51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

Speaker Madigan: "The House will come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We ask the Members and our guests in the gallery to turn off laptop computers, cell phones, and pagers and we ask our guests in the gallery to rise and join us for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by the Reverend Gregory Mayer, who is the Pastor of the First Lutheran Church in Rock Island, Illinois. Reverend Mayer is the guest of Representative Verschoore."

Reverend Mayer: "The Lord be with you. Gracious Lord, we come before You this day, praying for Your people all around the world. But especially we do we pray for those who are caught in devastation from tornado and flood and fire here in our country. We ask that You be with those who till the land. We pray for favorable weather. We pray for peace in the world, and those serving in our military, and their families who suffer loss. As we are entering that construction season, keep workers safe and travelers watchful. We pray for all in authority, the President, the Congress, the Governor, the Legislature, justices and judges, that all will govern with justice and equity. And in all that we do, let us remember the poor, the homeless, the widowed, the elderly, the underemployed, the uninsured, and all who struggle for a livelihood. Let us be mindful of these, the least among us, in all that we deliberate. Guide this Legislature, that in all they do it will glorify You and fulfill Your will as they reason together. Be with the Members of this Body that struggle with illness and let them know of Your love. Be with those families who mourn the

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

loss of loved ones and fill them with the hope and peace only You can give. For all of these things and whatever else you see that we need, we pray this in the name of our Creator. Amen."

- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Moffitt."
- Moffitt 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 Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Rich Bradley, Representative Chapa LaVia, and Representative Patterson are excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Beaubien is excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 114 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Representative Holbrook, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment & Energy, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 10, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' Senate Bill 1257, Senate Bill 69, Senate Bill 126, Senate Bill 154, Senate Bill 569, Senate Bill 1419, Senate Bill 1663. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

State Government Administration, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 10, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' House Resolution 265, House Resolution 279, House Resolution 300, House Resolution 309; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' Senate Bill 580, Senate Bill 1523, Senate Bill 1619; 'do pass Short Debate' Senate Bill 116, Senate Bill 199, Senate Bill 207, Senate Bill 208, Senate Bill 321, Senate Bill 555, Senate Bill 768, Senate Bill 1304, Senate Bill 1326, Senate Bill 1385, Senate Bill 1438, Senate Bill 1621, Senate Bill 1665. Representative Saviano, Chairperson from the Committee on Registration & Regulation, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 10, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' Senate Bill 149, Senate Bill 360, Senate Bill 448, Senate Bill 573, Senate Bill 745, Senate Bill 867, Senate Bill 1174, Senate Bill 1225. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Local Government, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 10, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' Senate Bill 249, Senate Bill 263, Senate Bill 305, Senate Bill 684, Senate Bill 1201; 'do pass Short Debate' Senate Bill 29, Senate Bill 56, Senate Bill 152, Senate Bill 186, Senate Bill 255, Senate Bill 341, Senate Bill 343, Senate Bill 345, Senate Bill 382, Senate Bill 436, Senate Bill 438, Senate Bill 473, Senate Bill 612, Senate Bill 689, Senate Bill 744, Senate Bill 1261, Senate Bill 1729. Representative Molaro,

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II-Criminal Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 10, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 2853; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' Senate Bill 88; 'do pass Short Debate' Senate Bill 14, Senate Bill 55, Senate Bill 75, Senate Bill 97, Senate Bill 132, Senate Bill 142, Senate Bill 265, Senate Bill 273, Senate Bill 386, Senate Bill 585, Senate Bill 594, Senate Bill 705, Senate Bill 1293, and Senate Bill 1358. Referred to the House Committee on Rules is House Resolution 402, offered by Representative Madigan. House Resolution 405, offered by Representative Hoffman. House Joint Resolution, offered by Representative Bellock."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if we could ask the Members to take their seats and we ask the staff to retire to the rear of the chamber. We have a special guest today. Mr. Barukh Binah is the Consul General of Israel to the Midwest, stationed in Chicago, and he will offer remarks and a message from the government of Israel to the people of the State of Illinois. So let me present to you, Consul General Barukh Binah."

Consul General Binah: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Speaker Madigan, distinguished Members of Illinois House, I'm very pleased, indeed humbled to stand before you once again in this august chamber and bring greetings and best wishes to you from the people of the State of Israel. I have had the pleasure of meeting many of you during my tour of duty as Consul General of Israel to the Midwest and I hope and trust to meet many

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

more of you before I return home to Israel. Perhaps, because my Consul of General is based in Chicago, I feel a special affinity for the State of Illinois, and its leaders, and certainly value the warm friendship that I have with several people in this room. Many of you have been to Israel either on personal tours or on trips mounted by organizations. Ι this opportunity, Ladies take Gentlemen, to invite those of you who have not yet visited our wonderful though compact country to do so and those who have been, I assure you that one visit is never enough. Whenever you go I place my office and my staff as well as the Israeli Economic Office in Chicago at your disposal to recommend and arrange interesting and useful meetings with key Israeli officials, business leaders, and opinion makers. Of course, it is not only on the personal level that a strong multilayered relationship has developed between Illinois and Israel. Several trade missions to Israel have already taken place during the last 2 years. Last year the highlight of a trade mission to Israel sponsored by the Homeland Security Market Development Division of Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity was the signing of a declaration between Israel and the State of Illinois to encourage industrial R&D cooperation biotechnology, homeland security, life sciences, and related This June, a conference sponsored by the DCEO, sectors. among others on, Illinois and Israel homeland security business practices is scheduled to in connection with the visiting Israeli trade delegation. Other missions were organized by the Chicago Israel Business Initiative of the

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

America Israel Chamber of Commerce in Chicago. missions focused on homeland security and life science markets, both areas in which Israel and Illinois have much to offer each other. Also, in the vital area of homeland security cooperation the Consul General of Israel membership in partnership with government and private organizations has sponsored seminars for counterterrorism officials, law enforcement professionals and the local state and federal level emergency medical personnel, and other first responders. These meetings brought Israeli experts to this... in this field in which, unfortunately, Israel has far too much firsthand experience. In contact with their counterparts from Illinois and other Midwestern states, they shared their knowledge and learned from each other about how to access... and how to assess... I'm sorry, the threat of terrorist attack, take preventive steps and if those sadly fail, to deal with the aftermath. Thus, on May 16 in Chicago, the Consulate in partnership with the National Strategy Forum and the Institute for Counterterrorism in Israel is presenting a daylong conference entitled 'Combating International Terrorism Trends and Domestic Implications'. The presenters are the cream of the crop of Israeli experts on these topics and I strongly encourage you if you cannot be there yourselves to have a staff member attend. And of course, anyone can see me afterwards for details. Needless to say, I hope that the people of Illinois, indeed all the citizens of this wonderful country, never have to live under the constant cloud of terrorism as the people of Israel have for so many years. Yet, the people

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

about their daily lives, building of Israel do go businesses, attending schools, and crowding cafes, and clubs, despite the continuing restaurants, hostility of states and terrorist organizations in our region. Despite the existential threats for our country... I'm sorry. Despite the existential threats, our economy develops in an astonishing rate. Israel is known worldwide as a center of high tech. Our scientists are coming up with groundbreaking research to cure disease. Our artists cover the entire musical landscape from classical to hip-hop, our films win prizes at international festival including nominations for Academy Awards. We publish, Ladies and Gentlemen, nearly four thousand (4,000) new books every year. This torrent of life and creativity will never be stopped. Mr. Speaker, Israel has just celebrated its 59th anniversary of her independence as a modern sovereign state. Next month we commemorate the 40th anniversary of both our miraculous victory over several adversaries in the Six Day War and the reunification of a capital at the heart of the Jewish people, our beloved Jerusalem. Forty years ago, Israel was led by Prime Minister Leve Eshkol and Chief of staff Yitzhak Rabin, two of Israel's greatest political and military leaders. I personally have strong memories of the days and weeks of panic, I should say, that preceded that war. How strangled and threatened we were, how as a teenager I dug trenches in my desert hometown of Beersheba, just in case, how the international community failed us, and how our neighbors spewed venom at us on a daily and sometimes hourly basis. Our young state faced then an

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

existential threat from the most formidable armies in the region. The objective of the Arab nations as expressed at that time by then President Abdul Rahman Aref of Iraq was very simple and precise, and he said and I quote, 'The existence of Israel is an error which must be rectified. This is our opportunity to wipe out the ignominy which has been with us since 1948. Our goal is clear, to wipe Israel off the map.' I remember how later, in June of 1967, Israel battled and defeated the armies of Egypt, Jordan, and Syria, as well as an expeditionary force from Iraq. Iran was still a friend and an ally. Forty years later, those same chilling words have been repeated again and again by President Ahmadinejad of Iran a man who denies the holocaust and prepares for another. He openly calls for annihilation of the State of Israel. He heads a country which since the Islamic Revolution of 1979 has become the world's largest state sponsor of terror and the most dangerous threat to the peace and stability of not only Israel but the moderate Arab and Muslim states as well, and also of international community, especially the United States and its allies. Forty years ago... I'm sorry... forty Israel faces challenges from terrorist vears later organizations in Lebanon and in the Palestinian Authority as well. An international community should not fail Israel and the entire free world in standing up to tyranny and terror. We expect that in Lebanon the international community will enforce the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1701 which calls for the return of our kidnapped soldiers, Eldad Regev and Ehud Goldwasser, and for the immediate

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

stopping of the smuggling of arms and ammunition to Hezbollah which are sent by Iran via Syria. We expect that the international community will maintain and uphold the three criteria put forth by the international quartet for the Palestinian government, namely: recognizing Israel, renouncing terrorism and adhering to all existing agreements between Israel and the Palestinian Authority. And we expect that the Palestinian Authority will live up to its own commitment including the release of our kidnapped soldier, Gilad Shalit. Regarding Iran, we expect the international community to live up to its commitment and certify that Iran will never be allowed to realize its vicious program to attain weapons of mass destruction. Ιt is Iran's Revolutionary Guard which trains and encourages radical Islamists in Iraq and in Afghanistan to kill American ally, and Iraqi troops, as well as thousands of innocent civilians in mosques, markets, and schools. They train their terrorist proxies to lay roadside bombs and IEDs where they can cause the most damage and inflict the heaviest casualties among U.S. and allied troops, your friends and neighbors, your sons and daughters. The government of Iran and its terrorist proxies are the enemies of the American people as well as the citizens of all enlightened and freedom-loving nations. Iran extends its tentacles of terrorism throughout the Middle East and beyond. Along with its junior partner the Assad regime of Syria, Iran has created, armed, financed, and trained sophisticated terrorist militias such as Hezbollah in Lebanon, and the Palestinian terrorist groups Hamas and Islamic Jihah which

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

threaten to destroy any prospects for peace in the region. However, as dangerous as Iran is as a state sponsor of terrorism, if the current regime is allowed to complete its development of nuclear weapons, a truly nightmarish scenario would become a reality. While Israel would certainly be in imminent danger, moderate Arab and Muslim states and the rest of the world would then be held hostage to Iran's nuclear bomb-backed ultimatums. This cannot be allowed to happen. Since everyone wants to do everything possible to avoid the military confrontation, and since political negotiations containing generous incentives conducted by the United Kingdom, France, and Germany have been rejected by the Iranian regime, new options need to be pursued. Among the most effective in putting pressure on Iran, have been economic measures including reducing Western investments in Iran's lucrative oil sector. The UN system has already begun to take action against Iran for violating multiple UN and IAEA resolutions. The U.S. Government, notably Congress and the Departments of State and Treasury, have been doing there share as well, and most recently the newest actors involved in efforts to deprive Iran from using U.S. citizens' dollars to fund terrorist operations and its nuclear weapons program are state and local governments. Several states have begun to take action. In Missouri the Treasurer has introduced, through executive order, a policy of terror-free investment. In Kansas the Legislature has just passed a Bill which prohibits the deposit of state pension funds in any company or fund which does business with or invests in companies that support the government of

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

A similar Bill has just been passed by the Iran. Legislature in Florida as well. It is our hope... it is our hope that more states in this great nation, including Illinois, will adopt appropriate measures as they see fit to send a crystal clear message to Tehran that the free world will not tolerate a terror sponsoring state with weapons of mass destruction. In the case of Iran, the time to search for creative diplomatic and economic options, options that can reduce or eliminate the potential for a military confrontation is now. We have no time to lose. Mr. Speaker, as we begin our 60th year of independence, the people of look ahead with great pride in accomplishments, and in confident anticipation of what the future holds as we move forward to protect, cherish, and beautify our country, to improve our society, and to do everything in our power to bring peace to our region. know that even though the journey may be difficult, Israel can count on the unbreakable bond of support and friendship of the American people to sustain us. These shared values, freedom, democracy, and respect for the rule of law and human rights will always characterize the special relations between the United States and the State of Israel. you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "The Consul General will be in my office for a reception, for those that are interested in a personal conversation, and he'll go back there right now. So, Mr. Consul General, thank you very, very much for your remarks. Thank you and the friendship of your nation. Mr. Clerk on

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

page 45 of the Calendar... For what purpose does Mr. Sacia seek recognition?"

Sacia: Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Sacia: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a very tiny community in northwest Illinois, Apple River, has their middle school energy club here today. Their teacher is Pam Phelps, she is here with the students. They are the #1 rated energy club in the State of Illinois. They're here visiting today and in June they're invited back to Washington, D.C. Would you make them feel welcome, please."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens?"

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Stephens: "I would like to introduce the family of Chapin Rose, who has joined him on the House Floor, Jack, age 3, Annie, age 1, and Camille, ageless."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, on page 45 of the Calendar, on the Order of Resolutions, there appears House Resolution 402. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the Resolution that relates to the Gross Receipts Tax. I've spoken with Mr. Cross. We had a very full debate yesterday from 9 in the morning 'til 5 in the afternoon. And I would suggest that for purposes of today's debate that there be five Democrats speaking and five Republicans, and then no more. Five Democrats, five Republicans and then we will go to a Roll Call. The first person seeking recognition is Mr. Lang. Mr. Lang."

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I understand the Resolution this isn't a for or against the Resolution, but a 'yes' vote means you're for the GRT and a 'no' vote means your opposed. Is that correct?"

Speaker Madigan: "That's correct."

Lang: "All right. So, I would be voting 'no' on this Resolution, Mr. Speaker. We did have a full discussion of this, in fact we have all been discussing this issue for months since the Governor proposed it. And at the time the Governor proposed it he just laid it out there with not a lot of conversation. He's... not... lot of information and what's coming from other states, what other states have done on the GRT, what they may... what their accomplishments may have been, what their failures may have been, what the pros and cons of the GRT has been in those states. information has not been forthcoming. I asked about it yesterday. I was told the information is out there, but we still have not seen the information. I must applaud the Governor as I have throughout this entire process for being bold, for being creative, for talking about important issues that we need to talk about our pension debt, our capital needs, our health care issues in our state, and maybe more... most importantly the need to fund education better in the State of Illinois. And I support the Governor in his efforts to accomplish those goals. But Ladies Gentlemen, we have a responsibility to get at those goals in a way that works for all of our citizens, that works for our businesses, that works for our consumers, that works for our school children, people in need, et Cetera. We also have a

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

responsibility to come together as a General Assembly with a willing Governor to sit down and discuss the issues that face the State of Illinois. I asked the Governor yesterday how he could be talking about compromise when he's taken all ideas off the table except his own. I didn't think the answer was very forthcoming, frankly. But I do think this, I think the time for gamesmanship on all sides should be over. I think the time for polarization should be behind us and I think the task before us really is, while difficult, laying out the problem should be easier than we're making What should we be doing? What we should be doing is working together, both sides of the aisle, both chambers and the Governor's Office, to first outline the problems the State of Illinois faces. What are those problems, what are those issues, what will it cost to resolve those issues, and then what should we do to find the revenue to deal with those problems? What should we do? We don't have all the answers, if you went to each of us individually we might all have different ideas, some might even say we don't need new revenue. But it's not so much where are we going to go, it's more how will we get there? It seems to me that we have to now get past this speed bump of politics, past the speed bump of gamesmanship, and lay out for the people of Illinois the problems we face and the solutions we seek. Once we do that, we can reason together. Once we do that, we can determine, in some measure, what it will cost if we chose to resolve all of these issues. And are we willing to bite the bullet to raise the revenue necessary to deal with all of those issues, or will we as a General Assembly working in

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

concert with hopefully a cooperative Governor, only be willing to tackle some of those issues this year leaving some of those issues for another year or will we decide this is not the year? Ladies and Gentlemen, it's up to the Legislature to legislate and it should be up to the Governor to be Governor. We must work with him, but I do not think its good government for us to simply agree with a Governor who comes down here and tells us what we should do to help him move his agenda along. We have an agenda. Our agenda should be listened to, our agenda should be laid out, our agenda should be responded to, both sides of the aisle, both chambers, and the Governor's Office. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's pretty clear that there is not a significant level of support for the GRT on this floor, and it should be pretty obvious now that is not a large significant level of support for the GRT among the thirteen million (13,000,000) citizens living in Illinois. It may be that citizens from other states would like us to pass the GRT; perhaps it would benefit Indiana, or Wisconsin, or Missouri, or Iowa, if we passed the GRT but it does not appear that the citizens of our state appear that it would be helpful to our state to pass the GRT. Yes, we must fund education; yes, we must deal with health care issues and these other issues, but we appear to be of a mind that this is not the way to do it. So, this is the time, Ladies and Gentlemen, to make a loud and clear statement that we as the Illinois House of Representatives will stand for moving forward together, to get past the speed bump of gamesmanship, to get past the speed bump of partisan politics, to get past being told what

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

we are going to do, and taking the bull by the horns and stating what we think we should do to move the State of Illinois forward. We have that responsibility, and frank... frankly and honestly many of us have not pushed that responsibility in the right direction, we've let others do that for us. It's time to make the statement today that not only are we opposed to the Governor's direction on this, but that we will affirmatively work hard and long to establish our priorities for moving Illinois forward and how we will get there. Not just this year, but a plan for the future. I stand with all of you in our efforts to make Illinois what we all want it to be, the GRT does not get us there, but we must not stop today by simply saying 'no' to this proposal, we have a responsibility to make our own voices heard not only here, but all over the state to let our citizens know that we understand our governmental responsibilities to lay out the priorities, and lay out the solutions. Let's work together to make that happen. I, for one, am anxious to begin that debate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black. Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just wondering an inquiry of the Chair, after the Governor's comments that perhaps you wanted to hold this or are you planning to bring another one after he actually puts his whole proposal together. The Governor seemed to think that we could vote 'no' today because his plan isn't put together, but I thought perhaps we would just go ahead anyway or that you would just bring back another Resolution when he gets his real plan together. But I presume you just want to go ahead

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

now with this, even though he's made the comment that we should vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "I would recommend that we engage in a good debate and discussion."

Mulligan: "All right. Thank you. Then I won't... I will make the comments that I was planning on making."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed. Okay. Thank you."

Mulligan: "Five years to lead on public policy is a long time. Leading on public policy is not doing campaign ads. It is Actually going out and having more in-depth discussion with the people that you represent, the Legislature that is supposed to work with you. A good state is a place to live and raise your family, to take care of the elder, the young, the fragile, both physically and mentally. It means you pay your Bills on time and you don't balance your budget on the back of human service providers. It also means that you don't distort what you have done, both in education funding, and in funding of pensions. You don't go out to unions and sell this particular plan where there's no wiggle room, and said it's going to fund pensions. The Treasurer's Office got back to me and said that actually our bond debt on the is twenty-one point nine billion dollars pension (\$21,900,000,000), ten billion (10,000,000,000) of that is interest. If you add that to the amount that he says that they've cut pensions more than any other Governor, you will find that that is not so. If you look at what his and supposedly the ten presentation was on billion (10,000,000,000) out of this that is supposed to go to education... Mr. Filan answered yesterday that only one point

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

five billion (1,500,000,000) would go in this year, and then everything else would probably be up for negotiation in the coming years. In the presentation on the budget, prior to the budget address, listed under the ten billion dollars (10,000,000,000) was paying off pensions, but when I asked the question, is this going to be pension money or is it actually going to education? They said, 'oh, no, it was going to education', and that template was removed from the screen and then was not in the packet the following day. This is not a plan for education, this is slipshod. As far as the health care goes, a good health care plan is not something that we are opposed to, but it's not something that you pull out of the blue. In other states that have passed this, they have managed to have insurance reform, include everybody and not had such a population as ours, and you don't do it all in one year. And I would hope that whatever happens he doesn't do it in an open-ended Bill like he did with 'all kids'. A Bill that does not specify any plan, except bring it to the Rules Committee so that the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules has to sit there and either argue or figure out where he's going. This is not leading in public policy. Putting forth a tax plan as your only plan, without any alternative to it, that penalizes business after you've given unions carte blanche to go after health care, and then saying health care is being expanded. Of course health care is being expanded, you've been attacking health care while you say you're promoting it. quite frankly, to only put out one thing on the table and say, 'it's my way or the highway' really doesn't fit what I

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

would call negotiating on good public policy. It doesn't talk to the people of Illinois on what they really want and what they're willing to pay for. It doesn't talk to the Legislature and what they can go home and talk to their people about and it certainly doesn't prove that we are going to have good public policy in Illinois. As I've stated a number of times on this House Floor, by 2015-2020 Illinois will have more retired people than they will have people that are working. The state that attracts jobs and keeps business is a state that will be able to take care of their senior citizens and will be a good place to live. This Governor, the saddest part of what he's doing makes me sad as a Legislator to see what's going to happen in our state, now and in the future. I think it's time he gets realistic and talks about real public policy, comes to the table and talks with all the people, and doesn't say, 'it's my way or the highway'. If I mortgage my home to pay off my credit card, I am not taking care of debt, I am incurring more debt. If I keep doing that over and over again, I am not looking at anything for the future or retirement. What he's doing to business in this state is a crime. frankly, I think if you want jobs for labor you have to have a compromise, that's not his issue. To say that he will not compromise on this is ludicrous. I urge a 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Resolution. I remember it was... it was actually May 26... May 26 of 2004, so then a little bit later

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

in the Session than now, when we called a Bill in the House knowing... knowing that it was going to fail. At that time the Bill was closing several loopholes to the corporate income tax that would've raised around three hundred million dollars... (\$300,000,000) three hundred million dollars (\$300,000,000) for our budget. At that time, if you all remember, twenty three (23) people voted in favor of that Bill and the Bill didn't pass. And I mentioned at that time, and I don't know if you recall but I remember saying, if you look out the windows, now we don't have quite as good a view as we used to since we had the renovation of the House but if you look out the windows to my left and you stand here and you look out on the fourth of July you get a great view of the fireworks of downtown Springfield. we're a little bit not quite as close to adjournment as we are debating this today. We have 3 weeks to get together, to pass the budget, to do for the people of Illinois the visions that we have all talked about in campaigns. What are they? Every one here... and the real issues here are, do we want to provide affordable access to health care for the people of Illinois? Do we want to provide a quality education with education reform and more money and less reliance on the property tax in this state something we all ... have all run on. Do we want to provide money for the pensions and get rid of the structural deficit of unfunded obligations to our pensions for state employees? Do we want to provide infrastructure improvement, roads, bridges, mass transit, to move our economy forward? That's the real issue, that's the real debate we need to be having.

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

The question then becomes, why are we doing this today? Why are we doing this today? Who would vote for a tax increase not knowing where the money's going to go? If we had 750 and a Resolution that I have introduced House Resolution 405, and it contains the provisions of 750 Representative Miller, in good faith, has put forward, 66 percent increase in an income tax, an increase on sales tax for services. If we were to vote for that today... if we were to vote for that today, who in their right mind would vote for that not knowing where the money's going to go? Why are we doing this today? The real issue if we pass this Resolution or if this Resolution fails and we don't provide money for education, health care, infrastructure, pensions, is the next Resolution going to be we're going to cut five hundred million (500,000,000) out of education 'cause we don't have money? Is the next Resolution after that going to be that we're going to not fund our pensions? So we then put forward a Resolution saying we're not going to have a payment cycle of 53 days for health care providers 'cause we don't have money to pay our bills? And the next Resolution, that we aren't going to build roads, bridges, and infrastructure that we need. This is a Resolution. What are we doing here? You know, the Governor was here yesterday and testified that he's willing to sit down and work with us, with a couple defining principles, principles that he ran on, principles that he got elected on, no income tax and no sales tax. Now, I don't understand why people can't hear that. Now they may say well that's too strident. Well, over the last year he told the voters, 'I will not

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

raise your income tax, I will not raise the sales tax, I will veto those types of unfair tax increases.' That's what he said, that's a matter of principle. That's what he means. So why do we continue to talk about it? Unless we have 71 votes in this House to raise the income tax, why are we talking about it, to override a Governor's Veto? Unless there's 36 votes in the Senate to raise the income tax and put sales taxes on services, services that are contained in House Bill 705, we're now going to tax, that we don't tax now services such as... services such as visiting historical sites, services such as going and getting your hair cut, changing your oil. We would even tax death care services, funeral home services, funeral services, hair, nail, skincare services, barbershops, beauty shops, nail salons, pet care, parking lots, garages, appliance repair maintenance, travel agencies, tour operators, security guard patrols, armed car... armored car services, I know a lot of people use those, pest control, landscaping, carpet cleaners, and the list goes on and on. We can have that debate, but we don't see that Resolution here. The Governor has indicated he's not going to sign an income or sales tax increase. However, you have to admit this, we have to admit this to ourselves, there is a fundamental unfairness in the current tax system It's absolutely fundamentally unfair when in Illinois. twelve thousand five hundred (12,500) of the biggest corporations in Illinois pay... with the biggest income in Illinois, a one hundred and fifty-one dollars (\$151) average in income tax. It's fundamentally unfair when corporations, the top 100... fortune 100 corporations that

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

reside in Illinois, thirty four (34) of them pay no Illinois income taxes. So, I don't see any reason we shouldn't be having that debate, the Governor's willing to have that debate and we should be talking about how we provide fundamental fairness to the income tax system. Speaker, to this Resolution as drafted, the Resolution indicates that it is mirroring or mirrors what is in the Senate, the Bill that is in the Senate. Unfortunately, the Resolution as this is drafted doesn't even include the correct language as it now stands in the Senate, and the Bill that passed out of the Senate Executive Committee. This Bill, as drafted, indicates that only individuals or businesses, only businesses... that have gross receipts of two million dollars (\$2,000,000) are exempted from the Gross Receipts Tax. We all know in the Senate that that now essentially has been raised to five million dollars (\$5,000,000) therefore exempting about 90 percent of the businesses in Illinois. Now you may be against the Gross Receipts Tax, you may not like it, but you got to admit there is some fundamental fairnesses in our tax system that need to be addressed. Those fundamental unfairnesses can be addressed, we can provide funding for education, we can work together and provide funding for health care, we can work together and provide infrastructure improvements, and a fundamental change in our pension system. Now, by my... Ι have a letter that was written by Michael Carrigan, the president of the AFLCIO, cosigned by Tom Balanoff of SEIU as well as Ed Smith of the Laborers' International, regarding this Resolution. As you know they were here testifying in

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

favor of... 'yes', of the Gross Receipts Tax yesterday. Here's what they indicate. 'The Committee of the Whole hearing yesterday was a good exercise. We feel that asking members to take a position on a nonbinding Resolution is premature. We also are urging all Members of the House of Representative to vote 'no' on House Resolution 402, to continue the debate and modify the proposal as needed. We look forward to working with you to focus on the core values we share and turn them into reality.' I, like them, today am going to vote 'no', and the reason... the reason that I'm voting 'no' are varied. This House Resolution isn't real, there's no spending proposals in it, we're not talking about how we're going to spend it. It's kind of like, if you're going... if you're going in the preseason, why are you going to risk a season or career-ending injury before... when you're only playing practice games? This is a practice game, it's not real. Mr. Speaker, we can work together, with the Governor, with the Senate President, to craft a reasonable budget that's going to take care of health care, affordable access to health care, educational needs, as well as infrastructure improvements and funding our pensions. Therefore, I say, let's stop the charade. Let's call the Bill for a vote and I am going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me start by applauding what Mr. Lang said at the outset. It's time we truly put partisan differences aside, and I really believe that the Gross Receipts Tax is not about partisan differences. Just yesterday, I had the

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

privilege of specifically asking the Governor, would he sit down with a group from organized labor, from major corporations and Legislators and hammer out an agreement, come up with something? He stated he was more than willing to do that. The previous speaker alluded to the fact that there is a fundamental unfairness in our tax structure. disagree with him strongly and here's corporations are employers, they give people jobs, they have write-offs for expansions for growth for creating new jobs, that's what business is all about. And we have to... Governor has taken the position that corporations are less than honorable in many cases, that we are not something to be reckoned with; he numerous times has referred to large corporations and the individuals in charge of them as corporate fat cats. We need to get beyond that, and I think Representative Lang said it very, very well. We need to sit down with groups and come up with something that makes plausible sense. Yesterday... yesterday, Ladies Gentlemen, only three organizations spoke in favor of the GRT... the Governor and his panel, organized labor, and the teachers' unions. Every other group, some 15 to 20, stated it will not work and it will destroy business in this great state. We have an opportunity now, better than any other time, the Governor's willingness to sit down with Members of the Legislature, with corporations, with organized labor, and come up with an answer that will work. And Governor, I ask you to recognize that corporations are not evil. provide jobs for all of us. They only write-off legitimate expenses and they do it so that they can create jobs.

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

Resolution is a good one, it sends a clear message to the Governor and it gives us an opportunity to thereafter, sit down and come up with something that actually will work. The House Republicans have already submitted a plan, the argument is said over and over, where is a plan that is a good start on coming up with the necessary revenue needed to run this great state? Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask you to vote 'no', or correction, to vote 'yes' on the Resolution and support it for what it is. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sacia. Mr. Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To vote 'no' on the House Resolution, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hamos. Mr. John Bradley."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bradley J.: As a matter clarification the AARP has asked me to indicate that they do not have a position on the Bill. As chairman of the Revenue Committee, along with Representative Biggins, Representive Mautino, other Members of the committee, we have spent the last four months trying to act as a truth seeker for the people of the State of Illinois. We have conducted a series of subject matter hearings, that have been bipartisan, that have been fact and policy driven, that have been designed to try to get down to the facts of the matter. Yesterday we continued that enterprise, through the Leadership of the Speaker, and the Leaders of the Republican Caucus. And in a cooperative effort, engaged in nearly 8 hours of testimony over the facts of the Gross Receipts Tax. And what I have heard for the last four months, and what I heard yesterday, was that the proponents of the Gross Receipts Tax basically

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

supported along two lines: number 1 that it would provide much needed funds to programs, to policies that all of us in this chamber believe in, and number 2, that it would establish some sort of fairness for the people of the State of Illinois in terms of making people pay their fair share. Ladies and Gentlemen, in looking at the Gross Receipts Tax, we have to divorce the well intended and imported programs for which it is... it indicates it would provide funds from what the Gross Receipts Tax actually is. We want to put money into education; we desperately need to fund a capital Bill. We desperately need to take care of the pensions and the other obligations towards health care within the State of Illinois. But a Gross Receipts Tax, in and of itself, doesn't have anything to do with what you spend that money on, you could put money into health care, you can put money into education, you can put money into a capital Bill through a number of revenue sources. It doesn't have to be exclusively tied to a Gross Receipts Tax, which brings us to what a Gross Receipts Tax actually is. Now it has been indicated through proponents of this yesterday and through other testimony that the Gross Receipts Tax was a sort of Robin Hood type of proposal that forced big companies that aren't paying taxes currently to give that money to the state to thereby be redistributed to people who need it. But in Aactuality, what I have heard in testimony and what I think is a compelling argument is that the Gross Receipts Tax will actually increase the prices of commodities, that it has a pyramiding effect thereby it's being trickled down upon small businesses, medium-sized businesses

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

ultimately the consumer. A business which is forced with instituting a Gross Receipts Tax has two choices: they can make a business decision as to whether they want to continue to be subjected to the taxing policies of the State of Illinois, or they can pass that on to consumers and that my fellow colleagues, is where the idea of regressiveness' When those commodity prices, through the Gross Receipts, are passed on in the price of commodities, in increased sales tax, in increased taxes to the little person, to people like me and you, from Wall Street to Main Street, that is regressive and it hurts the very people that we're trying to help. So we need to do something, we need to... we need to think about this, and divorce the concept of where we put the money from the concept of where we get the money and that's what this is all about, not where we're going to put the money, it's where we get the money. And so having said that, and with all deference to the Governor, who I have ... commend for coming here and taking questions for 53 minutes and giving testimony for 52 minutes in a remarkable and extraordinary day, in deference to that and out of respect to the Office, I respectfully say that I rise in opposition to the Gross Receipts Tax, not because of making any other point than what is up there on the House Resolution, whether or not the Illinois House Representatives should pass the Gross Receipts Tax, that is the question before us. And my answer at this time is based upon the testimony and the information that's been provided, the answer to that is 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Biggins."

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the I rise in opposition to the Gross Receipts Tax. Thanks, first of all, to Chairman Bradley and also Vice Chairman Mautino for the fine way that they conducted the hearings yesterday, and we think that they were very fruitful, that have already been discussed what was discussed. I'm opposing this tax because of the effect it will have on the State of Illinois and its citizens. first let me just mention something that had been stated The proposal on this tax... Since the Governor introduced the idea of the Gross Receipts Tax he's already raised it twice. We haven't even passed it and he's raised the tax twice. It started out at 1.8 percent; then he raised it to 1.9, now it's at 2. I mean that's quite a feat of raising the tax twice that we haven't even enacted into law yet. That's another reason this tax is very dangerous because it sounds like it's small, but it grows very quickly and it actually starts out quite large. The proposed tax in Illinois will be much higher than any other state that has imposed a Gross Receipts Tax. There are no states around us that have anything like this. Do you know that our major competitors generally border our state? This is a dangerous precedent. They're already camping on our borders; they're already advertising on our airways 'cause they know we're headed toward a very bad business and economic climate if we pass this Gross Receipts Tax. Again, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hamos."

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

Hamos: "Thank you. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I am also voting 'no' today. We've essentially agreed that that's probably the best course of action for today; however, I'm standing today on the side of tax reform. Tax reform and I hope that our 'no' votes today will not be misinterpreted, that all efforts at changing the business tax structure of Illinois are now off the table and we are ready to move on to some kind of personal income tax or sales tax or other kinds of taxes that impact consumers the most. Because I believe that the Governor has made a compelling case, that some reason, some reason that we don't really understand, businesses are not paying a fair share in Illinois. I don't want to say this in a negative way, I just asked questions about why that is. What is the problem with our business tax structure? So I'm asking our Speaker and the Leaders that we depend on for more factual information on possible alternatives to a modified GRT, such as what we heard yesterday, maybe a better approach, a value-added tax or a Gross Margins Tax. We need more factual information on possible alternatives that would maintain a strong business climate but also improve the Illinois business tax structure to create a broad-based, fair, more equitable system. We need more factual information on alternatives to create greater transparency of business receipts or profits. Again, something that was brought to our attention yesterday. We need more factual information on what the limitations are of the Illinois Constitution, as it relates to business taxation. think the fact that the business... Spring Legislative Session

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

is drawing to a close, we hope, is also... that this is also the time that we need to learn more about what we can improve, what we can do to create tax reform in a fair and equitable way. I, personally, and I hope we all believe, that if we're going to have increased spending on the important issues, the priorities of the State of Illinois, that we will look at this as an approach to have fair share, fair pain, fairly distributed pain, if we're going to ultimately ask our constituents and the consumers to pick up some of the pain I really hope that we will do the same on the business side as well. I feel that if we're taking the GRT off the table today or are beginning to look at other approaches, that we will not give up on the opportunity that this is creating to create a more equitable system, that is something that this Governor did bring to our attention and I feel that it disserves even more research and information before we make a final decision. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. The Governor was here yesterday and he made a couple of amazing revelations. One was that he sees as one of the top, if not the top issue in the State of Illinois, in some convoluted logic tried to relate this top issue to why we should raise taxes by seven billion dollars (\$7,000,000,000) but the Governor's own word said that because people are paying the highest utility rates that they have ever paid and that is the most significant of issues in his mind. And I've perused the public records and I don't have inside information as to the Governor's personal schedule, but we are aware of no

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

meeting, no meeting that the Governor has called to deal the most egregious of issues, skyrocketing, devastating, utility rate increases at the residential and business level. He mentioned four dollar (\$4) gas five dollar (\$5) gas; he's done nothing about that. But that was another reason that we should vote for what he, in his own words, called 'a broad-based and fair tax'. Now Broadbased, I thought, meant everybody paid equally, and then he says that nobody will have to pay it except these rare few like Caterpillar and other Fortune 500 companies and I did a little bit of research on Caterpillar and over 90 percent of their product is exported. So again, the Governor's giving these solid, solid reasons why we should support this tax and gives us examples that have nothing to do with his revenue source. A lot of us are opposed to the Gross Receipts Tax based on it's just basic unfairness that just because you have money coming in doesn't mean you're showing a profit and an ability to pay. I mean the only tax more unfair than Gross Receipts is property tax, because you're taxed on what you have and not what your ability to pay is. The other portion of the tax that bothers many of us is last year's state receipts in tax dollars and other fees received was around twenty-eight billion dollars (\$28,000,000,000). The Governor wants us to just assume that the right thing to do this year is to increase spending by... revenue by seven Billion dollars (\$7,000,000,000) 25 percent increase, oh, because... oh yeah, because... because utility Bills are hard to The Governor did not admit, did not admit, that a Gross Receipts Tax, whoever is charged that fee, that tax,

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

he would not admit that that's going to be passed on to every Illinoisan that has anything to do with the economy, whether you're buying a loaf of bread, a gallon of gas, or paying your utility Bills, you're going to pay more because if parts and production and services cost just one company seven billion dollars (7,000,000,000) that cost is going to be spread to every possible customer that they can reach out to, because that's the way they will stay in business. then... I got then I read... that I was a little confused yesterday, no one here is surprised by that, but then I read the Governor's press release today and then I heard the Representative from Madison say that he's going to vote 'no' on the Resolution, and that the Governor, indeed, wants us to vote 'no'. I'm reading from his press release, he said, 'So we are asking all Members to vote 'no' to send a clear message.' All right, we're going to vote 'no'. We're not going to vote 'no' for the reasons that the... whatever the reasons the Gentleman from Madison suggested, we're going to follow the sage advice of Representative Sacia. Vote 'no', just like Sacia and the Governor and the Gentleman from Madison request. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "All right Ladies and Gentlemen, some of you may have not have been in the chamber when we began. As I announced at the beginning, there would be five Democrats and five Republicans. We've now had four of each. The next person to speak will be Mr. Cross... Mr. Stephens?"

Stephens: "An inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Traditionally a hundred (100) 'no' votes, there's a presentation made of the century

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

club award, I would move that this Resolution be exempt from that presentation."

Speaker Madigan: "Yes. Right. We were ahead of you, that was the plan. All right. Mr. Cross will speak and then I will close and we will go to Roll Call. So, Mr. Cross. Mr. Hannig in the Chair."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Been a lot of discussion this afternoon, a lot of talk yesterday. I want to join those that, that have given the Governor credit and applaud him for a rather bold initiative and I think we have a responsibility as a state to talk about health care. have a responsibility to talk about schools; we have a responsibility to talk about infrastructure improvements and a whole list of things. And we have a responsibility to do something about them, but we have an also, have an obligation to make sure that in all of those areas, we do it in a way that we can afford it, and in the most efficient way, but nevertheless, I do want to say thank you to the Governor. He's bold; he's creative; he is not afraid to take a big leap. I'm not so sure, though, that this leap is one that people in this chamber are ready to accept. We had a good debate yesterday on Gross Receipts and some have suggested that that's not enough. We have, at least on this side of the aisle and I suspect on your side of the aisle as well, have held hearings around the State or in your own districts asking your local Chamber of Commerce's, those at Rotary, town hall meetings, whatever service clubs you may belong to, you've talked to mayors, you've talked to business people, you've talked to consumers, you've talked

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

to grocers, the list goes on and on. And everyone of us in this chamber, regardless of where we live, whether we're in the City of Chicago, whether we're in the suburbs, whether were in central or southern Illinois, we're all hearing the same thing. We are hearing the exact same thing, the Gross Receipts Tax is not the way to go. It won't be fair to consumers, it won't be fair to the mother that's buying her kid's new school clothes, it won't be fair to the farmer that has cattle or hogs, grows corn or soybeans, won't be fair to the grain operator, the grain elevator operator... won't be fair to the small grocer, independent grocer, those that we have throughout Illinois. It won't be fair to the automaker, won't be fair to the tractor maker, and the list goes on and on. We can have all of the hearings that we want to have on Gross Receipts, we can call it different things. We can modify it, we can look at it in different ways. We can raise the rate, we can lower the rate, we can do it in so many different ways, but at the end of the day, from a policy standpoint, it just doesn't work. It's not acceptable. It's not something the people of the State of Illinois are ready to embrace, certainly not Members in this I don't know what's going to happen over in the Senate. Frankly, I'm not too worried about it, but I think the people in this chamber are ready to make a decision and ready to take a vote, ready to send their message that the Gross Receipts Tax is not fair, it's not right. And There's been a lot of talk and a lot of discussion that we can't do this other tax, we can't go down this road because it's not fair to Illinois's residents, it's not fair to consumers.

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

Gross Receipts Tax is as onerous a tax on the consumers of the State of Illinois is as any tax or revenue raising idea that you could ever find. There's a reason there are only a few states in this country that have a Gross Receipts Tax. There's a reason that three states have repealed their Gross Receipts Tax. It doesn't work, it's not fair and it's time, once and for all, to put the Gross Receipts Tax to bed and this is the way we do it, by voting 'no' on this Resolution. Now, I think that the question then becomes, what do we do next? And a lot is going to happen over the next few weeks and a lot... in the next... maybe in the next month or two I don't know. We want to help get out here just like... want to get out of here just like everybody else. I think it's a mistake, though, for this chamber, and the chamber across the aisle... the hall, to accept the premise that we need to raise seven and half or eight-billion а dollars (\$7,5000,000,000- \$8,000,000,000. That means we grow our budget by 30 percent, nobody raises their budget or their spending by 30 percent. Business doesn't do it, families don't do it and there's no reason this government in the State of Illinois should be in the business of raising their budget by 30 percent. We have not done a very good job over the last few years of managing our money and quite frankly, even before this administration we didn't do the best job of managing our money and what I'm saying is Republicans and Democrats are both at fault in overspending and not making the best decisions when it comes to money. Can you imagine what happens with this Body if all a sudden we have eight billion dollars (\$8,000,000,000) of new money to spend?

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

Couldn't control ourselves. It's not the right road to go down and in all of the debate and all of the discussion the last few weeks and the last few months, all we focused on is bringing in new money to the state to spend on problems No one is talking about fixing those we've created. problems that absorb so much of our money. We want to raise money for new programs and not focus on our existing Several people have mentioned it today, obligations. there's no question we need to do an infrastructure plan. We haven't looked at roads, we haven't looked at schools, we haven't looked at mass transit, we haven't looked at higher education in 8 years and we have that obligation. an obligation to do it right, correctly and with the revenue stream and we're ready and willing to look at that and we have a Bill actually that... or a proposal to raise money for a capital Bill, but we've had no significant substantive discussion on those other areas that are in dire need of attention. Our Medicaid system and we've talked about this but we've done nothing about it, is growing at a rate of almost 10 percent a year, 10 percent a year. It's happening around the country. Other states are trying to do it, but we've done nothing. Everybody in this chamber, I believe, agrees that we have a responsibility to provide health insurance coverage to those that need it, there's no question about that, we do just as much as you do on your side of the aisle. As I mentioned the word obligation, we need to do it in an efficient manner, in a better way that we can. If you look at one of the reports from either out of the Commercial Club or the Civic Federation, around the

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

country, around the country, those on Medicaid, 60 percent of them are on some type of managed care plan, in our state it's less than 10 percent. We can't go on with Medicaid growing at the rate of 10 percent a year, it'll cripple us. In 20 years Medicaid will take over 60 percent of our budget. Try funding more money for schools, for roads, for prisons, for seniors, for DD, when 60 percent of your budget is taken up by one item. Pensions, again, when you talk about mismanagement and wrong decisions, it's our fault. We need to look at pensions, but we're the ones that we need to look at, we're the ones that haven't made pension payments, we're the ones that when the groups come to us and say increase our benefits, we vote 'yes'. They're the teachers, state employees, university employees, they've made their contributions, I don't know that we need to look at them to point blame. It's us, but we... yet we've done nothing about it in this debate over the last few weeks and the last few months. All we want to do is talk about new money and to spend it recklessly and to spend it in a way that's not appropriate. And for us to ignore what's going on in the world of health care coverage for state employees, and retired employees it includes us and to ignore that is also a mistake, a billion eight (1,800,000,000) we spend on that every year. And as we know from also those reports, we have obligations nearing fifty (50) well, somewhere between forty fifty billion dollars (\$40,000,000,000 \$50,000,000,000). So, I would urge caution for all of us and it's the instinct of this General Assembly to want to spend. We want to please our constituents and we think we

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

do that by spending money and bringing stuff home, but we also have to be strong, we have to be disciplined and we need to think twice about whether or not it's right to continue to raise money and pour it into holes that we're not doing anything to fill or close, that is irresponsible. And that day is going to soon come where all we're going to be doing is filling those holes. So Mr. Speaker, today is a good step. I don't think from a policy standpoint the Gross Receipts Tax is a good way to go, and I think we will probably see, when this is all said and done, a vote that sends a clear message, that in this House at least, the Gross Receipts Tax is dead. But I also again stress, that accept the premise that raising eight (\$8,000,000,000) dollars in a different way is also not necessarily, or not the appropriate thing to do. appreciate the ability to speak. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "So, Representative Black, we've concluded from your side of the aisle. For what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Prior to Speaker Madigan's close, let me ask a question and there's little or nothing I could say that will add to the eloquence of Members on both sides of the aisle about the issue. But the inquiry, I think, needs to be made before we vote and that is because of potential confusion. If the Chair would enlighten me, a 'no' vote would indicate your opposition to the Gross Receipts Tax, a 'yes' vote would indicate your support for some form of a Gross Receipts Tax. Is that an accurate perception?"

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, Representative Black, I would suggest that's an accurate way to read the Resolution."

Black: "I appreciate that and Mr. Speaker, if I may very briefly. Let's not be confused by political tricks and the oldest trick in a magician's handbook is to get you to watch one hand while their other hand completes the sleight of hand. And the e-mail from Chicago today, that we should all vote 'no' because it's meaningless anyway and that way those of you who support the GRT, of course, could hide and come forth at a later date. If you support the Gross Revenue Tax vote 'yes', if you don't vote 'no'. But I don't want to hear it from people 2 or 3 weeks from now and unnamed sources who say 'there's really, thirty-five (35), fortyfive (45), fifty-five (55) Members who support the Gross Revenue Tax' but they didn't want to vote against the Speaker and they didn't want to vote against Leader Cross, so our strategy is that they all vote 'no' and in a date to be determined, they will rise and say I was really... 'I'm really for this. I was for this the whole time. Ya know, I voted... I voted for this, If you have the courage of your convictions and you believe a Gross Revenue Tax is fair, vote 'yes'; if you, like me, believe it has an undue impact on our Illinois business community and the residents of the State of Illinois and farmers, who are an integral part of my district, then vote 'no' and mean no. No means no. Don't hide behind it, don't let somebody trick you into a vote that you really don't want to make. Vote your conscience, vote 'yes' or 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "Speaker Madigan to close."

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the First let me commend the Governor, as I did yesterday, for showing the courage of his convictions, for being prepared to take a bold initiative and for being prepared to recognize the role and the responsibility of Government to as its people, he sees that Unfortunately, a proposal responsibility. imposition of a Gross Receipts Tax in Illinois would constitute a fundamental shift in the philosophy of taxation Today, we impose an income tax in Illinois; in this state. we impose that tax on profit and on income. It is not imposed upon receipts and we all know that when people start a company, fresh start, generally, they expect to lose money in the early years of operation and so for people like that, during those early years, as they lose money, show losses, they'd be paying this tax as the rate prescribed in the statute. We all know that Illinois today is not exactly a Mecca for those that wish to invest money. We've heard that for years, years and years. Investments go to other parts of the country and so given that problem, why the imposition of this tax would act as another disincentive for meaningful investment in our state. The Governor has spent a lot of time talking about tax fairness, tax fairness corporations, the closing of corporate loopholes; I agree with the Governor, that we ought to close corporate loopholes and many of us in this chamber have supported the Governor in that effort. He's been working along those lines for over 4 years and on many occasions many of us, including me, have voted to close corporate loopholes. On

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

May 26, 2004, there was a Bill offered by the Governor, House Bill 848, that would have closed five (5) or six (6) corporate tax loopholes. The Bill didn't do well, it only got 23 'yes' votes, but I was one of the 23. So my record is very clear that I am prepared to support him when he wants to talk in terms of closing corporate loopholes. Others have spoken to this, it has to be acknowledged, the Gross Receipts Tax is a regressive tax. There is a passthrough to the ultimate consumer, many times those people are the least able in our society to take on additional costs. I think we have to recognize that the announcement of this proposal by the Governor has not exactly been received with a great deal of support, so as an example, even his own Lieutenant Governor has stated opposition to the tax. The mayor of Chicago stated opposition to the tax, the Comptroller and the Treasurer of the state are also opposed. For all these reasons, I plan to vote 'no' today and want to emphasize that I plan to continue to work with the Governor and with every Member of the General Assembly to craft a budget for the State of Illinois which provides the proper level of service and support for all Illinoisans, but in particular, those within our society that need the help of government, sometimes just to live from day-to-day, other times to have an opportunity, or to take advantage of an opportunity to advance themselves and their family within our society. So, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you for your attention and let's proceed to Roll Call."

51st Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall the Resolution be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all who voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Jefferson, Dugan, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 0 voting 'yes', 107 voting 'no', and 7 voting 'present'. And the Resolution fails. We're going to move to the Order of Second Reading. We've got a number of Legislators on both sides of the aisle that have asked to have Bills considered on Second Reading, so why don't we start down the alphabet. Now Representative Beaubien, I understand, is excused. He has House Bill 1622 on this list. Does someone wish to sponsor that with Representative Beaubien? Do you know the status? Okay. So, we'll just take it out of the record. Representative Coulson, you have House Bill 2033. Do you wish us to read that? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2033, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. And Representative Coulson, you have House Bill 3765. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3765, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Cultra, you have House Bill 1736. Out of the record. Representative Duncan,

51st Legislative Day

- you have House Bill 920. You wish us to read that? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 920, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. All notes have been filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Collins, you have House Bill 791. You wish us to read that? Representative Collins? Representative Collins, do you wish us to read that Bill? Out of the record. Representative Golar, you have House Bill 1398. You wish us to read that Bill? Do you wish us to read that Bill, Representative? Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Kosel, you have House Bill 2007. You wish us to read that? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2007, a Bill for an Act concerning Education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Smith, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Smith, this is your Amendment."

 Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is... the underlying Bill is an initiative of the State Board of Education and this Amendment would simply... it does gut and replace the Bill but it... the main changes are the removal of the limit that's in the program currently on a 260-person limit in the program. Only Chicago had this. There's also a 30-day period for the state board of approval and this just removes the time limit as well as a 5-year work requirement. Again, that only

51st Legislative Day

- applied to the City of Chicago. Those are the only changes in the Amendment."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Scully, for what reason do you rise?"
- Scully: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Earlier today a parliamentary question was raised as regard... regarding whether or not a Resolution is eligible for membership in the century club. The ruling by our parliamentarian is that Resolutions and Floor Amendments are not eligible for membership in the century club. It must be a record vote that kills a piece of pending legislation. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative McCarthy, you have House Bill 2632. Do you wish us to read this? Out of the record. Representative Boland, you have House Bill 2013. Representative Boland? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2013, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Now, Representative Chapa LaVa's excused but she has House Bill 3475. Representative Holbrook, would you wanna handle this? I don't know if she wants to move it to Third or not. Do you know, don't know? All right. We'll just take it out of the record until the Lady returns. Representative... Representative Lindner, you

51st Legislative Day

- have House Bill 3010. Do you wish us to read that? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3010, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lindner, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lindner."
- Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 merely strikes the word 'unreasonable' from the statute when there is a denial of... just to a denial of visitation rather than unreasonable denial."
- Speaker Hannig: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Mathias, you have House Bill 1613. Okay. We'll take that out of the record. Representative Moffitt, you have House Bill... Okay. Take that out of the record. Representative Mulligan on 1534. House Bill... Out of the record. Representative Reboletti on House Bill 3662. Out of the record. Representative Winters on 3665. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3665, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Lindner, you have House Bill 298. Shall we read that Bill? House Bill 298. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

51st Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 298, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

 No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Meyer on House Bill 197. You wish us to read that Bill, 197? Should we read the Bill? Yes, no? Okay. Out of the record. Let's see. Representative Howard has House Bill 1831. Out of the record. Representative Lyons you have House Bill 1526. Representative Lions 1526. Out of... No? Okay. Out of the record. Representative Mendoza, you have House Bill 2425. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2425, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Mendoza, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mendoza on the Amendment, on the Amendment."
- Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment becomes the Bill. It requires the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity to establish a program that would provide annual grants to women entrepreneurs. The grant award would be five thousand dollars (\$5,000) in a total of ten (10) grants. The women would be nominated by the local Chambers of Commerce and DCEO would be responsible for determining who becomes the grantee. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

51st Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment? Then all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Miller, you have House Bill 1438. Representative Miller. Okay. Out of the record. Representative Smith, you have House Bill 2011. Representative Smith. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Read the Bill? Read the Bill? Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2011, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third reading. Representative Neikritz, you have House Bill 1619. Representative Nekritz. Representative Neikritz, 1619. Do you wish us to read the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1619, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third reading. Representative Coulson, we have another Bill with your name on it. House Bill 693, would you like us to read that? No. Not today. Okay. Representative Eddy, you have House Bill 1652. Would you like us to read that? How about House Bill 1925. Okay. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1925."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1925, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

51st Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Flider on House Bill 1119. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1119, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation, has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3 was adopted to the Bill. Floor Amendments 4 and 5 have both been approved for consideration, offered by Representative Flider."
- Speaker Hannig: "So Representative, you have Amendments 4 and 5.

 What would you like to do with Amendment 4?"
- Flider: "I'd like to attach both 4 and 5 to the Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, why don't you... why don't you address Amendment #4."
- Flider: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment #4 deletes a requirement in current law in the legislation that requires alternative retail electric suppliers to demonstrate that its employees have requisite knowledge, skills and competence to install, operate, and maintain generation facilities. House Amendment #5 reinstates the word 'generation' that should have been included in Amendment #4."
- Speaker Hannig: "Let's just start with Amendment #4. Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. And now, Representative Flider on Amendment #5."
- Flider: "Okay. And again this reinstates the word 'generation' in the language... which as the Bill... so the word 'generation' should have been included in Amendment #4."

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

Speaker Hannig: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 227."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 227, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have both been approved for consideration, offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie on Amendment #2."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This Amendment was approved in the Judiciary Committee. The effort in the Bill this becomes the Bill. The effort in the Bill is to provide uniform statewide standards for electronic recording of property tax deeds. In its almost final form this then would propose a commission in the Secretary of State's Office composed of a number of county recorders and people representing title associations, law and other relevant... or organizations, people familiar with property transfers and they would then propose rules which could be adopted by the Secretary of State so that we would have uniformity in this area. I know of no opposition to the Amendment and I appreciate your support."

Speaker Hannig: "We're going to adopt both Amendments, Representative, 2 and 3, is that correct?"

Currie: "Can I do it on one Roll Call? I wanted... The Third

Amendment is a technical Amendment that was discussed in

Committee."

51st Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "Why don't we just adopt Amendment #2? All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Now Representative Currie on Amendment #3. It is a technical Amendment. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Franks, you have House Bill 1548. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1548, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Hernandez on House Bill 1450. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1450, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Hamos on House Bill 1258. Okay. Out of the record. Representative Jefferson on 1143. Okay. Out of the record. Representative Molaro on House Bill 1703. Out of the record. Representative Mathias, you have a couple Bills, 1613, 1614. Okay. Representative Crespo, you have House Bill 3477. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3477, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law, has been read a second time, previously.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2,

51st Legislative Day

- offered by Representative Crespo, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Crespo."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. House Amendment #2 reflects the recommendation of the Attorney General's office and creates the new offense of unlawful use of encryption, making it a Class A misdemeanor to use encryption to commit, conceal, or aid in a commission of any criminal offense."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions Filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third reading. Representative Dugan, you have House Bill 2043. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2043, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. And Representative Dugan, you also have House Bill 3626. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3626, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2853."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2853, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2, offered by

51st Legislative Day

- Representative Sullivan, have both been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, do you wish to adopt both Amendments? So we'll start with Amendment #1 then."
- Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. What it does is it sets up a Internet Gang Crimes Unit in three jurisdictions throughout the state: one in Lake County, Cook County Sheriff's Office and one down in Vermilion County."
- Speaker Hannig: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Sullivan, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Sullivan."
- Sullivan: "Thank you. Floor Amendment #2 is just... changes some... clarifies some language in regard to appropriations it's a technical Amendment."
- Speaker Hannig: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Howard, you have House Bill 1831. Did you wish to move that to Third, House Bill 1831? House Bill 1831, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1831, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

#1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading."

- Speaker Madigan: "Speaker Madigan in the Chair. Mr. Clerk, read the Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Joint Resolution 59, offered by Representative Currie. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 95th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring hearin on that, when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, May 10, 2007, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, May 15, 2007 at 12:00 o'clock noon."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk has read the Adjournment Resolution.

 Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 401, offered by Representative Crespo. House Resolution 403, offered by Representative Black. House Resolution 404, offered by Representative Sacia."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk has read the Agreed Resolutions.

 Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I can have your attention. This afternoon I shall send a letter to the Clerk extending the deadline for House consideration of House Bills until Friday, May 18. Again, this concerns

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

House Bills. So today I will send a letter to the Clerk extending the deadline for House consideration of House Bills until Friday, May 18, and for Democrats, I wish to announce that Tuesday morning at 10:00 a.m. we will have a caucus concerning a possible tax Bill. Let me say that again. Next Tuesday, 10:00 a.m., Democratic Caucus concerning a possible tax Bill. There being nothing further, Representative Currie moves that the House stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 15 at 12 noon. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does stand adjourned until Tuesday, May 15 at 12 noon, providing perfunctory time for the Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session shall come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson for the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures were taken, and/or Joint Action Motions were referred, Action taken on May 10, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'approved for floor consideration', and referred to the Order of Second Reading is House Bill 2564 and House Bill 2664; 'approved for consideration' and referred to the Order of Second Reading is also House Bill 3106. Introduction and reading of Senate Bills-First Reading. Senate Bill 115, offered by Representative Riley, a Bill for an concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 280, offered by Representative Coulson, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 829, offered by Representative Mendoza, a Bill for an Act concerning local government and Senate Bill 1167, offered by Representative Yarbrough, a

51st Legislative Day

5/10/2007

Bill for an Act concerning property. First Reading of these Senate Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."