

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

Speaker Hartke: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford the Assistant Pastor of the Victory Temple Church in Springfield. Guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

Pastor Crawford: "Most gracious and kind Father, I honor You as the Great Jehovah Shalom, the God of perfect peace grant to us a peace that will pass all understanding, rule us and govern us by Your grace forever. Keep our eyes and minds upon You, for You said in Your word they that do so, You said that You would grant them perfect peace. We pray and ask this kindly in Your Son's name. Amen."

Speaker Hartke: "We shall be led in the pledge today by Patti Bellock."

Bellock - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Hartke: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie on the Democrat side report."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Brosnahan, Joe Lyons, Bob Ryan, and Ricca Slone are excused today."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Durkin, Representative Pankau, and Representative Simpson are all excused today."

Speaker Hartke: "110 Members answering the Roll Call and quorum is present. Mr. Clerk, please read the Governor's Proclamation."

Clerk Rossi: "Executive Department Proclamation 2002-320."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

Whereas the Illinois Constitution requires the General Assembly to make appropriations for a fiscal year that shall not exceed the funds estimated by the General Assembly to be available during that fiscal year; and whereas the Illinois Constitution authorizes the Governor to Veto a Bill by returning such Bill with his objections to the House in which it originated; therefore pursuant to Article IV, Section 5 (b) of the Illinois Constitution of 1970 I hereby call and convene the 92nd General Assembly in Special Session to commence on Monday, June 10, 2002 at 2 p.m. to consider my reductions and Vetoes of items of appropriations in Senate Bill 2393 and to consider my Veto of House Bill 3714. A message from the Governor to the honorable Members of the Illinois House of Representatives of the 92nd General Assembly pursuant to Article IV, Section 9 (b) of the Illinois Constitution of 1970, I hereby veto House Bill 3714, entitled an Act in relation to criminal law."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, introduction of Resolutions."

Clerk Rossi: "First Special Session House Resolution #1 and First Special Session House Resolution #2 are introduced."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move for the suspension of appropriate House Rules so that we might take up for immediate consideration the adoption of First Special Session House Resolutions 1 and 2."

Speaker Hartke: "You heard the Lady's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Would the Clerk please read First

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

Special Session House Resolutions 1 and 2?"

Clerk Rossi: "First Special Session House Resolution #1

RESOLVED, That the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-Second General Assembly be adopted as the Rules of this Special Session, so far as may the same... so far as the same may be applicable, and that the Committees of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-Second General Assembly, including the House Journal Review Committee and their membership, shall constitute the Committees of the House during the First Special Session.

First Special Session House Resolution #2

RESOLVED, That the Clerk inform the Senate that a majority of the House has assembled, pursuant to the Proclamation of the Governor, convening a First Special Session of the General Assembly and are now ready for the transaction of business."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie now moves the adoption of the First Special Session Resolution #1 and 2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. If I can have the Members' attention, please. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's the Chair's intention to call, of course, the Committee of the Whole and we will use the same procedure as we did a couple of weeks ago when we had Representative Black's request for a Committee of the Whole. We will have members of various agencies here for questioning. We hope to give every Member a time limit of about five minutes to question agency directors and we will proceed in an orderly manner to try to get through this process. It's also the Chair's intention that sometime

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

today we will be voting on a... on an issue later on, say about 4:30 or 5:00 on Supplemental Calendar #1, which has been distributed. We expect to adjourn at a reasonable hour this afternoon, so all the Members should be aware of that. We may not conclude our business as the Committee of the Whole today, but if not, we will reconvene it tomorrow. Members should also be advised that they should be ready to stay through Wednesday. Representative Currie, for a Motion."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move that the House now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of a subject matter hearing on the Governor's item and reduction Vetoes to the fiscal year 2003 budget in accordance with the guidelines you have just now heard."

Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Ladies Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted. The Motion is adopted and the House hereby resolves into the Committee of the Whole and we will proceed in the agenda referenced in the Lady's Motion. Is there leave for the Attendance Roll Call to be accepted for the purpose of establishing a quorum of the committee? Leave is granted. And a quorum is established. The Chair recognizes Representative Hannig. Representative Hannig is appointed as the Chairman of the committee and recognized for the purpose of conducting the hearing. The Chair recognizes Representative Hannig, the Chair of the Committee of the Whole."

(IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE)

Speaker Hartke: "On Supplemental Calendar #1, on the Order of Total Vetoes, appears House Bill 3714. Representative

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the Bill that we passed with an overwhelming majority back in March and deals with the issue of clarifying our prison privatization... prison privatization laws. As we all know, prisons are dangerous places to work. Those people that we hire to work in our institutions, our guards, have only the physical structures and each other to protect themselves from some very, oftentimes very violent criminals. And even so, I'm told that last year 1,358 guards were assaulted, 1,358. So, clearly, we know that prisons are dangerous places. That is why this Bill, which clarifies an earlier law on prison privatization, in my opinion, is so necessary. The people who work in the food services and the commissaries are not just cooks, in fact generally speaking, they are trained security officers who supervise the inmates, who supervise the inmates who do the cooking and who serve the meals. The presence of these security personnel in the eating area help keep order and discipline in an area where a large number of convicts gather. Removing these trained officers from the area and replacing them with low paid, perhaps even transient workers in my view is an invitation for disaster. Unfortunately, I fear that if we would do this that some of these minimum wage employees may very well decide that they can make more money by struggling... by smuggling contraband into the facilities and consequently take that direction which would cause a great deal of trouble for everyone. So, there's some real questions in my mind as to whether or not this whole idea of trying to replace highly trained personnel in our correctional system with what I believe will be minimum

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

wage individuals who will come and go, is really good public policy and that's what this whole debate is about, what is the best public policy for running our prisons. I believe it's having highly qualified and highly trained personnel in important places to ensure that we can minimize the kind of problems that exist in a system like our correctional system. So, I would ask for you to join with me and override the Governor's Veto of House Bill 3714. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Yes, to the Motion."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Motion."

Johnson: "Ya know, early on in this process we had the debate and we all basically supported the nonprivatization of the food service and this was early on in our Session and in terms of the overall budget restraints that we now find ourselves in. And I supported that Motion so that we would not privatize the food service at that time. I rise today that we are all faced with a lot of difficult choices and priorities here in Springfield. This particular piece... and privatization in fact, I think we all need to be aware of that, especially food service has been done in a number of places, and in fact, has been used in the past even in Department of Corrections and is currently being used in the Cook County Jail, and in fact security is provided and I don't think severely jeopardized in the scope of things. Now, I personally, when it comes to prioritization and I've never been one to try to micromanage the Department of Corrections, it's a very difficult place as you well know. But in terms of prioritizing, I would much rather see a work camp remain open, I would rather see work on

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

recidivism, I would rather see us continue down the path of reform that we started here. And for us to dig our feet in here as it relates to this particular program, I think at this time is probably, though a difficult choice and one that if we had all the unlimited resources available, I would not wanna do either. However, I'm gonna support the Governor's Amendatory Veto on this particular thing today and I wanna suggest to all of us in here that this issue of privatization, I would hope that people'll begin to think consistently on this, because as you all well know last week we passed probably one of the largest privatization Bills in our history where we gave the City of Chicago the right to privatize the Chicago skyway. And so privatization is not in and of itself a bad thing and it becomes something that we ought to always have the options open. Let me tell you, people who work even in the private food sectors and so on, these are union employees as well. They might not be AFSCME employees, but they are union employees. And so, I think it's incumbent on us to turn around and take second look at this and say in light of where we are with this budget, I think the Governor is making the right choice here and I would urge this Body to rethink this position and I know we've all had a lot of heat, especially from our own AFSCME workers who work within that food service section and along with the entire AFSCME union that protects one group or whatever and that's their job and they've done a admirable job. But now it's our job to try to make sure that wherever we can prioritize funding to where it gets to the most important places, this is not just a jobs protection program, but we have the entire goodwill and good work that we need to do for all the people of the State of Illinois. And I would suggest

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

that this is one part that in fact we should sustain the Governor's Veto. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Bost: "Representative, I am... and I agree with everything you've said as far as privatization. I supported this Bill when it went to the Governor and plan to move to override it and support you with that vote. My other concern is because as we've worked through this process, the emotional roller coaster that we put families and people that are involved with this process, the line workers, on. I don't want to send a confusing message to them that if we send this back that's gonna change all the problems, because there's another problem and that is with the Bill that is now over in the Senate and the line item that was removed. Am I correct on that?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, there's the lump sum is in the budget, but the Governor has vetoed that, as well. So, you're correct that the ideal situation that would be that we would override the Governor's substantive Veto, this Bill in both the House and the Senate and then we'd override the Governor's Veto of that line item in the budget in both the House and the Senate."

Bost: "All right. Then my next question then is, if we move to override this, this goes to the Governor, that does not occur. What do you see... how do you see this play out?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, that would then become the law of the land should the House and the Senate override the Governor's Veto of this substantive Bill. I believe that the agency would have to find a way to live with that law."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

So, they would either have to transfer money that exists or they would have to ask for a supplemental. I mean there are ways that they could do with it, but they would have to live with the law."

Bost: "Okay. And that, Gary, is what I wanted to clarify, to make sure that if this goes and that wouldn't pass over there there's still a way we... I mean it would make it tough in other area but money would have to be transferred to make sure that these employees that are working in the food service and the commissary would stay working and that money would transfer having transferred from somewhere else. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "Yes, Representative."

Bost: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Representative Garrett."

Garrett: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Garrett: "Representative, I do have a question on this. I have a letter from the Governor and he has made two statements that I need some clarification on. The first one is in... I don't know if anybody else has this. The third paragraph, last sentence it says, 'on this particular Bill, if this Bill were to become law State Government would face added costs in the fiscal year 2003 budget of \$27 million.' So, what he's basically saying is if... if this goes through the way we have already voted for it to go through, it'll cost the state an extra \$27 million. And then later on in the same letter he says, 'by implementing a plan to privatize food and commissary service DOC estimates that it will save approximately \$25 million in fiscal year 2003.' My question is, we currently have costs as to how much this

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

particular... this program is costing the State of Illinois and then I guess the other way to look at it is if we do not privatize, what those costs will be, which would probably be keeping the costs the same, though the Governor says that will increase up to 27 million and if we privatize how we will save that money. I guess the numbers don't add up to me, it's like a fuzzy math thing, but if... could you clarify that?"

Hannig: "Representative, I would agree with you. My view is that I really question as to whether or not we would save any money by privatizing the food services in the commissaries. Clearly in my view, you're gonna have a situation where the people who work in prisons are more at risk, we'll probably see more people be assaulted. You'll have more workers compensation claims, you'll have more settlements of that nature that you'll have to deal with, you'll have more items smuggled into the prison, contraband that will cause trouble. So, while you may argue that you could save some wages by replacing highly trained people that are paid a higher wage with lesser trained people that are paid a lesser wage, I think there's also a price that you pay for it as well when you look at, especially in a prison, with the assaults and the trouble that these folks can cause."

Garrett: "But, I guess I still don't understand, why if we implement this program of nonprivatization, why will it cost the state above and beyond what we're already paying, an additional \$27 million?"

Hannig: "It will not... I mean the people who provide the food services are already there."

Garrett: "Right. So where does the \$27 million? Does anybody know that?"

Hannig: "I think what the Governor is trying to say is that if we

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

would abolish those positions and privatize that we would save 27 million, but I would suggest that that probably is a little bit of a fuzzy math question."

Garrett: "Do we have any... almost like independent data on this information on this particular... these costs?"

Hannig: "No, Representative, unfortunately, oftentimes the difficulty in... on these kind of issues is we don't have anyone in authority... of authority other than the agency itself who would venture to give these kind of guesses."

Garrett: "But it seemed to me in one of the committees I sit and maybe it's appropriations, that we have asked for an independent report of cost analysis on what the real expenditures are and what the real savings would be. Nobody... did we never get that from anybody but internal sources?"

Hannig: "I'm not aware that we've ever seen any kind of independent documentation that shows that we can a penny."

Garrett: "Well, to the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Motion."

Garrett: "I have a concern with... with approving the Governor's Veto only because I don't believe that we have the real numbers in front of us. It may be that we should've had those numbers, but even looking at these two sheets of paper it is not clear what the real savings is going to be to the state and it is not clear what the real expenses currently are going to be if we keep things in place. We have to be very careful as we're looking at all sorts of different ways in which to save money that we're not throwing the baby out with the bath water. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Black: "Representative, as you and I have talked about a little earlier today on the letter from the Governor on the second page, the next to the last paragraph, the last sentence, 'if the state is forced to assume the direct operation of these services the new associated costs are anticipated to be \$2 million for fiscal 2003.' When we first talked about this Bill many months ago, I don't think it was our intent that we overturn what was being done and had been done at Joliet for a number of years and those adult transition centers that have a privatized component, was not our intent that those who were already doing this be eliminated and that we step in then and restructure. Would you agree with that?"

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, I agree."

Black: "Yeah, it's... it was the expansion that we were aimed at... or that we were aiming at, not those institutions at Joliet and the adult transitional centers who may have a private contractor doing food service. The one at Joliet does. The adult transitional centers obviously are not setup for kitchens and that suc... sort of thing. It is not a prison. Let me ask you a question based on what Representative Garrett has said. Have you, as the Appropriations Chair for your side of the aisle, have you seen any hard data that would indicate a potential savings of \$25 million if Ronald McDonald served 'Happy Meals' at all the prisons?"

Hannig: "Representative, I have not. I really do not believe in all honesty that we're gonna save any money by going to a privatized food service system."

Black: "We have a... I don't believe anybody has seen hard data

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

that would indicate there would be a \$25 million savings to privatize. And let me ask you a question, have you seen the request for proposal that the department put out?"

Hannig: "I've seen some of them, Representative, yes."

Black: "I have not. Have you, in your capacity, seen the contract that it appears that the department would be ready to accept from Aramark?"

Hannig: "I'm not certain I saw that specific one. I've seen some, though."

Black: "Okay. I have not seen the RFP, I have not seen the contract. How many bidders were there, Representative? Do you know how many bidders actually bid on this proposal?"

Hannig: "Representative, I can't recall. I know there were a number of... I think a relatively small number of large companies that showed an interest before the courts actually stepped in and kind of put things on hold."

Black: "Yeah, I... it's my understanding and someone I'm sure will correct me if I'm wrong, but it's my understanding that only one company actually submitted a bid to provide food services at the Illinois Department of Corrections and if I'm wrong I'm sure I will be corrected. That, in and of itself as a lifelong resident of Illinois, tells me that that raises a flag flapping in the breeze that this gives me pause. If... if this contract is going to be so solid and they're going to make money and they're going to save us money, why only one bidder? I... that just gives me some pause. Mr. Speaker, to the Gentleman's Motion to Override. This is not an easy task. When I left here I voted for various, I won't call them revenue enhancements, I think that's political doublespeak in this millennium. I voted for tax increases that I thought would get us through the budget year and restore the \$25 million to operate the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

dietary system in the Illinois Department of Corrections. It has not been an easy task for me to take on the department, I happen to have great respect for what they do and how they have done their job in the last few years. I have great respect for people who go into those institutions everyday, sometimes working double shifts because we are understaffed, and put up with people that none of us want to deal with on a day-to-day basis. That's why they're there, that's why they're locked up. And to the director, it gives me no pleasure to cross swords with this Director of the Department of Corrections, I think he has done some amazing things on his watch. I visit the prison in Danville on a regular basis and I can tell you in years past it was like going on a college campus, there were inmates wondering everywhere. They had various types of dress. Somebody may be wearing a pair of \$200 Michael Jordan sneakers, somebody else may be having to make do with a pair of \$5 Keds. There was no rhyme or reason to anything. I go to the Danville prison now and I see controlled movement and I see a uniform, may be too strong a word, but they have a choice they can buy white sneakers from the commissary or they can buy black sneakers from the commissary, all the same price. So, if they have family members who send them money, no more can they wear a \$200 pair of sneakers, no more can they walk around in the yard wearing anything they want to wear. They are dressed in prison denim or dungarees and it has been a positive influence, a controlled movement. Their movement in the dietary centers is much more carefully controlled than it was four years ago. I congratulate the director for what he and his staff have managed to do, but I would also say we disagree, we absolutely disagree on this idea. And I

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

think what bothers me the most is that there were no public hearings. Were any of you notified... were any of you notified that we were thinking about privatizing dietary at all of the Illinois prisons? Were there any public hearings held? I don't think so. I don't think so. Twenty-five years ago the Department of Corrections came into what is now my legislative district, they wanted to have a hearing on trying to build a new prison. Nobody in Vermilion or Edgar counties wanted anything to do with 'em. They told them to go away. They don't even want a hearing. But 19 years ago they came back, the City of Danville couldn't do enough to have that hearing. Over 2 thousand people showed up at the hearing. What was the difference? The difference was the economy. The old post-World War II plants that employed thousands of my constituents were closing, were moving offshore and so all of a sudden the possibility of getting a prison in your town with a decent wage and stable employment seemed like a good trade-off. No one spoke in opposition to locating a prison in Danville at the hearing in Danville that was held about 19 years ago, a considerable change. Let me... let me... and again reasonable people can differ on this, but I've taken a long look at this. If you'll look at the Private Correctional Facility Moratorium Act in Statute 730 ILCS 140/1 through 140/4, I want you to just go with me very briefly and take a look at what that language says. The law specifically bans the Department of Corrections from contracting with a private contractor or private vendor for the provision of services relating to the operation of a correctional facility. It goes on to say, certain contracts for ancillary services that apparently do not relate to the operation of a correctional facility and which therefore

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

can be privatized are explicitly enumerated: medical services, educational services, repair and maintenance contracts. Nonenumerated services that might be eligible for privatization are described as other services not directly related to the ownership, management, or operation of security services in a correctional facility. Now, based on this language, it appears that reasonable people can read this statute and disagree and I have read it and I disagree with the Governor and I disagree with the Department of Corrections on this issue and in all due respect to them. It would seem to me that you could use case law to say, if it is reasonable to expect the prisoners must be fed while incarcerated at the Department of Corrections, then would it not also seem reasonable to say that feeding prisoners is part of an essential function of a prison and cannot be described as an ancillary service? I think that that is the whole root of my disagreement on this issue. I could go on and on. I have a Resolution from the Vermilion County Board urging no privatization, a Resolution from the City of Danville, no privatization and a letter from several independent vendors who provide services to the prison who say they have not been contacted by the current bidder on whether or not they will be allowed to continue doing that. Last but not least, let me give you some questions I asked the department back in March, listen to the... listen to the answers. I asked the Department of Corrections on March 19th: 'Will the private contractor pay any apportioned rent to the Department of Corrections as they will be using considerable square footage of space?' Answer, 'No, the private company will not pay any rent for the dietary or commissary site.' Wow. Question: 'Will they be asked to

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

pay a portion of utility costs in the facility they use, will they be asked to pay a portion of correctional officers who will be responsible for security in the dietary center when the inmates are eating?' Answer: 'No.'

Last question: 'When items have to be repaired or replaced will the private contractor pay all maintenance and replacement costs or will the department pay these costs?' Answer: 'The department will pay for the repair and maintenance of equipment as it does in the current operation for the preparation of food. We will also replace equipment as necessary.' Where's the savings to the taxpayer on that? They come in and use space, pay nothing, the private contractor uses equipment that the taxpayers bought, pay nothing, if it breaks the taxpayer replaces it and the private contractor pays nothing. Ya know, even an old country boy like me could make money on a deal like this, I don't have any overhead. In summation and I again rise to support the Gentleman's Motion to Override and I don't do so lightly. I don't often fight with Governors of my party it's not a pleasant situation to do. I have great respect for the Gentleman on the second floor and as I've tried to indicate to you I have great respect for the Director of the Department of Corrections. But I take this back to a situation at the Danville prison in 1999 when we had a private contractor who provided health care services to inmates. That private contractor never adequately staffed the infirmary. I called this to the department's attention, nothing was done. The private contractor was not paying bills to vendors in the City of Danville. I called this to the attention of the Department of Corrections, nothing was done. The private contractor then tried to cut a semisecret deal with the Veterans

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

Administration Medical Center in Danville so that they could take prisoners to the Veterans Administration Medical Center for treatment rather than the local hospital. The veterans groups came unglued and once the light of the press got on that, that went away. Why did they try to do that? Well, then I found that they hadn't paid the hospital. They owed the hospital in Danville over \$350 thousand. To make a long story short, they left town owing about \$400 thousand in unpaid bills. This private contractor is still in business. I asked the Department of Corrections, will you help me go to the Court of Claims and get that money? No, no, we have nothing to do with that. That's a private contractor, we have nothing to do with the fact that they left bad debt in your community of \$400 thousand. If that's the way to do the public business, I don't think so. I rise in strong support of the Gentleman's Motion and I would ask that you override the Governor's Veto of privatizing food service in the Illinois prison system."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Mitchell, Jerry Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield for a question."

Mitchell, J.: "Representative, there are several ways to see if this particular move would save money. Have you seen anything or any indication from those states, it's been indicated that there are other states that have successfully moved to privatization. Have you seen any cost figures where it saved them money to do this?"

Hannig: "Representative, I have not."

Mitchell, J.: "Well, neither have I. It would've been very easy

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

for the department to get those figures to us to help convince us of their argument. Have we seen any reports of safety within those prisons that are privatized to show that safety was either as good as, better, or worse?"

Hannig: "Representative, I think in the data that's available widely we've seen where safety has deteriorated, where we've had more problems in those states that have privatized their prisons."

Mitchell, J.: "So, as far as we know safety is not better for sure, we're not even sure it's the same and it may be worse and we've seen no cost savings whatsoever from any of the states that have done this. What we're going to do is simply put a lot of good folks out of jobs, hurt the economy of local districts and local communities without any assurance that we saved any money whatsoever. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this does not sound like a good maneuver to save money. I also agree with Representative Mautino's earlier request as where did the deal fall apart? Ya know, we put money in to assure that privatization would not happen. We put money in to assure that our schools could at least survive. We put money in to assure that DDMI would at least get a COLA increase so that they could survive and yet, we are here faced with a budget that looks even worse than what we faced before we went to work. It seems to me like we spent two weeks in futility working our fingers to the bone to get a balanced budget and now all of the sudden in three or four days it's blown apart and we're right back where we started from. Well, this is a poor start and I, like my colleague from Vermilion County, support the Gentleman's Motion. Let's override this and put the money back. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Any further discussion? Seeing that no one is

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

seeking recognition, Representative Hannig to close."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. When the framers of our National Constitution looked at what was the best way to run a government and when the drafters of our State Constitution tried to find a system of government, they looked to a system of checks and balances. And we in the Legislative Branch play an important role in that system of checks and balances. Part of what we have to do is make decisions every day that we're here on items that we believe are good public policy or bad public policy. Now, we know that our prison systems are already overcrowded. We know that other states who have gone to privatization have seen deterioration of the services in their prisons, that there's been more guards that are assaulted, there's been more escapes, there's been generally more trouble. And so the question that we really have to decide now here in this House is whether the issue of privatization of our food services is good public policy. Now, the Governor did what he thought was right and I think we can honestly disagree with him and still believe that he is wrong, because we have a role that we have to play as well and we have to try to set public policy based on what we think is right. And so, in this system of checks and balances the Governor has used his veto pen, but we have an opportunity, I think an obligation to override that veto, because in my view this privatization is bad public policy. So, I would urge each and every one of you to join with me and Representative Black and Bost and Mitchell who have spoken from their side of the aisle and override the Governor on House Bill 3714."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3714 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' This Motion

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

1st Legislative Day

June 10, 2002

requires 71 votes. This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Scully. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 90 Members voting 'yes', 21 Members voting 'no'. And this Motion having received the required Three-fifths Majority, the Motion to override prevails. And House Bill 3714 is declared passed, notwithstanding the Governor's Veto. The House is being prepared to adjourn. We are preparing to adjourn. Representative Poe."

Poe: "Mr. Speaker, for announcement."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes."

Poe: "The Republicans would like to make sure that they know that in the morning at 10:00 there is a caucus in 118."

Speaker Hartke: "No further announcements? Representative Currie now moves that the House stand adjourned until Tuesday at the hour of 11 a.m., allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the First Session... Special Session stands adjourned until the hour of 11 a.m."