen, and I hope it doesn't, but when



that does happen I hope that you are prepared to tell your local homeowners that while you gave business a 14% decrease, you expect them to pick up the difference. I think everything about this Bill, everything, all the rhetoric aside, all the facts contained in this Bill.... shows that the Democratic Party was conscientious when they put it forth. When we passed the Bill out of the House and out of the Senate, it wasn't at 5% or 4% or even at 3.5% that a lot of us sincerely believed was necessary. Despite the fact that we had a Majority in both the House and the Senate, we came down to a 3% and finally a 2.85% as a compromise to the business community. Well, we are not prepared at this late date to compromise the school districts and the local units of government. They have been compromised enough. If you choose to vote with big business, if you ~~choose to vote with~~ the Governor then do so, but I think you should be, should be willing to accept the fact that when real estate taxes go up in your district you are essentially responsible for part of that increase. I, therefore, ~~move that~~ House Bill 2569 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall House Bill 2569 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', and all opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to explain my 'no' vote, to hear the rhetoric from the last Speaker and the Sponsor of this motion, it's the philosophy of the party of the other side of the aisle, it seems like, to drive the free enterprise system out of the State of Illinois, drive them into other states by imposing new taxes, and besides that it's the policy of the National Democratic Party it seems like that they're taking our country on a course of economic destruction. We're in a reces-





sion now. What does the political party want to do, drive us into a depression? And this is what you're doing. You're driving industry, you're driving jobs out of the State of Illinois, and you're going to make Illinois an economic desert. And you won't have to worry about it anymore because you people are going to be restoring the breadlines of the 1930's by this type of legislation. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Constitution mandated that the personal property tax be replaced. The dictionary says that replaced means to put back into place, to supply an equivalent for. It doesn't say you're supposed to add another 25% or 50%, it doesn't say you might sit around and dream about a depression or something else that might happen. It just says to supply an equivalent for. Now the, it's obvious that the Members across the aisle are not telling you the whole truth because the Governor had really asked for a 2.5 beginning in January and now he says that he will accept 2.85 beginning in July for 18 months as a catch-up back to January the 1st. I just think it's incumbent on us to replace the personal property tax, not to create a new tax, because I can assure you that it will be subject to a court test if that, if you do that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to comment in explaining my vote that in my judgement, and from the study that I've been able to do, that there will, in fact, be no short fall and that school districts will receive the funds to which they are entitled on the basis of collections, which are included in this Bill. One should also remember that with the reduction of the assessed evaluation, that local school districts and numbers used in determining state aid



will be changed significantly. And so many districts which had previously used extension figures to determine their state aid, will now be using collection figures on the real estate tax and those school districts, particularly those in Cook County, will be using significantly different numbers. And for this reason, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think at the very best that we could do, that this is very reasonable and I think we will find that the 2.5 will be more than adequate to cover the cost of this program and for that reason I am opposed to this motion to override the Governor's Veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I attended a meeting recently out West that has been much publicized and during the discussion there there was one of the sessions that was on keeping and expanding business in the State of Illinois. And one of the points that was brought out in that meeting was that between 85 and 90% of all business expansion in the Midwest are existing companies that are expanding, not new companies. Frankly, I'm voting 'no' on the motion to override because I had a great deal of conversation with the Governor's Office and I felt that it was a real travesty of justice that we did not take into consideration some of the gross inequities that happen in individual cases. Now the example that was used a great deal in discussion here when we passed the Bill was the Caterpillar Corporation and to use that same example, they would be going from 3.3 to 15 million dollars taxes. I think that the Governor would have been well put and they would have accepted a 200 to 250% increase in their taxes. I think that would have been between 8 and 9 million dollars from 3.3, that



was a reasonable compromise. He refused to go along with it, so did all of us when we passed the Bill. I still think that's one of the glaring example of what we're doing to ignore the business that have stuck with us through thick and thin and through some of the 'business climates' and everything else. And I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "In explaining my 'aye' vote, Mr. Speaker, looks like it's not going to get 107. But I cannot even respect this Amendatory Veto. Either a 2.85 rate is right or it's wrong. Either a 2.5 rate is right or it's wrong. I don't understand frankly, why the Governor says 2.85 is right for 18 months and wrong for the rest of the time. It seems to me that a better approach for him would be to pick an intermediate figure if he really has the convictions that he alleges to have. Furthermore, if he attempts to justify the lower rates in the, after the 18 month phase in period, because of the higher, because of a natural growth in the tax base, then he inadvertently admitting, it seems to me, that his own 2.5 figure will be too high three, four, five years down the road. It seems to me that the Governor is really speaking out of both sides of his mouth on this one. He's trying to have it both ways and I, for one, intend to support this motion to over-ride."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Question, there's 72 'aye', and 92 'no'. Representative McPike."

McPike: "I'd like this on Postponed Consideration, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. On Supplemental Calendar #1 appears a motion with respect to House Bill 2569. Motion #2. Will you read the motion, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 2569."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."



Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would yield to the Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am pleased today to make the motion to expect, to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 2569. All of you know of our deep involvement in this issue. The Governor had indicated that he has spent more time trying to resolve the personal property tax problem and the replacement of it than on any other issue including the road program. And it is an extremely important issue. We have not in any way failed to try and reach a compromise with the other side of the aisle in this issue. When they indicate that we should not have been back here for this Special Session, they had the most adequate notice that we would be. The Governor has at all times indicated that their Bill was unacceptable in the form in which they insisted on its passage. When we talk about compromise we would have to look at the many many issues on which there was complete compromise. We gave up on the issue of a cap on the personal property tax replacement. There was no special consideration given to big industry and business for those who would pay many times an increase in the replacement tax over what they were paying before. There was a limit on the long term growth of the replacement tax. There was no compromise. In all of these areas, this side of the aisle and the Governor's Office accepted their recommendation. All we ask that there be a fair rate of return so that we had in fact a replacement tax and not a new tax on business and industry. Compromise proposal which the Governor's put forth here is one, which I think the media has rightly acclaimed as proper, it is a fair tax. It assures replacement to units of local government and schools while at the same time it is there to business.



Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 2569 by the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor vote 'aye', and all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I think the average person out there watching us in Illinois thinks this is a time for tax relief. They're not looking at this subject through the view of the Republican party or the Democratic party or big labor or big business. I tried to explain this to a number of small businessmen in my district and I said, 'What's the difference between 2.85 and 2.5.' And the average answer was tweedle dum and tweedle dee; You're laying a new tax on us; You're driving business out of Illinois. People and workers are going to leave Illinois with their families and with their school children. You're going to cause more harm to the State of Illinois by doing this and you should stand fast for some tax relief. The Supreme Court of our state wiped out this tax and now you fellows and girls are going back down there to lay it back on us. I think you ought to stand up. The Constitutional Convention in 1970 was not written with this mandate at a time when there was a recession and when there was business fleeing Illinois as fast as they could go. We are not under this mandate. I think we have another choice; A rate, lower rate and I would urge everyone to vote 'no'. And even though it may require us to be in the fall working, maybe simultaneously, in another special session, we can please the people who are looking at us with one question on their mind; Are you going to give us tax relief or are you going to lay another tax on us? And I urge more 'no' votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I supported Jim McPike's motion on a 2.85 rate. I did it because I believe we have a Constitutional mandate.



Section 5-C of Article 9 of the 1970 Illinois Constitution required that the General Assembly to abolish the corporate personal property tax and concurrently replace all revenues lost by units of local government and school districts throughout Illinois. In January of this year the Illinois Supreme Court declared that further assessments and taxations of this personal property tax payable after January 1, 1979, would be illegal but concluded that the 1978 personal property tax payable in 1979 is collectable. It further held that the Constitutional mandate to the General Assembly to enact a replacement tax continues. I know that many of the Membership here realizes that we've been mandated since the 1970 Constitution was adopted to replace the corporate personal property tax in this state. Until Speaker Redmond appointed a task force to study this very serious problem, that the General Assembly finally coped with this Constitutional mandate. I don't believe anyone in this General Assembly wants to impose any type of a tax on any people in the State of Illinois, but it's mandated by the Constitution that the personal property tax was to be eliminated and a tax that was supposed to be replaced by us was on the same individuals that were paying the corporate personal property tax. In response to these factors, the Democratic Members of the General Assembly developed a replacement tax legislation which is fair both to business curb tax and the local governments and school districts that rely upon this revenue. The legislation, as was contained in House Bill 2569, provided an additional 2.85% in corporate income, 1.5% tax on trusts Chapter '5' corporations and partnerships income, and 0.8% on invested capital of utilities. The Governor amendatorily vetoed House Bill 2569 not saying that the 2.85 was not more than enough, saying that it was what's needed between now and 1981. We disagree with that comment, but we're going to support his issue here because of the



fact, in my personal opinion, the school districts and local units of government cannot be placed in jeopardy when school in coming back in September and not having the necessary funds to operate the schools in this state. The tax replacement question... there has been much debate over the question whether corporate personal property tax extensions amount billed, or collections should be replaced. The difference is substantial. The 1977 tax extension was \$698,000,000 while only about \$414,000,000 has been collected thus far. Another 20,000,000 to 30,000,000 may ultimately be collected. In other words, the current annual corporate personal property tax extensions exceed annual collections by over 250,000,000. Additionally, all general purpose governments will lose federal revenue sharing funds because of an abolition of the corporate personal property tax. House Bill 2569 replaces the estimated loss collections only. Since 1970 when the new Illinois Constitution was approved by the voters of Illinois, the effectiveness of the assessment and collection of this tax has declined substantially. For example, in Cook County the percentage of corporate personal property tax as billed that have actually been collected from about 60% to the 1970's to approximately 46% in 1976. And thus, in 1977 we're down to 41%. This legislation replaces only the estimated corporate personal property tax collections which would have been made in 1980 and had the 1975, '76 collection efficiency been maintained and those collections grown at an 8% annual growth rate. The estimate, the 1980's revenues lost from any subsequent base, would only provide a reward for those recent increases of tax avoidance. It is estimated that those replacement taxes would yield approximately \$621,000,000 during the year following the imposition on July 1, 1979. This amount would just replace all revenue lost by units of local governments and school districts as a result of the abolition of the



ad valorem personal property taxes as required by the Constitution. I believe every one of us took an oath of allegiance, both to the U.S. Constitution and to the Constitution of the State of Illinois. Unfortunately, this provision was adopted by the voters in 1970. We have been lacking in our responsibility for the past eight years, but we have studied this question for the past eight years and hopefully today we'll finally come to a conclusion, both to your satisfaction and to mine. There are certain interests in this state that don't want to have any type of a corporate personal property tax replacement. None. Well tell me, how are you going to finance? How are you going to go around Section 5C of the Constitution? How are you going...and just totally disregard the Supreme Court ruling? For this reason I would hope that the Membership will provide the necessary votes and adopt the Governor's amendatory veto. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I urge you to support this Democratic Bill. I urge you to support the things that they want and the things that they are getting in this Bill. I would like to mention the fact that industry can receive relief in other ways and this Bill will, if it is according to the fact sheet that I have seen, more than replace the amount of money that is being taken away. And as far as the grant of personal...of additional real estate tax, I want to remind the Members of the General Assembly that we have a Strayer-Haig formula in education whereby there will be no additional real estate tax whether this is passed or not. So please vote for the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've had some close to six hour debate on this Bill during the General Session and now being the Special Session."





We've heard some elegant speeches this morning and we've heard some pretty good arrangements of the poor taxpayer back home, how we're so concerned about it. As someone else said this morning, and I won't take credit for it, it's not this special session I'm worried about, it's the next special session. And I wonder how they're going to feel and who their choreographer is going to be when we come back at the next special session and ask them... us to spend a billion dollars for an RTA subsidation program and a road program down-state. I think if you're really concerned about the taxpayers back home let's get enough green votes on this Bill, 107, send it over to the Senate, and let's come back and approve this Bill so we all can go home and save the taxpayers money by not being here tomorrow again."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I probably shouldn't explain my vote because I am consistent on this vote and the other vote. I'm voting 'no' on both. But I rise because I was the one who walked over to Elmer and said, 'I'm not so much worried about this special session as I am the second special session.' And I've heard so much said on both sides of the aisle today, both sides of the aisle, that we don't want to raise taxes. So I want that rhetoric that I heard on both sides of the aisle to carry over into the second special session because if the second special session concludes the way I think it could conclude with all of the political powers that be, with all of the powers of... There was a meeting, for example, in Peoria last week of Union leaders throughout the State of Illinois and I know who called that meeting to rally up the strength of political strength of labor to pass a mass transportation proposal. I want to hear the same rhetoric, ... rhetoric then that I heard today. I want those who are concerned about business, even



if the proposal is only in the six county area, even if it's a sales tax for that area, I want anybody on both sides of the aisle to try to convince me that that won't increase the cost of business all over the State of Illinois because you know it will. I want to hear the same rhetoric then as I hear now. And I also want to go on farther because they tell me that special session's going to be in September, the first week in September, and I just can't understand why we can't wait a little longer and wait till the fall Veto Session, but I want to go farther on to the Fall Veto Session. I want to hear some of the same rhetoric that I hear today when we have the veto of the sales tax on food and medicine. I want to see those who are standing here, the bleeding hearts of corporations, of big business, and I want to see what they say about senior citizens; What they say about those people who are on the low totem poll on the economic ladder. I want to hear what they're going to say then. Can we only afford tax reform for big business and no tax relief for the poor people, for senior citizens, for those on fixed incomes? I want to hear what you say then. So Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we all know what's going to happen today, and I don't think anybody can take credit or blame for it. Someone said the Governor has said we are sticking an eye, a finger in the eye of business. Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, think about that next special session. Think about the Fall Veto Session on the exemption of fall of food and medicines. If we are now sticking a finger in the eye of business, where does the Governor want to stick it to the poor taxpayer? You know where."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've heard some strange rhetoric here today. The Gentleman from Winnebago said, 'We had breadlines back in the 30's



and we'll have them again.' I want to remind you in the 30's there was no state corporate income tax. We had breadlines without it. I understand you realize that because you're voting for the 3.85, 2.85 additional tax now in accepting the Governor's Amendatory Veto and we appreciate that. To the Gentleman from Lake, my colleague who's sitting over there, and says we don't have a responsibility to replace the personal property tax; I wish he would read the Illinois Constitution, Article 9, Section 5, and the Supreme Court decision which states it is a duty of the General Assembly to replace the personal property tax. To the Gentleman who's worried about the invasion from Wisconsin, my colleague from Lake County, worried about Wisconsin stealing our business, I would point out that Wisconsin has a higher corporate income tax, a higher corporate income tax than the 6.85%, and 6.5% in a year and a half it will have under this Bill. Wisconsin's income tax is higher, not lower than ours and they have a tax on tangibles as well. The Governor's Amendatory Veto, although I don't agree with it in all respects, although I favor House Bill 2569 and voted to over-ride the veto, the Governor's Amendatory Veto in my opinion, in my opinion, it is our Constitutional duty at this stage at this point in time, to support that Amendatory Veto because we must provide the replacement for local government and school districts that mandated in the Constitution. It's our duty to do it. It's our Constitutional obligation to do it. And I, for one, I, for one, although I was Chief Sponsor of this Bill, Cosponsor with Representative McPike and Chairman of the Democrat task force on personal property tax replacement; I, for one, can, at this stage, support the Governor's Amendatory Veto because, in my opinion, it does fulfill in a very minimum way, but it does fulfill our Constitutional obligation in replacing the personal property tax. If it doesn't provide sufficient



income in 18 months, we can come back and extend the 2.85 rate. But for today, the only responsible vote here is to accept the Amendatory Veto, the changes, and the Governor's message and I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I share Representative Pierce's concern and the concern others have expressed that the Bill we have before us, the Bill with the Governor's Amendatory Veto, may not sufficiently replace the revenues lost to school districts and local units of government by the abolition of the corporate personal property tax. I'd like to share with the Members of the House a Constitutional question, a Constitutional concern about the validity of the amendatory reduction in the rate. This General Assembly, the House and the Senate, agreed to by the Republican Governor established 2.85 as the corporate income tax necessary now to replace those lost revenues. Representative Ewell earlier talked about the magic involved in a reduction of that rate to 2.50 January 1, 1981. I'm not sure the court will buy that kind of magical rate reduction... if 2.85 is the rate we need right now, what is to say to the court that the Legislature has responsibly fulfilled its Constitutional mandate if that rate is reduced be magic to 2.50 in 1981? Barring a re-assessment of corporate personal property in 1981, I'm not sure if what we are asked to do here today will in fact meet the test of Constitutional validity. Should the court decide that it isn't appropriate so to reduce the rate established by the Governor and acceded to by the Legislature and acceded to by the Governor? I think it is arguable that the court could severably regard the Amendatory Veto reducing the rate as a separate issue from the other piece of Act that the Governor's veto has brought us to today under the Supreme Court case Benjamin vs. Devon Bank. I think it is at least arguable



that the court could so do. With that concern in mind, I nevertheless agree thoroughly with Representative Pierce and with Representative Lechowicz that our responsibility, the responsibility the Constitution gave us to replace the revenues lost by the abolition of the corporate personal property tax, is a real and serious one. Our job today is not as Representative Duester would have us think, to provide tax relief to the corporations, but rather to provide those revenues lost. While I am not as happy with the Bill in its Amended form as I was with it when it left this General Assembly, I will nevertheless, accept my own responsibility as a Legislator, as someone appeared to fulfill the mandate of the 1970 Illinois Constitution, and vote 'yes' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. ~~About~~ five weeks ago, Representative Griesheimer tried to make this a military matter and I said it should not even be a partisan matter. And finally here today, in early August, I'm happy to see that it's not a partisan matter. The Governor has finally agreed to every particular of our Bill. The House Bill 2569 as it left the... as it finally left the House, and as it left the Senate, will be the law of this land for 18 months. It is our Constitutional obligation to replace the tax. I think 2569 does that in every way. I only hope that the next General Assembly, when it convenes in January of 1981, will see fit to raise the 2.5 rate back to 2.85. That is as we believe it should be, not only for 18 months, but for the future of Illinois. Therefore, I would urge everyone to vote 'aye' on this and to pass 2569 as it originally left the House and Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my 'aye' vote. I was one of those who voted to over-ride the Governor's veto."



That motion, having failed, I am also one of those who recognizes his responsibility to school districts and local governments throughout this state to provide sufficient revenues to continue operations for this Fiscal Year and into the future. I disagree with the Governor's estimate of needed revenues for those districts, and in 1981, if a need is demonstrated to increase the rate on this tax again, I will be one of those who will vote to increase that rate. But at this time, I think it is in the best interests of the State of Illinois and it is the vote cast with the most reason and responsibility to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I, too, rise in support of this Bill. I'm not pleased with the vote I'm going to have to make, but I see that you have the vote that is needed now. I only hope that when we come back in the Override Session that you think about the consumer, think about the tax relief on food and drugs, and I would hope that those persons here today, the vote that they're doing today because the Comptroller of this state has already spoken out and told there's sufficient amount of monies there to relieve, to give relief on food and drugs to the consumer, and I, therefore, urge my fellow Members to vote 'aye' for this override motion on House Bill 2569."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 155 'aye', and 12 'no'. And the motion having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails. Three fifths. Majority, having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 2569 for the adoption of the Amendment."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi. We're not finished yet. Agreed Resolutions. There's a possibility that the Senate may not agree with what we did so, it's our studied judgment that should just stand in recess to see what that unpredictable Body does. Representative Giorgi on Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 2, Getty-Grossi. House Resolution 3, Madigan-Beatty-Kucharski. #6, John Donovan. 7, DiPrima."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 2 by Getty honors a 100th birthday. 3 by Madigan a 50th anniversary. 6 by Donovan, Judy Bixler of Morton, Illinois. And 7 by DiPrima the Veterans Administration. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. Death Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution #4, Bower.."

Speaker Redmond: "Death Resolution..."

Clerk O'Brien: "With respect to the memory of professor Lawrence F. Dopler."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bower move the adoption of the Death Resolution? Those in favor say 'aye!', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. The Death Resolution is adopted. Any further Death Resolution?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution #5, Tuerk et. al., Whereas, the House has learned with great sorrow and sadness of the passing of our former colleague, the Honorable James D. Carrigan, and whereas, James Carrigan entered for public service in January of 1973 after an illustrious political career that spanned 40 years, and whereas, he was first elected to the Peoria City Council as 7th



Ward Alderman in 1933 at the age of 28, and whereas, in 1946 James Carrigan was elected to the first of 12 terms he would serve with great distinction as a State Representative and whereas, James Carrigan will long be remembered as the beloved elder Statesman who exemplified the finest in moral and civic leadership, and whereas, his passing is a severe loss, not only to the members of his immediate family, but also to his community and the State of Illinois. Therefore, be it Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-First General Assembly of the State of Illinois that we express our sincere and profound sorrow at the death of the Honorable James D. Carrigan and that we extend to his family our heartfelt sympathy during their time of bereavement and be it further Resolved that suitable copies of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to the members of the family of Mr. James D. Carrigan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, approximately 35 Members of this Body that is serving today served with Jim Carrigan. I had the pleasure of serving with Jim my first two terms in the Legislature. James Carrigan was a man with a great deal of honor. He served his community of Peoria well in the Council as the Resolution points out. He also served county government and he served a total of 24 years in the House of Representatives. James Carrigan was a man of his word. He was a good man. He was a man who believed in responsible representation. He was a man who served his District well and I consider it an honor to have served with Jim and I know those of you who knew Jim would share the feelings that I just expressed and I would invite any Members of the House who so desire to become Co-Sponsors of the Resolution. Mr. Speaker,





I would move for the adoption of the Death Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Members of the House, I, too, want to offer condolences to the family and to the community and to this House of Representatives on behalf of the Membership. There was a story many years ago that I learned from friends of Jim and Dorothy, and that was the story about the depression when Jim and Dorothy opened up a small restaurant near south side of Peoria. .... Time was in the depression so many people were hungry and yet I've heard the story so many times that that last bowl of chilli had a little more water put in it and a little more people were fed free. This typifies James Carrigan, Representatives of the General Assembly, typifies what he has meant to so many that have known him or have been recipients of his good deeds. .... Time he was in the electrical business and this was later on in life and for many years. Any time you went to his shop to talk about the political or social affairs or whatever, you needn't never fear to go right up to Jim because he had so many friends there ahead of you wanting assistance he always had his hand out to help those people. And I don't know what more can be said of any individual particularly a man like Jim and his wife Dorothy, who served so many people, so well for so long a time. I, too, would like to recommend the adoption of this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Leave for the entire Membership to be added as Co-Sponsors. The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. The Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, another Death Resolution."

Clerk Leone: "Resolution #8, Ryan-Skinner-Hanahan, Whereas,



the Members of this House are deeply saddened to learn of the death of R. Bruce Waddell, our esteemed colleague in the House of Representatives, and whereas, in an active life of 64 years, Representative Waddell was an exemplary figure of family devotion, business and civic involvement in service to both his community and the people of the State of Illinois, was highly respected by his community of Dundee, Illinois, and by all those who knew him, and whereas, he exhibited the strong sense of self reliance and independence and hard work characteristic of his Scottish and German descent, and whereas, his career as President and Principle Administrative Officer at the Task Master Equipment Company was a testimony to the soundness of those time honored values of individual initiative and free enterprise, and whereas, his many successes and achievements in life were built on the solid foundation of a loving family including his wife, Francis Waddell, two sons, Bruce J. Waddell and David R. Waddell, and one daughter, Mrs. Carol Johnson, and his grandchildren, and whereas, Representative Waddell, a graduate of Thorton Township High School, Thorton Junior College, and the University of Illinois developed a keen interest in education and the opportunities for advancement that higher education may provide and whereas, he utilized his interests and expertise in education as Republican Spokesman of the House Higher Education Committee and maintained a particular fondness for the University of Illinois, and whereas, he was extremely dedicated to the cause of conservation, having been past National Director, State Vice-President, State Director of the Issac Walton League and Member of both the Illinois State Park Board and Audubon Society, and whereas, he demonstrated great interest in agriculture and agricultural activities, having been past Secretary-Treasurer



of both the Northern Illinois Southern Breeders Association and the Illinois Farm Bureau, and whereas, he demonstrated a strong sense of patriotism as shown by his honorably serving his country as a medical corpsman and medical administrative officer in World War II, and whereas, he actively and conscientiously worked to enrich and improve the community as a Member of the Elks and and Royal Order of the Moose and a Member of the Dundee Lodge 190 AF and AMM, and as a Member of the Chicago Academy of Sciences, whereas, he was a loyal supporter of the Republican party and its philosophy, having been former Dundee Township Republican Committeeman and Member of both the Dundee Township Republican Club and the John Essex Club, whereas, Representative Waddell was a devoted and well respected Member of this Legislative Body, serving in his sixth term in the General Assembly at the time of his death, and whereas, he served both his party and the Legislature well as Minority Whip during the Eightieth General Assembly Therefore, be it Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-First General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we do, hereby express our deepest sympathies to the family of R. Bruce Waddell and pay our respects to his numerous achievements and services to his family, his community, and the people of the State of Illinois and be it further Resolved that suitable copies of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to his wife, Mrs. Francis Waddell, and their children, Bruce J. and David R. Waddell, and Mrs. Carol Johnson."

Speaker Redmond: "Sponsor of the Resolution? Representative Ryan."



Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think everybody in this chamber who knew Bruce, knew what kind of a public servant he was and what kind of a dedicated individual he was. I think the Resolution says it all. I spoke with his wife last week and she said that she was sure that Bruce died a very peaceful death and I think that's some consolation for all of us. He was cremated last week. There'll be a memorial service for him on Saturday, August 11th, at the Congregational Church on West Main Street and West Dundee. And I would ask leave to have all Members placed on as Cosponsors of the Resolution and ask for the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Is leave granted to have all the Members shown as Cosponsors? Hearing no objection; Leave is granted. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Members of the House, the loss of a colleague is always something that hits us, makes us realize how fragile we are and how short our lifetime and our service to people are. Bruce Waddell is, our colleague... epitomized dedication to his philosophy, the philosophy that he and his family... with, being very conservative, the philosophy of a man that believed in his country and his state and his community and fought very hard for those beliefs. As a candidate for office, who campaigned, I could tell you that Bruce epitomized the qualified candidate that held dignity above even an ability to garner a vote. In the years that we served together and campaigned together, never once, never once was Bruce Waddell the kind of candidate that you would not want to run with, no matter what your viewpoint on an issue was. He never was disagreeable; He epitomized the best in his character certainly. And his 'conducture' toward the House, you could always talk to him, you know. Too often we forget that we have a



greater cause and Bruce never forgot that. And I could say that in his passing the people of Illinois have lost an effective, a dedicated public servant. And I know the people of the 33rd District will have it... find it hard to replace such a dedicated Gentleman to serve here in the General Assembly. And I, too, want to wish to the family just that they take this in the light... as people. I know they are strong, that Bruce epitomized strength in his family and his community and that from my family, and I'm sure from this General Assembly, we all extend our condolences to the Waddell family."

Speaker Redmond: "You heard the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Resolution. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. And the Resolution is adopted. The memorial service is set for 11:00 a.m. Saturday August the 11th at the Congregational Church, 417 Main Street in West Dundee. An honorary delegation of the Members has been set. Representative Giorgi, Mautino, Murphy, Representative Friedland, Hudson and Klosak. The House.. The House will now stand in recess until the call of the Chair. Representative O'Brien is the only one here that can tell us what the Senate's liable to do and he said he'd keep their confidence. So he's not going to tell. Recess till call of the Chair.... The House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Has the time yet arrived to identify the former President of Young Democrats? .... Republican? Or do we want to wait that.. Let that wait for awhile? Representative Winchester. Representative Barnes is seeking..."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will have to admit that at one time I got lead astray and somehow or another got affiliated with the Democratic party in the State of



Illinois. It didn't take me very long to find out that I was on the right side and you know, left the.."

Speaker Redmond: "You're right..."

Winchester: ".. Right side. But I do think back to the good old days of ..... when I was a young Democratic Chairman of Hardin County. But I.. to get back on the right side, Mr. Speaker,...."

Speaker Redmond: "... The truth is out. Come back to order You have a message from the Senate?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the acceptance of the recommendations for change for tax to the Bill entitled to wit House Bill 2569. Adopted by the Senate August 6th, 1979 in the First Special Session by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything else, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution and the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit; Senate Joint Resolution #1. Resolved by the Senate of the Eighty-First General Assembly of the State of Illinois, at the First Special Session, thereof. The House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the two Houses adjourn on August 6th, 1979, they stand adjourned sine die."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan at Representative DiPrima's desk or Taylor's desk."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of the adjournment Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the adjourn-



ment Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. The House now stands adjourned sine die."



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
AUGUST 06, 1979

PAGE 1

HB-2569	VETO	PAGE	8
	VETO	PAGE	26