206th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "The hour of 11:30 having arrived, the House will be in order. The Members will please be in their seats. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and pagers, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Wayne Padget, the assistant doorkeeper."
- Wayne Padget: "Let us pray. Dear Lord, we come before You today in sound body and mind, praying that on this day, You grant us wisdom and guidance. During these hard times of negotiations, we pray that everyone can come together on one common ground and resolve the issues for the people of Illinois. We pray for the men and women in the Armed Services, both here and abroad, provide them with Your protection and give them the strength to make it through these tough times. Let us also pray for the men, women, and their families who have made the ultimate sacrifice to defend our country. These things we ask in Your Son's name. Amen."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Dunkin, will you lead us in the Pledge."
- Dunkin 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 Hannig: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."

206th Legislative Day

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Hernandez and McGuire are both excused today."
- Speaker Hannig: "And Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Bassi is excused today."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There are 115 Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. The Clerk will read the Committee Reports."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative John Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 10, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2482."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, do we have any Agreed Resolutions?"

 Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 890, offered by Representative Washington. House Resolution 891, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Resolution 893, offered by Representative Feigenholtz. House Resolution 894, offered by Speaker Madigan. And House Resolution 895, offered by Representative Monique Davis."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. On page 3 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, Representative Dunkin, you have House Bill 2482. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill?"

206th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2482, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill has been read a second time, previously.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Dunkin, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Dunkin on the Amendment"
- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the chamber. I ask that we adopt 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 Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2482, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Dunkin,"
- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 House Bill 2582 (sic-2482) simply extends the film tax

 credit for another year, which expired this... last year,

 December 31. I ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 2482. And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."
- Black: "Thank you. Representative, the tax credit that we give to the film industry what... how many... can you give me an

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

approximate figure of how much money we didn't collect because of this tax credit?"

Dunkin: "Absolutely. We... since 19... since 2005 we didn't collect about twenty seven million dollars (\$27,000,000)."

Black: "All right. So, one could say that we subsidized the film industry to the tune of about twenty-seven million (27,000,000) since '04?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Black: "Okay. Would this be one of the corporate tax loopholes that the Governor wants to close? You know, these film companies are huge, huge corporations. I just got back from the Rose Bowl. I'm telling you, these are big corporations. I saw people in expensive cars, expensive suits. These film people are making money. So, is this... is this a corporate loophole that the Governor thinks we should close?"

Dunkin: "I'm not exactly sure. I'll ask him when I see him, Representative."

Black: "Have you seen him lately?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Black: "I haven't seen him. Is he in Springfield, do you know?"

Dunkin: "I saw him in the newspaper the other day."

Black: "Oh. I think... wasn't Elvis's birthday Tuesday?

Dunkin: "I'm not sure, maybe... I'm not sure"

Black: "Well, I think Elvis... Elvis would have been 73 on Tuesday. So, I just assumed the Governor was in Memphis, but I'm sure he'll be back. Well, that's very interesting.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Representative for his indulgence

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

and maybe the Governor's staff could get back to us before we act on this Bill. I'm concerned about this might be one of the corporate loopholes that the Governor is talking about, because... I'm telling you, the film industry is a huge, I mean really big corporate Goliath. They're big, this a lot of money."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representatives Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise in support of House Bill 2482. The film industry in Illinois lagging and the film tax credit Representative Dunkin passed previously and is now trying to extend has helped bring this business to Illinois. best example about why we needed to do this was raised some years ago when the movie entitled Chicago was filmed in Toronto, Canada. There are many film companies that would like to come to Illinois, that would like to spend their money here, would like to create jobs here, but have found it necessary to go elsewhere to other states and other locations that have provided incentives for these film companies. It's no longer to be considered a corporate loophole but a rather a business incentive to entice these folks here, otherwise they simply won't come to our state. So, Representative Dunkin is right on the right track here. This is a Bill we should pass. It will create jobs. will improve this industry in our state and that can only be good for economic development. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Reis: "Representative, you come over and worked your Bill very good yesterday as you have in the past and I'll even give you credit as a Farm Bureau Adopt-a-Legislator. You've been down in my neck of the woods several times and I have nine (9) counties, three thousand (3,000) square miles and along with hunting and gun issues that our Farm Bureau members talked to you about, they talk about the lack of jobs. And other than your Bill, I've been on record both in the introduction of my own legislation and my votes, which aren't very many, as supporting tax credits. got to tell you, if this is so good for the film industry why can't we get our Bills out of the Rules Committee? Why can't we have a hearing on our tax credit Bills, exemption There must be a... four dozen (48) tax exemption Bills? Bills that languish in Rules to help create manufacturing jobs. I have an ethanol tax credit to help expand the Enterprise Zone for ethanol and bio-diesel plants that a lot of times have to be built out in the country in order to attach to Enterprise Zones. We have all those things for small businesses. Why can't we get a fair hearing and a vote on this House Floor for our tax exemptions? And that's why many of us downstaters will not support this. We support it conceptually, but we're not going to vote for the second day in a row for something that only benefits the City of Chicago when we can't get our tax exemption Bills heard on this floor. Do you have any comment to that, why this one is so good that we have

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

to vote on it every year, and it passes, but we can't get ours?"

Dunkin: "Representative, this year for some reason, I'm not on the Rules Committee, so I can't answer that question of why your Bill is not coming out of Rules. But I can tell you that in Ottawa, in Starved Rock, Highland Park, Alton, Illinois, in other places here in our great state there's production that has gone on, that's taken place and that's proposed or projected to take place there. This is not a...

Reis: "Representative, I agree with you. I know it works."

Dunkin: "This is not a Chicago Bill, Representative. This is a State of Illinois jobs Bill."

Reis: "It is perceived as a Chicago Bill because it's the only one that ever gets..."

Dunkin: "No, that is not true."

Representatives Reis: "...it's the only one that gets heard every year. It's the only one that passes and I know it works. We know tax credits work. Why can't we get the rest of ours heard? And I don't know how many of you are going to vote for this today, it's probably going to pass and you're going to go home and tell everybody you're trying to help bring manufacturing jobs into this state, when in fact, it's just about the movie industry. They give campaign contributions to the Governor. I understand it's important, but can we all work together to try and make this fair for all businesses, manufacturing, biofuels, tax incentives, to bring jobs into Illinois so that we can increase our tax rolls and... we just... we want some help with this. Well, I'm not going to support this today from the

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

standpoint that we can't get our Bills heard and I think that this only benefits the city. So, thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens"

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield? Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he will yield."

Stephens: "Representative, is the Governor in change... charge... in favor of this legislation, Governor Blagojevich?"

Dunkin: "Again, I haven't spoken with him personally. I know that the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity is very supportive."

Stephens: "They have their support, so... It's fair to say that the administration, led by Rod Blagojevich, supports this legislation."

Dunkin: "No, I think..."

Stephens: "He has signed similar legislation in the past."

Dunkin: "Yes, he signed this... he has... as he signed major economic incentives such as..."

Stephens: "...and he's also, after signing that legislation, gone out to California to zip code 90210 had fund-raisers. And I would like to know if you're aware under the current... the current investigation into the Governor's administration, various pay-for-play charges that are pending? Is this, these donors that are going to benefit financially from his signing this legislation, are they being investigated? Is there a link between this legislation and Rod Blagojevich's pay-to-play scheme?

Dunkin: "Representative, I can't respond to something that I have no idea whatsoever, on a subject that's... I'm concerned

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

about pass... putting Illinoisans... keeping Illinoisans working, having our state benefit, places such as Jasper County, Effingham, Vandalia benefit..."

"Well, Representative... To the Bill. To the Bill. Stephens: It makes more sense to look at the broad scope of Illinois. The only movie we're going to be filming in downstate Illinois is going to be a remake of The Grapes of Wrath, as people drag their... their last belongings across the prairie one last time to maybe head west where the only jobs are going to be left is going to be in California where the Governor goes to do his fundraising. So I think that what we ought to do is have sound fiscal policy first so that people look to the State of Illinois and know that we're not going to go belly up. Maybe catch up on our Medicaid payments so that the hospitals and the nursing homes and the small medical providers downstate are able to survive. And you know, possibly even put us on a sound footing in bigger issues such as our pension payments. Representative, you can talk all you want about bringing jobs to Illinois. There will only be one job in downstate Illinois or one job that stays in Illinois because of these huge tax breaks that you're giving to the Governor's friends in 90210 area code."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Grundy, Representative Gordon."

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

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

main question is put. Representative Dunkin, you're recognized to close."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of this chamber. This House Bill is a Bill that has proven its success over the last four (4), five (5) years. We have experienced a tremendous growth here in the State of Illinois. we're projected in just in '07, and we haven't gotten all numbers, to go from ninety-six million (\$96,000,000) in film production in the great State of Illinois to one hundred and sixty-seven million dollars (\$167,000,000). That is since 2005, three hundred and fifty-five million dollars (\$355,000,000) that's been And then there's a multiplier of about expended here. three (3) times that gets us close to a billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) in direct spending here in our State of Illinois. That's three hundred and fifty-five million dollars (\$355,000,000) projected, when we conclude next year's numbers, to have been spent in Illinois since this chamber has took the lead in sponsoring this jobs Bill. Over five thousand (5,000) Illinoisans received full-time employment. They patronize stores. They buy paint, they buy wood, union jobs, carpenters, electricians, teamsters, putting Illinoisans to work. Batman alone has projected to spend over forty-eight million dollars (\$48,000,000). This is what we should be doing down in the great State of Illinois. I encourage all of my colleagues to help us extend this tax credit for one more year. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2482 pass?

All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is

206th Legislative Day

- open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Coulson and Gordon, do you wish to be recorded? Last call. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 108 voting 'yes' and 7 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mautino, on page 7 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 4163. Mr. Clerk, would you read that Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4163, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4163 is a supplemental appropriation Bill for the court reporters and this would put in place the funding that was structured within the union contract. I know of no opposition. It has a cost of 2.2 million dollars (\$2,200,000) and this would let us meet our contractual obligations. Be happy to answer and questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 4163. And on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Meyer."
- Meyer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, for some reason my computer isn't showing an analysis on it, perhaps it's behind. This is the second time it's happened. What's going on? Okay, here we got it. It came by. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then the question, is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Rita and Pritchard, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mendoza, you have House Bill 4170. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4170, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Lady from Cook, Representative Mendoza"

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4170 is an appropriation Bill that would appropriate 12.5 million dollars (\$12,500,000) to the CeaseFire programs. CeaseFire is a program that is in twenty-five (25) communities throughout the State of Illinois, seventeen (17) of those within the City of Chicago, has seen drastic reductions in shootings as a result of their efforts in intervening and working within the community to prevent gun violence. This is a program that is absolutely critical to the needs of the state, to the safety of the constituents that we serve; unfortunately, what fell victim to the Governor's Veto pen back in May. I would argue that this not a program that we can afford to cut, because by doing so we are adding a significant number of gunshot victims and dead victims to the toll that we should not be proud of increasing that number. I would ask that you please stand with me today in sending a message that we cannot afford to gamble with

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

people's lives anymore. We talk about issues of gaming, we talk about important issues that could potentially bring funds to this state. We can talk about that but I think we cannot afford to gamble on the lives of the people that we represent. Eliminating these funds does exactly that. And not only do you need to restore them, but we need to improve upon them. Just so you know the last year when CeaseFire was in full operation, this state had seen a reduction of one hundred and fifty-nine (159) shootings in those seventeen (17) communities in Chicago from the previous year... compared to the previous year. Governor cut those funds, within the last six (6) months we have seen an increase in those same communities of over a hundred and four (104) shootings. That is absolutely unacceptable. There was a woman in my district who was within a CeaseFire community that no longer has CeaseFire, who you all know about, was shot dead when she was trick or treating with her children on Halloween, eight (8) months pregnant. That's ridiculous. The Logan Square community, who had seen a drastic reduction in their shootings when they had CeaseFire. They no longer have CeaseFire and they open up the new year with a triple homicide and just three (3) days ago, a fifteen-year-old boy was gunned down and This is not the direction that this state killed as well. needs to go in. I think that the Governor made a drastic and tragic mistake when he cut those funds and today I ask you to stand with me and vote 'aye' on appropriating these twelve and a half million dollars (\$12,000,000), which are critically important. Thank you."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves for the passage of House Bill 4170. And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermillion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she will yield."

Black: "Representative, has the Governor given you any indication that he has changed his mind about this Bill and the amount of money that it would take?"

Mendoza: "Is that a trick question or are you being serious?"

Black: "No, no, I'm serious. This is a twelve million dollars (\$12,000,000) approp."

Mendoza: "No, the Governor has not given me many indication whatsoever, other than he unrolled a new plan that came from the Governor's Office to deal with the issue of violence prevention, a plan that has not been tested, a plan that will also appropriate millions of dollars. Yet, does not by any means substitute or create the type of effectiveness that the CeaseFire program creates. I would anticipate Senator... I mean, Representative, that that's a result of all the heat that has been... he's had to be taking for all the shootings that has increased so drastically since he made this Veto. I have just as hard a time hearing anything from the Governor, unless if I'm watching TV or reading the papers as you do, Sir."

Black: "So in other words, it's entirely possible the Governor will veto this Bill once again, correct?"

Mendoza: "I... I guess it's entirely possible..."

Black: "Okay."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Mendoza: "...but I would like to see him, actually, I challenge him to go ahead and explain how he could possibly veto an initiative that pretty much, I think, will be unopposed from this chamber, I would hope. And that the media understands it's critically important as well, because they've been following the statistics of what these results are from this program. It is difficult to argue against a program that has proven results. Not... it's not often that we can actually tally from a year-to-year perspective the successfulness of a program. This is one of those exceptions to the rule. CeaseFire program gives immediate results that not only on a human and social perspective, Representative, we can say is a good thing to do, but fiscally saves the state tens if not hundreds potentially of millions of dollars in health care costs. When we're talking about the fact that it costs over three hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000) to even treat a gunshot victim that makes it to the emergency room. So, if you multiply that by over a hundred (100) cases, I mean we're talking about many, many millions of dollars. So it's fiscally responsible as well as, you know, humanely, the right thing to do, and obviously, creates great social benefits to society."

Black: "Representative, I know you feel very passionately about this, but again, let me try to get to the root of the issue here. This Bill doubles the appropriation that the Governor has already vetoed. Now, why would you do that with only six (6) months left in the fiscal year?"

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Mendoza: "Well, the money is absolutely critical. The reason we need to do that is because these communities that I just mentioned have seen massive spikes in shootings and murders since this money was vetoed. Not only do we need to reinstate the money that he cut, but now we have to double up the efforts in those same communities because things have gotten completely out of control. The money is necessary. We need to repair the damage that the Governor has done and potentially, use funds to expand the program into areas that are critically needed right now that do not have this type of program benefiting them. It's critical. These are not funds that are being spent unwisely."

Black: "Just one further question, Representative. Do you have any indication from a Senate Sponsor that the Senate will actually take this Bill up?"

Mendoza: "I spoke with... and Representative Graham actually spoke with her Senate Sponsor, Senator Harmon, and I believe that Senator Claiborne, as well, both of them have agreed to take the legislation. I'm not sure which one of the two (2) is actually going to carry it, but both of them are fine Sponsors who have given a commitment to work this issue very, very hard in the Senate and hopefully get it to the Governor's desk."

Black: "All right. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Black: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't think anyone would stand on the floor and tell you that Operation CeaseFire is not a program worthy of our support, it is. And the Representative feels very passionately about the

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

program; it has had a good track record. And I would ask my friends in the media to pay attention to what's going on The Bill before this, we appropriated two million dollars (\$2,000,000) for the court reporters. I voted for that because I think with out it the court systems can fall even further behind. But now my concern is, Ladies and Gentlemen, it evidently appears that we're going to do appropriations Bills piecemeal. There's hundreds $\circ f$ millions of dollars of vetoed appropriation Bills. are we going to do? Are we going to sit here for the next two or three hours and then when we come back, whenever that might be, take up individual appropriation Bills? would think that the Appropriations Committees should meet and determine a priority on what kind of appropriation Bills we are going to once again try to override the Governor's Veto. This is again a Bill that I'm not opposed to in principle, but I think at some point we have to stand up here and say, now wait a minute. The Governor vetoed this appropriation. I don't think he has any intention of signing this should it get to his desk. Now, if we're going to sit here and do some Legislators' appropriations Bills one by one by one, I've never seen that done before, up on Vetoes. I have an appropriations Bill that I doubt will ever get out of the Rules Committee. Many of you, I hope, are familiar with Lincoln's Challenge Academy. A tremendous second chance program for high school dropouts that's been underway now for more than ten (10) years. by the Illinois National Guard, located in Rantoul, Illinois. Their boiler is being held together with duct

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

tape and glue. They need a quarter of a million dollars, two hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000) for a new boiler. Without that appropriation, if that boiler fails the program will have to shut down and most of those people are the young people involved in that program are high school dropouts from the City of Chicago. It's a great program, but I don't think my request for a supplemental appropriation will ever be reported out of Rules and yet we can do this one that's been vetoed by the Governor, will more than likely be vetoed again and we're now doing appropriation Bills on an individual basis, piecemeal. I've never seen this done before. So we'll take a half an hour debating this Bill, and there's no question in my mind that it'll pass, but there's also no question in my mind that the Governor, should it get to his desk, will not sign He will veto it again. And I doubt that the Senate from what happened in the Veto Session, will allow this Bill to be voted on. The Senate decided they were going to uphold most if not all of the Governor's Vetoes. intend to vote 'present' on this Bill. I'm certainly not opposed to Operation CeaseFire, but I am opposed to doing appropriation Bills doubling the appropriation in this account over Governor's Veto when we could and should have done that in the Veto Session and I think the Senate sent a clear message they weren't interested in overriding most of the Governor's Vetoes. So I think this is an exercise in futility and it's an exercise that leads us down the path of doing appropriations Bills piecemeal, one by one by one. That's not good public policy. This is a good program.

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

It's a great Sponsor, but this isn't the way to do it and I intend to vote 'present'."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Flider."

Flider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. The previous speaker makes some valid points, with regard to... you know, should we be looking at legislation appropriation measures on a case-by-case basis, piecemeal basis. And indeed, given what the Governor had done, given his Veto and given the fact that he took the wind out of the sails of a program that statewide was saving lives and making a difference this may be an exercise in futility, but I don't think that's a good reason for us to not go forward with this legislation. In fact, the reason we need to go forward with this legislation is that we know that this program did in fact save lives. It did make a difference it was unique in that the originator of the and legislation, a professional epidemiologist, understood full well that much of the violence is... comes from people who just simply want to resolve their disputes through violent means. And this program was able to hire people who could intervene in those kinds of situations to stop violence from occurring, to stop killings from occurring. And when those killings are stopped, when they're thwarted, it is better for our communities obviously, but also has a major impact on the cost to a community and it has been estimated that when somebody commits a murder or a crime, when you add up the hospital costs, when you add up the medical costs, when you add up the law enforcement costs,

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

incarceration, everything associated with it, it had been estimated that such crimes could cost upwards of a million dollars (\$1,000,000). So, this really what we're talking about here is a small investment in... in our future, in not only saving lives, but also reducing our costs to the community and improving the quality of life in community. I was very saddened in Decatur, Illinois, where we put together a coalition of groups, including churches, community leaders, law enforcement, elected officials who came together like they've never ever come together before to support a program, and a program that was working, and this is hard work. The people who were hired in this program are people who would intervene at two or three in the morning to stop the violence. Now those among us... there is very few among us who would actually go out into a neighborhood where there's a threat of a shooting or a crime to talk somebody out of committing a crime, but that's what this program has done. So it's a good program has done. So it's a good program. We need to continue to fight for these dollars, for this program. So many people have been disheartened by the veto of these funds, no mention has ever been made of why, other than savings were needed for a health care program. To my knowledge, these dollars are not going into a health care program, in fact, if you look at the fact that people were laid off who were employed under CeaseFire, now they were obtaining unemployment benefits. So where's the savings in that? I want to thank those of you in advance for supporting this legislation who believe in what we're doing and I want to

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

thank Representative Mendoza for leading the charge here. This is very important. We need to fight for these funds and if it's futile, let's put it on the Governor's desk and if he wants to veto it, he can do that, but let's at least not stop fighting for what's right. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Sacia."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield"

Sacia: "Ladies and Gentleman of the Body, I stand in strong support of the Lady's legislation. Many of you are aware that we had a committee meeting yesterday pertaining to it. And the good doctor, the gentleman who has spearheaded the program from its inception spoke to us, and it's the second time I've heard him in two (2) years. As I was traveling down here on Tuesday, I received a call from one of my mayors in the biggest city that I represent, which is Freeport, Illinois, population about twenty-five thousand (25,000). Wherein the past week we've had three gang shootings and CeaseFire is not in place in Freeport, Illinois, but obviously, it needs to be. Listening to those testifying in committee yesterday to include Mr. Flider who again spoke about it, the program in Decatur and certainly Dr. Gary and his discussions as what this has caused us in actual harm. I wish I had the statistics at my fingertips wherein we discussed the significant increase in shootings simply since this program has been taken away. Representative Black made a very good point. He said, 'I hope the media is paying attention.' Because what is

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

happening here we're asking to double the amount of money vetoed out of the Bill that or out of appropriations, and I think Representative Mendoza did an exceptional job of explaining why. We have a very significant problem, Ladies and Gentlemen, that goes right This is not an issue to the core of civilization itself. about guns; it's an issue about punks that have guns. is affecting, obviously, the major cities like Chicago, but Ι see it hit areas like Freeport, northwestern rural Illinois, this is becoming a problem that all of us have to pay attention to. The gentle Lady referred to the fact that the Governor has a program out there, but it's a totally untested program. CeaseFire is tested, no pun intended, under fire. It works; it's a good program. We need to get the funding back and if the media is paying attention and I know they are, and I know that the Governor is paying attention because the media will absolutely put the pressure on the Governor as people continue to get shot senselessly because of doing away with such a fine program. I urge all of us to support this excellent legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Fritchey: "A couple of questions and I'm going to try not to be redundant on some of the things that were previously said. You know, it's been said that this is a doubling of the prior appropriation request. It's actually as I see it a

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

quadrupling of that request, because it's a doubling of the amount for half of the fiscal year. So, I'm just trying understand what your rationale is in seeking essentially a quadruple... a quadrupling in the funding per fiscal year?"

Mendoza: "Well, we're asking for double the money that will be allocated for the year. Now, in the event that we... there's no way that they're going to through twelve and a half million dollars (\$12,500,000) in a quarter of the fiscal year. So that money would just be rolled over to the next quarter, and the next quarter, and the next quarter. The purpose is to have twelve and a half million dollars (\$12,500,000) for a yearlong program. And we will work with the Sponsors in the Senate, whoever we need to work with to insure that that is the way that the program is run."

Fritchey: "But if the initial request was for six million dollars (\$6,000,000)..."

Mendoza: "Six point two five."

Fritchey: "Six point two five million dollars (\$6,250,000) and that was deemed to be sufficient at the time, why are you now seeking twelve million dollars (\$12,000,000)?

Mendoza: "Well, we need to repair the damage that's been done. The 6.25 million dollars (\$6,250,000) was a result of... this program's been around for years. When they first started they were not funded at that level and every year that this program has been in place it has either expanded or redoubled their efforts in certain communities that needed it. That funding has gone up. Now that the funding was so drastically cut and it was basically immediate, these

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

communities have seen huge spikes in crime, specifically qun-related crime and a large amount of increase in murder. I mean, the City of Chicago had just been commended for their reduction in crime, which goes contrary to most large cities across the nation. And just in the last six (6) months alone, we have seen a huge spike in murders and in qunshot victims and we feel that the money is absolutely necessary that it increase, because now the problem has grown to be so severe that it's not going to take a normal amount of funding to just keep it going. It's basically like taking the initiative and starting over, regaining the trust of the community, which unfortunately at this point because of what was done, is going to take more money to be able to do. That is why we feel it's important to not just go back with the six and a quarter million (6,250,000), but to double up our efforts because, frankly, that's what it's going to take to do. We're going to have to do double the job at this point to get back on track. And then hopefully, this money will be able to be enough to not have to come back and beg and plead to do the right thing by creating programs that can sustain themselves and do the job that they're intended to do. That is why we're asking for the extra money, and again, if you break it down to how much the State would be saving by not having to spend on health care costs related to direct shooting victims, you know, makes a lot of fiscal sense as well to invest this money for this specific purpose."

Fritchey: "Can I ask what you're basing your statistics on? A report just came out about a month ago that actually showed

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

the murder rate in Chicago has declined to one of its lowest levels in recent memories."

Mendoza: "Yes."

Fritchey: "There are no... official semi-annual statistics to support a spike in the murder rate for the city. To the contrary it has shown that it has gone down."

Mendoza: "That is absolutely right. And it's gone down over the last three (3) to four (4) years since CeaseFire has been active in these communities."

Fritchey: "No, no, no, it went down this past year."

Mendoza: "Exactly, I just said that in my earlier in my comments, Representative, that the during the last year that was measured and the year before that and the year before that we have seen a reduction in the City of Chicago which runs contrary to most other large cities. However, these new shootings have not been a part of that number and we will... I guarantee you if we do not restore these funds the next study that comes out about... since May to the next May will have a vast increase in the amount of shootings that the City of Chicago has seen and specifically, in those seventeen (17) communities that are served CeaseFire. That statistic only proves to reinforce why we need CeaseFire back in the communities, because I don't want next year's study, that would include the last six (6) months, to say that we have now seen a massive turnaround in the positive direction that we had been going in. We're going to see a reversal of that and that to me is unacceptable."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Fritchey: "Well I... I'll respectfully disagree with your representation of the figures as well as what you're attributing are the short-term numbers on. Let me see... there was... there was an audit done of CeaseFire about a year ago that showed several hundred thousand dollars to be unaccounted. Do you know what happened with that audit since then?"

"Yes. My understanding and according to the testimony Mendoza: given vesterday in the Public Appropriations Committee, the University of Illinois is now completely redoing their... their process, I guess, for the accounting within the individual community groups that are reporting how they're spending that money, where it's going. The testimony said that during the course of the last few years, the groups had reported their fiscal status to the state and the state had accepted that without any other kind of further recommendation or complaint. And it was not until the audit came out that the group was told that they were in effect falling short or had shortcomings and it was only in a couple of those community groups. was certainly not in all twenty-five (25) communities. So that problem has been addressed internally and the director of CeaseFire said that... like as of yesterday, I think, they were in meeting, specifically through the University to create what the new format is going to be to address that so that is not... no longer an issue. "

Fritchey: "Well, wait... but wait, what you said."

Mendoza: "I would certainly not be supporting a group."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Fritchey: "But when you say it's no longer an issue, they acknowledged themselves that they have several hundred thousand dollars that they could not account for."

Mendoza: "They acknowledged that their reporting could have been much better done and that is what they need to fix. I mean, if the State had not been informing people that they weren't reporting sufficiently well, then I guess these groups... I mean they're not accountants by nature, they did not... they were not aware that they weren't meeting the standard of expectation that they frankly should have been meeting. So I think that issue has been resolved and I think all of us should know and be vigilant in insuring that there are no, you know, lack of transparency issues when it comes to the taxpayer dollar."

Fritchey: "So what..."

Mendoza: "I support that."

Fritchey: "You say there's no lack of transparency issues.

What happened to several hundred thousand dollars that they said themselves they couldn't account for, though?"

Mendoza: "Yeah, I personally do not know that. Representative, I would be happy to look into that and report that back to you directly or to anybody else who's interested in that. I can't answer that question at this time. But I know that in the broader scope of things that was the one issue that was brought up and my understanding is that it is immediately be addressed by the directors of CeaseFire as a whole outside of that specific community group and also by the University of Illinois, so that there are no further issues and that that issue gets resolved."

206th Legislative Day

- Fritchey: "Well, I guess, I would submit that the fact remains that that money's not accounted for, be that as it may.

 Who's the Senate Sponsor going to be on this Bill?"
- Mendoza: "The Senate Sponsor, I believe in well, let me see if it's up yet, but as of yesterday it was going to be Senator Harmon and then this morning I heard that it may potentially be Senator Clayborne, but both are interested in carrying the legislation."
- Fritchey: "Have any of them had discussions with Senator Jones about whether or not he would call this Bill?"
- Mendoza: "I have not spoken with Senator Jones. We just passed this out of committee yesterday and so I asked... and Representative Graham spoke with her Senator and both are interested, but I have not had a meeting personally with Senator Jones. We do have two great people, though, that would like to be a Sponsor of this important legislation and for that I'm very proud and happy."
- Fritchey: "I've been advised by the appropriation chairman on the Senate side that this Bill will not be called in the Senate. So, to that end, other than, and... let me be really clear, you know... you... bring the same passion to this that you do to all of your Bills and I... respect that to no end. I really mean that. I respect, as everybody on the floor does, the laudable goal of reducing violence in our communities. As I've said on other issues, you know, what are the only things worse you can do than offering no hope to people is to offer false hope to people. So we have a situation here where we have a Governor, who I think made a mistake, but we have a Governor that vetoed six million

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

dollar (\$6,000,000) appropriation for ostensibly worthwhile program. We have an appropriation seeking double that amount that will likely have the votes to come out of this I've been informed by the approp. chair in the Senate that it's dead on arrival in the Senate, but a number of people may have the impression when they see the House pass the Bill that more money is going to be on the way. And listen, I know what it's like to have Bills die in the Senate, trust me. I've got more than my share over there. But I just... I don't know what we are accomplishing by trying to move a substantive appropriation Bill on the second day of this Session when we're being informed that's it not even going to be called on the Senate side. you know, it's... not I don't even know that it's a question and if it is, it's not a fair question to you because I don't think it's one that..."

Mendoza: "I'd like to answer that, actually."

Fritchey: "Well, here, if you... if you want to respond, I appreciate it. That's fine."

Mendoza: "I would... I would like to respond to that because I think that... you know, it's not a situation of offering false hope, if that were the case then all of us should just pack our bags and go home. Let's go home, because the day I let the Governor tell me what I can or cannot support in this chamber and what should or should not make it to the other chamber is the day I don't want to work here anymore. It's that simple. It's that simple. Any of us should never live by the expectation of I've got to ask the Senate President whether or not my Bill may see the light

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

of day in the Senate. There are a heck of lot of Bills that are really great for the people of this State that end up getting caught in politics across the other chamber. That is ridiculous. It's unacceptable. And fine, I think what we're doing here is sending a message when we pass this that we think this is an important issue and that we're not going to be told what to do by the Senate or by the Governor because they have not gotten it right yet this That's why we're still here on what is today, January 10. We were supposed to be done May 31. So I plan on continuing to keep... what do they say that hope is the last thing to die, right? Let's keep hope alive, but I'm here to work and I'm here to stand up for what I believe in and I don't... I'm not going to let somebody else tell me from across the aisle what I can or can't believe in because it may or may not pass. We're going to pass this thing out of there and let them go up to the people, let them go back to their communities who are sick and tired of getting shot and explain why they think it's not a good idea. Let them do that. But I am not about to come back this chamber, not a single second more and permission on what I can or cannot support. That's what we're saying here. Oh, it's not going to be called in the I've had lots of issues not get called in the Senate. Senate, but I'm still going to fight for them. community is going to know what's important to me because what's important to them is what matters to me. That's why were here in this chamber and if any of us feel that we need to ask permission by the Senate staff, the Senate

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

staff or the Senate President or the Governor or his staff then I think we should just pack our bags and go home. That's not me. I'm not going to beg. I'm going demand that they listen and they better start listening now, because I've listened to my community and I've listened to people across this state who have this program in their districts and they want action. They don't want rhetoric. They don't want politics. They want action and that's what I'm asking you all to stand with me and show a little bit of action. Show a little bit of backbone sometimes and let's send it on over to the Governor and have him say why he doesn't think it's a good idea. Have Emil explain why it needs to sit in committee."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Fritchey could you kind of bring your remarks to a close?"

Fritchey: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I may not be the typical person that you expect to see in opposition to a Bill like this. I do mean... I do mean the positive comments that I said to the Sponsor. I will tell you that my comments are really based on the feedback that I've got from my community. She's listening to her constituents. The feedback that I've got back from CeaseFire operations up in my area has not been positive. They have been, they have been troubled by... Representative, if you, if you have a question about that I'd be happy to show you the e-mails and letters I have from my community. There have been questions about their operations. There have questions about their accounting and their finances. I do not believe at this point based on representing my

206th Legislative Day

- constituents for a number of reasons or that this something that should... be supported. I appreciate her indulgence in answering the questions, though. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Although I'm enjoying the show, I would like to move the previous question. Excuse..."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves the previous question.

 The question is, 'Shall the main question be put out?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 The main question is put and Representative Mendoza, you are recognized to close. To close, Representative."
- Mendoza: "You know, I think I pretty much said everything and more than I was planning originally to address, but I do think that again that the issue of that we're trying to do here is send a message that this program is very, very important. It's... every dollar that we spend on this is a dollar well spent that is an investment in the people that we serve in this state. We are saving the state tens if not hundreds of millions of dollars potentially by doubling up this money. It is an increase that will be well spent and I just ask for your support for a program that at this point we cannot afford to not have in place. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "So the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4170 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Jefferson, May, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

'yes' and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 7 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Third Reading, is Senate Bill 437. Excuse me, we got... Representative Graham, for what reason do you rise? Representative Watson, for what reason do you rise? Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if I could make just a statement about the appropriations process?"

Speaker Hannig: "Recognize you on a point of personal privilege, Representative. Proceed."

Mulligan: "Thank you. I had thought and then I had turned my light off and on and to talk to Representative Mendoza's Bill, but I don't particularly... I didn't particularly want and take that Bill is the only one of what the process is. The process right now, particularly the way the Governor's Office is operating, is that many people find themselves in the same position that the Representative did. grants out there that normally go to local organizations that are doing good work in the community. How we audit them or what happens with them is not a general standard that we follow all the time and there should be some process about how much goes to administration and how much actually goes to the program. But the fact of the matter is the lack of civility, the lack of the ability to pass a regular budget anymore is causing problems like this repeatedly. The grants will overlap who applies for them when the money will be applied. You know, I have no doubt that what the Representative was doing to benefit her

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

community and what other people will continue to do too is something that they feel is necessary. Unfortunately, we do not look at a budget any longer as a unified document on a pie chart of where the money should go, how it should be expended, what are the best ways to spend it because of what's happening from the top down. And so that puts a lot of Representatives in similar situations of what happens in your community and what's happening about not being spent. As we're approaching a new budget situation, we have such a mess that's left from the last year's budget that I don't know how you can determine what the new year's budget is going to be or even how you can spend the amount of money you put into a grant program because overlapped and it's half a year and how you put the money Those are all questions that are valid when were looking at how we fund a capital Bill, how we fund education, how we fund services. It's gotten to be such a disjointed way of doing anything and if anybody gets up and questions any particular Representative from their area, it makes you look like you are not supporting them, which isn't necessarily the case. What I think we need support for is a civil way of going back to doing a budget that allocates the money appropriately, having the agencies respond to us so that we know how much money is there and so we can figure out how the hell we can do a budget here, how the heck we go about spending the peoples' money that we're here to represent. What we actually do need is and what's appropriate to raise from revenue or whatever ways so that we can move forward. I think the process is so

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

flawed and so broken that as we go into this new budget year, those of us that have worked on it for a long time are truly concerned. I would certainly urge that the Governor's Office, their Bureau of the Budget, and the people that work on budget in Illinois get together and figure out what the heck we're doing as to going to in this new year."

Speaker Hannig: "On page 7 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, is Senate Bill 437. Mr. Clerk read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 437, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 437 is an initiative to require the Illinois Student Assistant Commission to provide for a thousand dollar (\$1,000) grant for each Illinois state scholar who attends a higher education institution in our state. The Bill is subject to appropriation. It passed unanimously out of committee and was also passed unanimously out of the Senate about seven (7) months ago. I'd appreciate your consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 437. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy"

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Eddy: "Representative, just for the record we did discuss this a little bit in Higher Ed and I support the intention here

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

and that is that for those Illinois state scholars who choose to stay in the State of Illinois..."

McCarthy: "Correct."

Eddy: "...we'd like to see them receive an incentive and that incentive is one thousand additional dollars (\$1,000) on their scholarship. And the cost of this if past history indicates the potential for those that stay, we have about sixteen (16), it could be as much as sixteen million (16,000,000), but..."

McCarthy: "Correct"

Eddy: "...but with those who probably will leave, the estimate is more like eleven million (11,000,000) or less. I couldn't..."

McCarthy: "I think when they figure it, the ones that are already eligible under the merit scholarship program, which we haven't funded, but you can't get both. So if they take them out they went back to that eleven million (11,000,000), I agree with you, though, and I think that's the fight we fight during the appropriation process. If we decide that we want to do this we have to look at it, 'cause there is some conflicting data, but like I say, this is not an appropriation Bill. This is just to get the idea on the books and then we can decide later whether we want to appropriate it or not."

Eddy: "And your personal intention as I understood it was that we find funding for the whole program and for all of those needs and that this wouldn't take from something necessarily, but would be part of the mix when the priorities are decided."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

McCarthy: "It certainly is."

Eddy: "Okay, thank you very much."

McCarthy: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Davis, Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

Davis, W.: "Representative, if I understood what you said correctly, this Bill will provide every student selected as a state scholar a thousand dollar (\$1,000) scholarship to attend state schools or any school in the State of Illinois?"

McCarthy: "Any institution of higher learning in the state."

Davis, W.: "In the state."

McCarthy: "Community colleges or any four-year university in the state."

Davis, W.: "In the state. Now, I guess my question is and just so I understand, what is the process by which a student is selected as a state scholar?"

McCarthy: "Well, it has to do with their performance in high school as well as a combination with their ACT score."

Davis, W.: "So, is it a...

McCarthy: "It's a current formula, that's not changing at all.

And like in 2005, 2006, we have sixteen thousand (16,000)

of our graduates were considered Illinois State Scholars."

Davis, W.": "So it's a very cut-and-dried process?"

McCarthy: "It's... it's pretty cut-and-dried. It's been there ever since I graduated from high school quite a few years ago, so."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Davis, W.: "Okay. That's... what I was curious about. Thank you."

McCarthy: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

Black: "Representative, my only fear about this program, we have almost a litany of... grants that I wish were awarded that haven't been. The Merit Recognition Scholarship hasn't been funded in years. I'm sure you do the same as I, when we get the list. I send them a congratulatory letter, thanking them for their diligence in their academic work and have to put in a paragraph that I wish we could give you the stipend that the was authorized for Merit Recognition Scholars, but we haven't been able to find or appropriate the money. So, aren't we getting into a very similar situation here with this Bill?"

McCarthy: "Well, all I would say is that, and I told others, that I would be very cautious of promising these people until the appropriation process..."

Black: "Absolutely..."

McCarthy: "...is going forward. 'Cause in my early time I had that merit recognition list and actually sent it out, including what I thought was the thousand dollar (\$1,000) scholarship and we've had one our local Senators..."

Black: "Right."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

McCarthy: "...do basically the same thing and it's come back to haunt him. So, I've told the people who've asked me to be very clear that this is not an appropriation yet. If we come in the future where we have a chance to do it, I think it's a worthy cause, because while we're doing a good job of maintaining a lot of our students staying in our Illinois institutions, the ones we are losing the... largest group that we're losing are the ones that are most ready for, you know, performance in college. Those are the ones we want to keep here more than anybody else and those are a lot of the Illinois State Scholars."

Black: "I... can't disagree with anything you've said. Mr. Speaker, if I could, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "...Bill"

Black: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I Representative Mulligan really addressed an issue that we need to concentrate on and in the previous Bill anybody's remarks wasn't aimed... no... matter what remark you made it, wasn't aimed at the Sponsor. It wasn't aimed at the program she was seeking money for, and yet we have to listen to the other side of the aisle stuff. We have to get back to the point where we question the conceptual idea and focus on the reality of our budget and the reality of some of the political questions that have been raised by the current Governor. To constantly vote for more spending when this Governor has made it very clear, if it doesn't fit his spending priorities, he's not going to accept it. He's going to veto it. To continue to ask to establish programs that cost money when if all of us don't understand

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

the fiscal crisis this state is in, then shame on this I don't know how we're going to put together a budget next year. I... if you read the economic forecasting arm of State Government, we will take in less new money than what our pension obligation payment will be on a continuing approp. We don't have anything to say about it. We have a payment in access of seven hundred million dollars (\$700,000,000) to the pension system in FY09 and growth, new money, is expected to only be about five hundred and sixty-five million dollars (\$565,000,000). Ladies and Gentlemen, when ideas are questioned or the timing of an issue is questioned, I'd hope you stop and think, I'm not questioning the Sponsor. I think he is a ... well, I... think without a doubt, and I don't want to hurt anybody's feelings, he is the best Chair of the Higher Education Committee that I have ever served under. He is fair. He takes an interest in High Ed. I know it's time to be warm and fuzzy, but I'm telling you the truth, he is. I respect him. He does a wonderful job as the Chair of Higher Education. He cares about Higher Education and he about giving students the opportunity to make cares themselves, to... take advantage of that opportunity by giving them ever conceivable possibility. I think this is a great idea, but I again, it's nothing in opposition to the concept. It's certainly not in opposition to the Sponsor, it's just that I have to be... I have to look myself in the mirror every morning and say, look are you just, are you just going along to get along or are you just playing the game or are you going to say, look, I think this is a

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

great idea. I wish we could fund it, but I've said to kids for years, I wish we'd fund the Merit Recognitions Scholar Program. And we don't. And I don't know if we can fund this. I'll tell you this, if Representative McCarthy can find a funding source and can find a Bill and bring it later in the Session to fund this program, I would ask that he let me cosponsor it and I'll be among the first to vote for it. But I can't vote for it sitting here today and I think what Representative Mulligan said was target. We are ... we are setting up programs. In one case, we actually appropriated money we don't have but in this case, we're asking for a... possible appropriation sometime in the future. Great idea, great Bill, great Sponsor, there isn't any money. And I, for one, am waiting for some leadership from the Governor's Office to tell me, if not all of us, how we're going to do this. And until we get to that point I find it very difficult to cast a 'yes' vote for a Bill that I think will never be funded as sad as that may be. So, it's for that purpose and that purpose only, I intend to vote 'present'."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Brady."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Sponsor will yield."

Brady: "Representative, what happens to this legislation if there's never any funding appropriated for it?"

McCarthy: "What happens if it's... not appropriated?"

Brady: "Correct."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

McCarthy: "Well, then the legislation sits there hoping that in some future date there will be an appropriation. I think what I... the first thing that I said in my presentation was that this is subject to appropriation, didn't wait for the question to come because I want to make it clear that... so no one runs out and tells their state scholars today that their going to get this grant because they're not, until we find the money."

Brady: "So, it... obviously, it is subject to appropriation."

McCarthy: "It definitely is subject to appropriation."

Brady: "Do you have any idea how long ago it was when these Illinois State Scholars would receive some type of stipend or scholarship funding?"

McCarthy: "I've been told by staff that the merit program is, I think, '72 or '73 was the last time it was funded."

Brady: "And are you aware of a piece of legislation, which I brought to the Higher Education Committee, asking that a study be enacted to see why we are congratulating our Illinois State Scholars. Why we are reaching out to them telling them they are doing a fantastic job and then finding out some of our universities in the State of Illinois that they deny Illinois State Scholars entrance to the school of higher education. Are you aware of that legislation?"

McCarthy: "I am somewhat aware of it, yes."

Brady: "And so since that is, I think, stalled in the Senate somewhere, you're somewhat trying to address the same thing and that if there are dollars ever you'd like to see that we give those dollars the way of scholarship to assist our

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Illinois State Scholars who we are reaching out to as Legislators and in fact, congratulating and acknowledging across the State of Illinois. Is that correct?"

McCarthy: "I think so."

Brady: "Okay. And I thank you very much for that. I am concerned in regards obviously to my colleague. He has demonstrated fine points but I am going to vote for your legislation subject to appropriation and I do see that I am a cosponsor of it as well."

McCarthy: "Yes"

Brady: "Thank you."

McCarthy: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Representative McCarthy to close."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have made it very clear that it is subject to appropriation. I do want to thank my friend from Danville for his comments. I hope my mother and father were listening. Yesterday they were mad at him for making a bad remark about our brother, Charlie McCarthy, and that was completely unforgivable, but after the nice things he said today, I'll forgive him, so. But I do think it's a good program to have it in place, so that if we do get fortunate enough at one point to have money that we can reward these scholars, we can give them an incentive for more of the best of the best to stay here in our state. It would be a worthy project and I hope that before I leave here we will be able to appropriate for both this and the Merit Scholarship Program. Thank you."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 437 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hoffman and Scully, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no', 9 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We're going to for just a moment stand at ease while we move into the Seventeenth Special Session. And now the Regular Session of the House of Representatives will resume. Representative Fritchey, for what reason do you rise?"

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Fritchey: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there seems to be a theme over these last couple of Bills and it's something that I want to follow up on for a second. We've had a couple pieces of legislation that have both tried to promote laudable and worthwhile programs, but there's a real question as to how to fund it. And it gets down to the very basic notion that we have tough decisions to make and we only have a finite amount of money with which to make those decisions. As many of you are aware, for many months now there has been... I guess there's no other way to phrase it than an ongoing battle between the Governor's Office and JCAR. The Governor had sought a massive expansion of his... of one of his health programs, JCAR objected and prohibited the rules. The Governor's Office and the Department of

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Healthcare and Family Services, nevertheless, decided to Yesterday in JCAR, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Department of Healthcare and Family Services put forth rules for another insurance expansion. It's a very laudable one, one that would extend the provision of preventive services to everybody that's covered under the state rather than those that's under the age of twenty-one (21) right now. As I said, a laudable purpose, but one that's going to cost a lot of money. Ladies and Gentlemen, when we finally did get around to passing a budget, we appropriated a sum certain to all the state agencies as we're required to do. We're require... we appropriated a sum Department of Healthcare certain to the and Family Services. The amount of programs and services that they are presently undertaking is far outstripping what we ever envisioned or authorized them to do. And the point of this comment right now is this, Ladies and Gentlemen, I could be wrong, but I don't think I am. I think that you are going least one department, the Department of see at Healthcare and Family Services, come back before this Body for a very significant supplemental appropriation for moneys that we don't have. They are going to come to us I think with the health care version of a doomsday scenario like the CTA has been doing and being chided for. They are going to come back to us and tell us that if the General Assembly doesn't give them hundreds of millions of more dollars, if not billions of more dollars, then all of our constituents are going to go without very basic services. I want you all to be on notice of this; I want you all to

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

be prepared to respond to this. That it is not the actions of the General Assembly that has acted responsibly. It is not the actions of Democratic Leadership or Republican Leadership. It is the actions of the administration that has refused to heed the directives of this General Assembly, that has refused to heed the appropriation realities, that has refused to heed the actions of JCAR and that is going to continue to spiral this state into a fiscal crisis and then try to lay it out into the public that it's going to be our fault. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's not going to be our fault and please don't say that you didn't see it coming. Mark my words; it's going to happen sooner rather than later. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "On page 7 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Third Reading, is House Bill 4191. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill.

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4191, a Bill for an Act concerning property. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is concerned with predatory lending. The first part of the Bill would accelerate the effective date on legislation, which is already law, signed by the Governor in which was designed to combat the practices of predatory lenders. So, again, the first part of the Bill just changes the effective date. The new effective date would be the date that the Governor signs the Bill. The second part of the Bill is concerned with a program already operated by the office of the State Treasurer where there

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

is a relatively minor change and that will be explained and that will be explained by Representative Yarbrough."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Yarbrough."

Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment #1 to

House Bill 4191 is designed to reduce predatory lending

practices. It expands the Our Own Home administered by the Treasurer's Office. The program offers an incentive for lenders to approve loans that they would normally reject. The lender offers the loan in exchange for the state securing 10 percent of the loan and it amounts for the first five (5) years of the loan at a reduced rate of interest on deposits of the state moneys and financial institution. House Amendment #1 permits the Treasurer to approve an application regardless if borrower has missed a payment. The current language of the Amendment simply removes that requirement that a borrower missed a payment. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for the passage of House Bill 4191. Is there any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Graham."

Graham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Graham: "Representative Yarbrough, as amended for House Bill 4191, does this Amendment allow the State Treasurer within this Our Own Home Program the flexibility to seek out and help victims of predatory lending practices?"

Yarbrough: "Yes."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

- Graham: "For instance, will this Amendment allow the Treasurer to assist anyone who is currently in an adjustable mortgage?"
- Yarbrough: "Certainly. The change in the law will allow the Treasurer's Office the ability to identify existing borrowers who are in trouble with loans that automatically adjusted exurbanite rates and helped those borrowers to refinance those loans."
- Graham: "I want to thank you guys for bring forth this piece of legislation. As we know, that predatory lending and foreclosure has swept our state and people are in desperate need of help; so I stand in full support of this legislation. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor Yield?"
- Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."
- Black: "Representative, Committee Amendment #1, can you give me a little better explanation of that? It... it allows the Treasurer's Office to work with eligible financial institutions to do what? Do an interest buy down?
- Yarbrough: "First of all, this is an existing program. And what it will do… under the current law, the borrower is seeking a home loan and the lender would not under normal circumstances offer them a loan without an incentive if the borrower has failed to miss a payment or if they're behind in mortgage payments. So this… this current program is already into effect. The only thing we're really doing is

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

removing the requirement that a borrower miss a payment and that goes to Representative Graham's questions.

Black: "Well, let me ask you a question. And again, please don't misinterpret my remarks. I'm trying to get a handle on what this Amendment does to the underlying Bill. What do I tell somebody in my district who is struggling with their mortgage, who make the payments, who'd never fallen behind no matter how hard they struggle. And then somebody goes to their bank, they signed up for an interest rate they never should have signed up for. They got a mortgage that was way, way beyond their ability to pay. And in the depressed real estate market, I can give you an example, somebody in my community owes a hundred and thirty-seven thousand dollars (\$137,000) on a house that's been appraised at ninety-nine thousand (99,000). So if I understand what you're doing, the person who got in over their head, and I don't believe all of these people were led astray. I believe some of them just don't sit carefully and think this thing through. But as I understand it, the person... my neighbor, who's done everything possible and is maintaining mortgage payments doesn't get any help. The person who is way over extended can now go to the bank and say, the state's going to help me buy down this mortgage. I mean, where is the fairness in that?"

Yarbrough: "First of all, currently, people can use this program. What we're trying to do… the situation you just shared, this program would help that person to refinance that loan."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Black: "And I understand that."

Yarbrough: "That would that would provide help for them. The person who's been making payments and they're in this loan already, but they see, like in for instance in an ARM, they now that right down the road a train wreck is coming because that loan is going to adjust upwardly and they really can't pay that. They could contact the Treasurer's Office and get help and work with participating banks."

Black: "All right. Let me concentrate on that part. The Treasurer's Office will pledge... what... up to 10 percent?"

Yarbrough: "I'm sorry, I didn't..."

Black: "...up to 10 percent of that mortgage?"

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Black: "So, we're using state money to subsidize that mortgage?"

Yarbrough: "The 10... these... these are funds that are already sitting in on an account. They are set aside for this program."

Black: "Specifically by law, set aside for only this program?"

Yarbrough: "Yes, that's correct."

Black: "Okay. All right. I'm glad to know that because, in other words, it couldn't be used for Link Deposit or other... the Treasurer's Office for years has done a very good job of Link Deposit to help people with the manufacturing."

Yarbrough: "No."

Black: "Okay, all right."

Yarbrough: "No."

Black: "At what risk then are these state moneys?"

Yarbrough: "Okay, it's my understanding..."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

- Black: "Could... could we lose any or all of the state dollars we put into the program? I shouldn't say program, into one specific mortgage?"
- Yarbrough: "Okay. Let me... I have some information here. First of all, the Treasurer's Office has approved three hundred and fifty-seven (357) applicants, totaling twenty-one million dollars (\$21,000,000) in loan guarantees. To date, the program has only experienced one loss and that has been of twenty-two hundred dollars (\$2200). The account currently has 5.6 million (5,600,000), which roughly two million (2,000,000) earmarked for current outstanding loans, and 3.6 million (3,600,000) available for new participants. And the money that was lost was mostly interest on that loan."
- Black: "If... if the process works and the person is able to restructure, make the payments, and the mortgage payments continue on and eventually the house or the mortgage is paid off, does the state get that money back plus interest?"
- Yarbrough: "We're guaranteeing... Okay. Okay. We're only spending if the mortgage goes bad and that's only happened once."
- Black: "All right. So, we would lose state tax dollars if the default happens, right?"

Yarbrough: "We're only guaranteeing this for five (5) years."

Black: "Okay. For five (5) years."

Yarbrough: "Yes."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Black: "If at the end of five (5) years the payments are being made on a regular basis, do we recoup the tax dollars that we've used up to that five-year period."

Yarbrough: "No."

Black: "Excuse me, staff just said we aren't really putting any money in that mortgage, it's just a guarantee."

Yarbrough: "It's a guarantee. That's correct."

Black: "Okay, so we would not be at risk unless the mortgage goes into default."

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Black: "Okay. Now..."

Yarbrough: "And again, let me... let me remind you, that's only happened once of the..."

Black: "Right."

Yarbrough: "...three hundred and fifty-seven (357) loans that..."

Black: "Okay. And I appreciate that. Let me ask you just procedural question. One of the problems that has occurred in this subprime disaster is that many of these mortgagers have been sold by the originator to six (6), seven (7), eight (8) different companies. Now, if I need this help and I go to my bank, can the state help if the bank says, well, I sold your mortgage to A,B,C, who in turn sold your mortgage to D,E and F, who in turn sold your mortgage to a institution in California and that has happened. So, the program wouldn't help me as I understand it if my mortgage was, in fact, then sold by the originator to some other subprime lender."

Yarbrough: "This is a guarantee on an origination."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Black: "Okay. So, the mortgage would still have to rest with the originator of the mortgage. If... if mine's been sold off, I'm pretty much out of luck."

Yarbrough: "No, that's not correct. That's not correct."

Black: "Well how?"

Yarbrough: "If you are in trouble, if you have a current mortgage now and you are in trouble, you simply would contact the Treasurer's Office and ask for this help. They would try to identify a lending institution to help you get into a new loan and they would guarantee it, the 10 percent for five (5) years. So, it doesn't matter whether that loan has been sold over and over again. You're coming for help at that particular time."

Black: "Okay."

Yarbrough: "And the bank that's going to take over, you know, refinance your loan, that's what we're talking about here."

Black: "Okay. Even though, the mortgage may have been securitized and rolled into equities and now is being held by a company in California. And this has happened, you know, where you can't even find out who in the heck owns your mortgage. But you can still apply for the help because you're still making payments to whoever you're making payments to?"

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Black: "All right. Okay. Our exposure is limited to five (5) years."

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Black: "And our exposure is limited to a specific dollar amount?"

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Yarbrough: "Ten percent of the loan amount."

Black: "Would it be limited to the amount of money allocated to this program?"

Yarbrough: "They are not going to guarantee any amount... in any amount over the amount in the program."

Black: "Okay. And what did you say that was three million (3,000,000) or..."

Yarbrough: "We got 3.6 million (3,600,000) available..."

Black: "Okay."

Yarbrough: "...for new loans."

Black: "Okay. I really appreciate your answers, because I was trying to make sure I understood what the Committee Amendment did to the underlying legislation. So I really, you know, we're so often misinterpreted that we're trying to kill your Bill or we're trying to opt the state. These are questions I really needed answered. One question that I've been asked to ask you, did the... have the mortgage brokers or the mortgage lenders association contacted you as to whether or not they are in favor of the Bill, neutral on the Bill, or still trying to figure it out?"

Yarbrough: "I've not heard from anyone. And as far as I know there are no opponents to this Bill."

Black: "All right. Representative, thank you very much."

Yarbrough: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor Yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Mulligan: "Representative, I'm sorry if this question was answered already. If the bank or whoever... and will it only

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

be banks, that's probably a second question? Are they... is it only going to be banks that will make these loans as opposed to a mortgage lender?"

Yarbrough: "That's correct."

Mulligan: "All right. And so, if a bank guarantee... you know, agrees to do this, is there any provision that they can't sell the loan themselves for that length of time?"

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Mulligan: "For five (5) years?"

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Mulligan: "So they would not be able to sell it?"

Yarbrough: "That's correct."

Mulligan: "Is the Treasurer making any other guarantees like placing state money in that bank?"

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Mulligan: "So, what we're doing is kind of giving that bank the credit or the ability to have state funds and then they will also agree to take on so many mortgages and they will be able to vet out the person to make sure that they can pay it if they're refinanced into a reasonable loan?"

Yarbrough: "That's correct. Representative, again, this is an existing program and we're expanding it to allow for people who maybe have not missed a mortgage payment, people who are in ARMs, people who are headed towards the train wreck of foreclosure."

Mulligan: "Right, I certainly can understand that. I think it's a good idea that Illinois does this. I think the lending practices, credit card, whatever need to be

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

adjusted at the federal level. Things are really out of whack and..."

Yarbrough: "I agree. I agree."

Mulligan: "...I don't know if it's because of lobbyists or what's going, but some... some of the issues have to be held, you know, down at the federal level as opposed to this, but I think this is a good idea, because I think there are people that probably did not understand or did not think about the economy changing the way it did and they find themselves in a really tough situation. They probably can afford with a reasonable mortgage to be in the home they're in and I think it makes a big difference. And I think that helping the housing industry makes a big difference in what the total economy is."

Yarbrough: "I agree. I agree."

Mulligan: "So I would like to support this I hope that it works out the way we... we're doing it. It seems like it would be a good idea to me and I think it would certainly help people who find themselves in a situation they never planned to be in make life go better and work out correctly and with something they probably could afford. But I'm glad you have the safeguards in there. I would hate to see the banks be able to turn around and sell the loans that they've made with the help of the state money. Thank you."

Yarbrough: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Sullivan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a mortgage crisis here in Illinois and I rise in strong support of this Amendment. The people that we represent are looking to us for action and for ways to help them get out of the financial burden that they can potentially get into by subprime mortgages. This Bill clearly states that instead of actually missing a payment and ruining your credit, we're going to allow you get into a lower rate, get into financial footing that is better before you miss a payment. That is a key distinction here that we need to understand. That is why this makes such good sense. This mortgage crisis this summer will get worse before it gets better. We need to Act now. We need to pass this Bill. I commend the Speaker. I commend the Representative for bringing this Amendment forth. I would hope all of us could support this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentlemen from DuPage, Representative Meyer."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Meyer: "Representative, there are a lot of aspects of what said that I agree with. I do have some questions though. I'm trying to get an understanding of the current program and then the expanded program. How is that changing?"

Yarbrough: The only thing that's changed in the program is that the Amendment... this Amendment removes the requirement that a borrower miss a payment. Currently, people are, in fact, using this program. Let me just read under..."

Meyer: "So, other than that, there's no other change to it?"

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Yarbrough: "No."

Meyer: "These... these new applicants would qualify for it if they had missed a payment?"

Yarbrough: "Yes. The only thing we've done here is remove that requirement so we can include more people so that we can help more people, who in fact, have in fact, you know, missed payments."

Meyer: "Does this legislation in any way address the grievance that possibly we have lenders that were kind of entrapping people into the problems that we're now seeing through their lending practices?"

Yarbrough: "This Bill only is trying to expand the Treasurer's Our Own Home Program to help more people not become victims of foreclosure."

Meyer: "So it's..."

Yarbrough: "There's nothing else that's changed in the program."

Meyer: "Okay. Well..."

Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me, Representative. Excuse me, Representative Madigan, I think, would like to speak to that as well."

Madigan: "To answer the Gentleman's question. The underlying Bill, which is now law, effective July 1 of '08, would deal with those practices. And so, the purpose of the first part of the Bill is just to accelerate the effective date."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Because I believe at some point and now you're indicating that it's part of this, the underlying Bill, that that needs to be addressed. And I don't have a problem supporting what you're trying to do,

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Representative, I just wanted to ask... to make sure that we weren't expanding it. As a matter of fact, to my way of thinking, what you're suggesting is really... you're really bringing people into the program that would have even the less... less risk of defaulting because they haven't defaulted prior to this on their payment. But I just wanted to make sure I was understanding it correctly before I vote. Thank you."

Yarbrough: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then Representative Yarbrough, would you like to close?"

Yarbrough: "Yes. Thank you so much for all of your questions. This language was brought to me by the Treasurer earlier last year and I thought it was a phenomenal program. And all of you I'm sure in your districts if you're having the same trouble that I'm having with foreclosures, I want to be able to offer some... people something at the state level that they can... before they hit what I'm calling the train wreck of foreclosure. So, I ask for a favorable vote on this Amendment and would just enlist all of your support. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4191 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Kosel, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes' and 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. So on page 13 of the Calendar,

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

- we have House Resolution 883. Now, Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that? Did we adopt that?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 883 has not been adopted. It's on the Order of Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Hannig: "At this time, I would ask for your attention.

 We're going to ask the Clerk to read a Resolution that

 mourns the death of a soldier lost in Iraq. And then we'll

 ask Representative Riley to say a few words and be joined

 by others. So, Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 883, offered by Representative Riley.
 - WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives are saddened to learn of the death of DeWayne Lenell White, who passed away on December 4, 2007; and
 - WHEREAS, DeWayne White was born on February 20, 1980 to Lenell White, Jr. and Sandra E. Ireland-White in Chicago; he was the first born to this union; DeWayne was baptized at an early age on March 20, 1980 at St. Raphael Catholic Church; and
 - WHEREAS, Private DeWayne White died while serving with the United States Army in Iraq; he was a part of the 1st Brigade Combat Team from Fort Campbell, Kentucky; and
 - WHEREAS, He attended St. Raphael Elementary School and Curie High School; when the family moved to Country Club Hills during his senior year, DeWayne earned his GED and trained to be a welder through Job Corps; for the next few years, he worked a series of jobs in Tennessee, Kansas, and the Southland; in November of 2004, he joined the United States Army along with his brother, DeShaun; and

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

- WHEREAS, While stationed at Fort Campbell, DeWayne seized the opportunity to attend Air Assault School; he served one tour in Iraq from 2005 to 2006; he was deployed in September of 2007 for his second tour of duty; it was during one of his military stints in Clarksville, Tennessee, that DeWayne met Syneca Beach and they were joined in holy matrimony on February 25, 2007; and
- WHEREAS, DeWayne loved to dance, draw cartoons of hip-hop characters, play pool and his PlayStation (at all hours of the night); he loved to write poetry and rap; he adored the family's dog, a Rottweiler named Zeus; and he also did a dead-on impression of Donald Duck; and
- WHEREAS, DeWayne White is survived by his wife, Syneca; his mother, Sandra; his step-father, Chester L. Miller, Sr.; his father, Lenell (Reneé) White, Jr.; his brothers, DeShaun White, Edwin White, and Chester Miller, Jr.; his sisters, Nekita Miller, DéJaneé White, and Kimberly (Korey) Miller-Highsmith; his grandmother, Geneva White; his grandfather, Paul Miller, Sr.; his very special niece, Jaida; and his soon-to-arrive niece, Makailah; his mother-in-law, Kova Thicklin; his brother-in-law, Seth Beach; his grandmother-in-law, Shirley Bluing; his grandfather-in-law, Chester (Laurine) Thicklin; and a host of aunts, uncles, cousins, and other relatives; therefore, be it
 - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-FIFTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we mourn, along with his family and friends, the passing of Private DeWayne White; and be it further

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

RESOLVED, That we honor the memory of Private DeWayne White and his willingness to serve our country, which led to him making the ultimate sacrifice; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the family of DeWayne White as a symbol of our respect and sympathy."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Riley."

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just indulge me for a moment. Some of us in this Body have done this and when you tell us about your fallen soldier, many of us have choked up, our chests were tight and maybe, just maybe, we said to ourselves, I just hope I don't have to do this. Well, I have to do this. Langston Hughes once said, what happens to dream deferred? Does it dry up and shrivel like a raisin in the sun? Private White's dreams will be relegated to eternity. I think about his life and the things that he did, the people that he touched, and when I heard about his death with all of the things that all of us have to think about at one particular time, my mind just started racing. And often, you know, art imitates life, life imitates art and I thought about the famous film Apocalypse Now, where one of the protagonist was a young innocent soldier named Clean, many of you remember. And the part that he played, it was almost, you know, like a Greek play. The part that he played was innocence, juxtaposed against this... this massive war and all of the contradictions attended to it. He got killed and his chief petty officer was holding him in his arms, crying about his loss as a tape was playing in the

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

background of his mother telling him about what was happening back home. What they we're going to do when they saw him again and how she told him take care of yourself and bring your little hiney back home. That never happened in the movie. It will not happen now. What's the best way to honor a young man like that whose... whose life and dreams were not deferred, but they were taken away from us because of his service. He will not see twenty-eight (28). hair will not get gray. The best way is to remember him as he was. There will be future honors. Matter of fact, the mayor of Country Club Hills was here today, I don't know if he's up in the gallery, but there will be a monument to Private White. But I just wanted to, along with your help, immortalize his life by dint of this Resolution as we keep him forever young in our hearts. The 101st Airborne Division is an air assault division and I remember they have a little song that they sing, which I will not sing, but I will tell you the words. And it basically goes, 'one oh worst, patch on my shoulder, one oh worst, Airborne Infantry'. Rest in peace, Private White, we will all remember you. God bless you. Thank you, Members of the House."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Riley moves for the adoption of the Death Resolution. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. On page 6 of the Calendar, under the order of House Bills-Third Reading, is House Bill 1841. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1841, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a very small Bill. It just requires cooperation in planning between the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning and RTA. That's all this Bill does. There's nothing controversial in this Bill at all. I seek an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for the passage of House Bill 1841. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Black: Representative, what will the purpose of this Bill be?

I don't think it has anything to do with the Amendment in the long run. Is this... do you plan to use this as a vehicle or a shell Bill in future negotiations?"

Hamos: "I'm trying to keep some options open in case we need to
 have something next week, to be honest."

Black: "One of... Thank you very much for your honesty. One can never have enough options in life, but we could see this Bill again. Correct?"

Hamos: "Well..."

Black: "I hope not, but we could."

Hamos: "Well, I hope that in just a few minutes we'll be calling a Motion to Concur, but... but we never what happens on the second floor."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Black: "All right. So, it would not be... it would not be ungentlemanly of me to say this... this perhaps is shell Bill."

Hamos: "It's a little... a little nicer than a shell Bill."

Black: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Hamos: "It has a... it has a valid purpose."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Hamos, do you wish to close?"

Hamos: "I just seek an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "So the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1841 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Sommers, Schmidt, Kosel, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 73 voting 'yes' and 42 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Bolin: "Attention Members, the Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's conference room."

Speaker Madigan: "Speaker Madigan in the Chair. On Supplemental Calendar #1, there appears House Bill 656, Representative Hamos. Representative Hamos, on a Motion to Concur."

Hamos: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I move to concur with Amendments 1, 4, and 5 to House Bill 656. I'm proud to be presenting what I hope will be final action on comprehensive, long-term transit funding and reform. Something we have worked on for over three (3) years. It's

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

been quite the effort. We hope this will be the final product the Governor will be able to support it. The only difference... this is a Bill that came out of the Senate and it almost mirrors the Bill we voted on yesterday, Senate Bill 572. Senate Bill 572 is again comprehensive funding and reform. The funding of transit in this Bill is a one quarter of one percent sales tax increase in the six-county region, a Chicago based real estate transfer tax, a state match that will compliment that, plus a one quarter of one percent increase in the sales tax for the five (5) collar counties for their own uses. Amendment 5 as it comes out of the Senate is a change from the Bill we had here yesterday. Amendment 5 allows the five (5) collar counties to use their quarter percent increase in sales tax not only for transportation, but also for public safety. All five (5) collar counties may do that at their own discretion. Just to remind everybody, I don't think we need much of a reminder, the way that we are thinking about the funding of Bill is that hundred million this one dollars (\$100,000,000) will be set aside to provide for ADA paratransit needs. This will carry us long into the future for disabled riders. We have a twenty million dollar (\$20,000,000) Suburban Mobility Community Fund, something that will assist especially the suburban areas with their mobility... their riders with mobility needs and this service will be provided by Pace. We have a ten million dollar (\$10,000,000) RTA Innovation, Coordination and Enhancement Fund to be able to finally test out some of those innovative transit solutions that are being worked on all

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

over the country. We have in here new bonding authority for of one billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) for Metra, again, to provided much needed, especially, suburb-tosuburb service and to be able to even match some of those federal dollars, really a capital program, within this The Chicago-based real estate transfer tax must be enacted by the mayor and city council if they wish to enact it, but if they do all of those dollars will be sent to the CTA for their CTA pension and retiree health care reforms. Ladies and Gentlemen, we've also provided for much needed reforms not only of the pension system, but for the RTA itself. This is based on some of the solutions of recommendations that were developed and were... auditor general that we adopted, but it's really to provide for better regional planning, fiscal oversight, and fare and service coordinations. So, this is a comprehensive Bill, this is an important Bill. This is for our worldclass region. To maintain our world-class region we need to have a world-class transit system. This is the Bill that will move us into the future that will allow us to be very competitive as a region for the International Olympics Committee. This is the Bill that will provide for better access to jobs for the people who depend on transit and who use transit. This is the Bill that will help keep us in a manageable state of congestion. Right now, we are already the second most congested region in the country. the Bill that really helps not only our region, but also downstate. We've also provided for better service, better operating assistance for the downstate transit agencies and

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

again, for those people downstate it may not be the two million (2,000,000) rides a day we have in our region, but for the people downstate who depend on transit and they often are seniors, disabled, workers, those are the people who need transit, this Bill will help them, too. This is a Bill for the state. It's not only for our area this is not a CTA bailout. It achieves regional balance and this is a Bill with fiscal restraints and it's fiscally responsible with a funding source. Again, I'm proud to be presenting want to thank again the very excellent, Ι hardworking House Mass Transit Committee, the unions that have been sitting at our side and really giving up and playing a role in accomplishing, first time ever, pension reforms of a public employee pension system. course, the hardworking executives and staff at all three (3) transit agencies and the RTA. I seek a strong 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I know we discussed this Bill in length yesterday. I think I gave my reasons at that time why I strongly support this Bill. The Sponsor, Representative Hamos, has given an excellent presentation as to all the parts of the Bill. In my opinion, this Bill is good for my district. It's good for the six-county regional area and it's good for the whole state because it's... there is funding for downstate mass transit. There's obviously funding for our six (6) areas and there's also funding for my area and my township and the surrounding township, to help those who are disabled

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

get to where they're going through township facilities that are being funded through Pace. So again, as I did yesterday, I strongly urge everyone here to support House Bill 656. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Miller."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Miller: "A question regarding the Suburban Mobility Fund. In the previous legislation, it was ramped up throughout the years and I think on our analysis it says that it's a twenty million dollar (\$20,000,000) grant. Just wanted... if you can sort of elaborate on the difference of how that's going to work?"

Hamos: "I believe we still have a twenty million dollar (\$20,000,000) from the fund within the RTA for the Suburban Community Mobility Fund. In addition to that, there will be a south suburban job access program that it also has made some commitments and will be ramped up over a couple years."

Miller: That... that is still included in..."

Hamos: "Oh, yes."

Miller: "...in this legislation. The ramping up part is still there? And not to get into discussion about it, but that piece is still there?"

Hamos: "Yes."

Miller: "The issues regarding minority procurement, it's still there?"

Hamos: "Yes."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Miller: "With the additional bond authority from the CTA, the CTA makes those decisions. That provision is still there?" Hamos: "Yes."

Miller: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I would like to compliment the Sponsor for her hard work. I was Vice Chair of Mass Transit when the committee first began. What she's been able to do in working with Members on both sides of the aisle and with both chambers is to expand the pie. When we looked at mass transit and trying to change the formula it was a situation where trying to take from Peter to pay Paul. But in this scenario we've been able to do what the people of the State of Illinois has asked us to. meaningful reforms that have been required and needed by the CTA and other transit boards and the concessions by the union and the fact that the General Assembly is acting responsibly to meet the needs of our constituents, of our riders, no just in the City of Chicago, but in south suburban, where I represent, and all northeast Illinois including downstate. Once this Bill passes, which I hope it does, it's up to the Governor of the State of Illinois to sign this legislation expeditiously. Citizens of the State of Illinois need this. We demand it and we expect it. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Yesterday, well, actually today, I'm a little under the weather, cold, temperature and frankly, didn't feel up to yesterday, but I can't let this go by. You know, to a downstater, it's abundantly clear that the power base of this state is

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Chicago. There's no doubt that Chicago Leadership is going to deliver for Chicago. What ticks me off, though, are my downstate House Democratic colleagues, who abandon us yesterday, as downstaters. The Senate Democrats stuck with us. Senate downstate Democrats stuck with us. What happened to the House downstate Democrats? Guess you threw in with Chicago ward bosses."

Speaker Madigan: "Wonder if I might exercise a prerogative of the Chair and state for the record that I think I played a significant role in the FutureGen project and I'm from Chicago. Mr. Joyce."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Sponsor yields."

Joyce: "Julie, I just have one question. What is the purpose of the having a shell Amendment?"

Hamos: "Well, you mean House Amendment 1... Senate Amendment 1?"

Joyce: "Correct."

Hamos: Senate Amendment 1 should have been withdrawn, but accidentally wasn't, so we we're required to do something with it."

Joyce: "Okay then, so I understand if we don't concur with it then they'd have to go and take action again."

Hamos: "Correct."

Joyce: "The question then is sending a shell Amendment to the Governor does allow him anymore leniency in acting on the final... taking final action on this?"

Hamos: "We believe that the Bill is engrossed and what the Governor receives is all of the Amendments engrossed together as one Bill."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Joyce: "So, there's no extra lines or anything that he can play with?"

Hamos: "No."

Joyce: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative Hamos, I know I didn't talk about these Bills yesterday and previously, when we talked about one of the Bills that I was against I think we kind of ended the conversation on a very bad note. And I know this might put you on the spot, but say on a scale of one to ten or whatever, how would you characterize this Bill along with your first Bill, which I supported and thought was a good Bill with a little tweaking necessary?"

Hamos: "This is essentially the same Bill."

Mulligan: So, basically this is a pretty good Bill for the people that supported all the work that was done by the committee over the past several years to come together with a really good Bill."

Hamos: "I think this is a really serious piece of public policy. I think one of the Members on your side acknowledged that yesterday. And that's what this Bill does. It's fiscally responsible and it creates a real balance in the system for moving forward on transit."

Mulligan: "All right. So, as far as operations goes, this covers operations. But as far as capital, it still does not cover capital."

Hamos: "That's correct. We still need a capital Bill."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Mulligan: "All right. So, in order to get federal funding for capital, we still need to pass a capital Bill that would address the capital to make the equipment and the tracks and everything better than what it should be?"

Hamos: "I think this a very important point and I want to make sure that people do understand that this is for operating budget. For the people in our communities who are worried about slow zones, who are impacted by slow zones, that requires a capital investment. And that's why they really do go hand in hand."

Mulligan: "And as far as the transfer tax go, is that transfer tax imposed only upon properties in Chicago?"

Hamos: "Yes. This is..."

Mulligan: "And only if the city council has the courage to pass it if they need it?"

Hamos: "We're asking them to be partners in this effort, yes."

Mulligan: "All right. To the Bill. I supported the concept of this and I certainly commend Representative Hamos for all her hard work and some of the Members on our side of aisle, particularly, Representative Mathias and Bassi, for working on this for a lot of years. Probably when they started off, they didn't realize it was going to be such a job or the politics of it. I also represent a little bit of Chicago, although, I represent more of suburban area. For the people that have faxed me against the transfer tax and the realtors, first of all, isn't impacted yet. And secondly, I think public transportation enhances the property values, not only of Chicago, but of the surrounding suburbs. We don't live there because we like

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

O'Hare noise or we like the flooding. We live there because it's convenient to get into the jobs in the city or where we're traveling. It's convenient to be able to get downtown or to come back out. It's convenient for our disabled people to move around, get where they're going. So, I think it's really good that we support this. As far as some of my colleagues being unhappy about not getting capital, I certainly understand that. And I certainly support you. I may not support exactly the way you want to fund it, but I certainly support the fact that the state has not had a capital Bill that is reasonable for last number of years which is causing problems. But in many instances, all of us know that whether you need 60 votes of whether you need 71 votes, you don't get them all from your colleagues on your side of the aisle. You don't get them always from colleagues in your region. You get them from all over. I support you, you support me back. For the Governor, why you would make a pledge on any tax issue as the major policy leader of this state is beyond me. Your responsibility as the leader of this state and as the policy maker is to weigh what the state needs and to address it appropriately in the context of what is going on with the economy and with the Federal Government. To make a pledge in one vein and say, well, I can break this, whether it be for gambling, which I think is more moral, than making a pledge on whether you're going to support a small sales tax, which seems appropriate, seems to me to be lacking in responsibility for your fiduciary responsibility of how this state is run. I would suggest to him that

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

people in this Body, although you may not respect us totally, have spent a lot of time coming up with the best solution they could in a way that we think is appropriate with a very small amount of sales tax, which lets the area function without coming back begging to us all the time to take care of operations. I would strongly suggest that he put aside what he considers campaign pledge for the fact of running the state efficiently in one effort maybe in the last five (5) years. I would encourage him strongly to sign this and not start playing games with tinkering with it, because a lot of people have spent a lot of time working on what they feel could be the best solution. And to make those changes would not be either appropriate or smart. Take your fiduciary responsibility as the leader. Figure out what's good for the area and do what you should do for a change. I would suggest that he support this and sign it. And then get on with making reasonable discussions on a capital Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Excuse me. Will the Sponsor yield for just a couple quick questions?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: Representative Hamos, I just want to make sure I understand the changes. You mentioned that this Bill allows for all collar counties to... excuse me, I have a Senator that has lost his way and I can't see the Sponsor. Could you explain specifically what types of leeway or flexibility we're providing those collar counties as far as

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

spending revenue from the sales tax increase and what portion of it?"

Hamos: "Under this Bill, the collar counties will have an additional half percent increase... half of one percent increase in the sales tax. Half of that, in other words one quarter of one percent, goes to the RTA for the transit system. And then half of that, the other quarter of one percent, is sent to the county directly for their own uses and we've identified for their ... spent according to their own digression and we've identified two uses Amendment... Senate Amendment 5. One is transportation purposes and second is public safety. And I'd like to point out that if they choose they could decide to bond the portion that they receive for transportation purposes for local road projects. That's an example, but that will be in their discretion."

Eddy: "Okay. So... so this Body is going to vote on a Bill that would tax those individuals on sales tax in that entire area without a referendum, but for specific purposes of use with mass transit initially, but now that's been expanded to include public safety. So in effect, if you vote for this Bill, you're voting for a sales tax increase for public safety without referendum."

Hamos: "Well, we are providing for two kinds of uses for the five (5) collar counties. That is correct."

Eddy: "So, I mean, I just... I hear folks all the time on this floor say I never vote for anything unless there's a front-door referendum or the people who are being taxed have the opportunity. Now, we all understood the mass transit here

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

and we understood that was the purpose of this and that we were... we were going to have to pass something and I understand that and I fully expect that. I guess my concern comes when we begin to, you know, add different ... and I understand probably that's done in the spirit of compromise to include votes, but I have a little bit of a concern with us becoming, you know, that Body or the Body that does that and takes that... because I think they could probably pass a public safety referendum, front door, if they've chose to do that without us doing it for them. would hope they could. Otherwise, what we're doing is something that the people don't want, but they're using us to do it. Does that characterize some of this? have here is the General Assembly acting as the referenda for that local question having to do with safety issues. And if that's the point of this... I just want folks to understand that that's one of the aspects they're voting on here. And I fully understand why you did it that way, but it's something we need to pay attention to. I'm a little disappointed on the capital, too, but I understand this needs to get done and I understand that we often work on issues that are complicated at the end, but I appreciate the fact that I had the opportunity to point that out to the folks that are going to vote on this. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Osterman."

Osterman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to commend the Sponsor, Representative Hamos, for her efforts over these many, many months. I want to thank my downstate colleagues for their vote yesterday and hope that they will

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

be here today and to each Member of this Body who has articulated the need for a capital program for our state. As a Chicago Representative, I share that feeling. And I think that we as a Body need to work towards that end. want to use that to repair the infrastructure for transit the Chicagoland area in my community, but that's something that we need to work on together. As my colleague, Representative Miller, touched on earlier, the Senate has acted on this. It is my hope that we collectively will act favorably on this legislation and then it will leave it with the Governor of our state and this message is simply to him. Governor Blagojevich, on behalf of my constituents, on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of transportation riders in our state that rely each day on transportation, we demand that you sign this Bill when it gets to your desk."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Joe Lyons."

Lyons: "Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question.

Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The
'ayes' have it. The previous question is moved. The Chair
recognizes Representative Hamos to close."

Hamos: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, I feel like we've had a very good discussion. We've debated this Bill. We've considered this Bill. I did want to point out that I added all of the cosponsors from the initial Senate Bill 572. You're now cosponsors of this Bill, because this is the Bill that we plan to pass today and it will go to the Governor's desk. And if all goes well, he can be the hero

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

- and we will have a strong transit system going into the future. And if all goes well, we will never have to discuss mass transit again. Please vote 'aye'. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 4, and 5?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 62 people voting 'yes', 51 people voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments # 1, 4, and 5. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We'd like to add to the record, if we could, that Representative Kosel is excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Let the record reflect the excused absence of Representative Kosel. On page 13 of the Calendar, on the Order of a Mandatory Veto Motions, there appears Senate Bill 783. The Chair recognizes Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 I would move that we concur or accept the Governor's

 Amendatory Veto, an action that would allow us to..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig. Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "We need to get the right the Bill... Okay, we got the right Bill on the board, now."
- Speaker Madigan: "Senate Bill 783, it's on page 13 of the Calendar. Mr. Black. Black. Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 This... I would move that the House accept the Amendatory

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Veto of the Governor, an action that the Senate has already And this will then be the final step that we need to take to enact the changes that we made last year for our This will conclude that long, rocky, and FY08 budget. sometimes winding road that we went down as we put together an FY08 Budget. Now, most of what is in the 'bimp' Bill The Governor made two changes. remains unchanged. first had to do with a date for special education reimbursements. The State Board of Education had given us the language, but upon further review it was found that that was incorrect and so the Governor simply corrected that through his Amendatory Veto. The second item had to deal with an inconsistency, where the amount of money that was appropriated differed from the amount of money that we had authorized under the Road Fund cap. The Governor's amendatory change simply makes those consistent. by accepting the Governor's amendatory change we will once and for all finalize the FY08 budget and that will mean, for example, that the State Board of Education will then be able to recalculate the amounts of money that they owe to our schools and to finally make them whole by providing the four hundred dollar (\$400) increase in the per pupil that we had agreed upon back in August. There are other things in this that deal with the Long-term Care Provider Fund, rate increases for IMDs and nursing homes, the Poverty Hold Harmless Grant language. These are all items that we're in the 'bimp' Bill originally and were not changed by the Governor. But again, by taking final action here today we can put this on the statute book and our school districts

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

can begin to receive the additional moneys that we promised them back in August. So, I would move that we accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black. Please be brief."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Black."

Black: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lyons in the Chair. See you, Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I join with Representative Hannig and I don't think we need to spend 5, 10, 15 minutes debating this Bill. We all know what it is. unfortunate that it's taken us six (6) months to get to this point. The budget implementation Bill and the money that is so desperately needed by our schools, the way that this has been handled will certainly never appear in anyone's book about profile of courage. But we are where we are and what has taken place has taken place. It is now time to move forward. Hopefully, we can get information from the State Board of Education on how they intend to make these payments in the remaining six (6) months of the fiscal year. And I would hope those of you who will be here for the next fiscal year will vow that this is not the way we should do the work that we're sent here to do. There is no reason that I can fathom that this has taken us six (6) months to get to this point. But it's here and at least being here now is better than never being here at all. So I join with Representative Hannig. I urge an

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

'aye' vote on the long-delayed and sometimes, I fear, often ignored, budget implementation Bill. It deserves an 'aye' vote. And I hope it will get an 'aye' vote. And I hope it passes tomorrow and I hope the money is on its way to the school systems, who so desperately need it, by the end of the month."

Speaker Lyons: "Chair recognizes Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Bob Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "He indicates he will."

- Pritchard: "Mr. Hannig, is there any idea how the State Board is going to distribute the funding so that all of the money that we've budgeted and allocated here will be paid to the school districts?"
- Hannig: "Yes. The intent would be that all the money would...
 that were due school districts would be paid. And so, I
 think they will have to devise a methodology where they can
 look at what a school district really should have received
 by January of '08 versus what actually received and then
 make up the difference."
- Pritchard: "Make up the difference during the balance payments here in the 2008 year?"
- Hannig: Right. So... so it would be the State Board's job to work to insure that the school districts receive all the moneys that were appropriated to them when we put this Bill on the Governor's desk the first time."
- Pritchard: "We also have had legislation this last year that didn't seem to pass the Senate that dealt with assuring school districts that the twenty-third and twenty-fourth

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

- payment would be made in this fiscal year. Is there any indication whether this money is in the budget and whether we're going to do battle with the Governor's Office on the twenty-third and twenty-forth payment?"
- Hannig: "I'm not sure that we actually addressed that issue in the 'bimp' Bill. I didn't see it in there, Representative.

 So, I guess I'm uncertain how to answer your question."
- Pritchard: Well, that's certainly going to be an issue that my school districts have already alerted me as a concern that we have this perennial battle about whether the payments are going to be made in this fiscal year to avoid some of the financial watch issues. So, I think that's something this Body is going to have to deal with."
- Hannig: "I would agree with you, Representative. Maybe that's something we ought to put in statute in a way that we are comfortable with."
- Pritchard: "And I certainly intend to introduce some legislation, I'd appreciate your support on that. I think this Bill is long overdue and like other speakers here, I would urge a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Rosemary Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Mulligan: "Representative Hannig, it's your understanding that aside from what the Amendatory Veto was that the spirit of what was actually passed in this Bill is still there and the moneys will be paid for?"

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Hannig: "Yes, that's my intention. The Governor made two changes: One to dealt with the Road Fund cap and one to dealt with the date for special education reimbursements.

I think we agree with both of those and everything else remained the same."

Mulligan: "I don't know if it would impact this Bill at all, but I had been contacted by a constituent in my district, who had a complaint about the nursing... what was happening with the nursing home that his mother was at, in that, she losing services because of the Governor's would be Amendatory Veto. When I checked, what I actually found out was that there's a rule change that was put out as a... an emergency rule that would cut back services for nursing homes, but it was also in conjunction with the MDS raise and that you couldn't separate them. And if we went against it what would happen is the raise might be in jeopardy, buy yet, they were cutting services and they were cutting them retroactively, going back to when they were actually provided after the first of the year, which I think is a little difficult to do at this point.

Hannig: "I think..."

Mulligan: "This Bill will not change that, that's strictly by rule. Correct?"

Hannig: "That's correct, Representative."

Mulligan: "So, in other words we would have to challenge the rule in some way, but I mean I don't think that..."

Hannig: "Or we could change the statute."

Mulligan: "All right. That would... I have a problem with them giving them a raise and then cutting services. It's kind

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

of like a backdoor way of putting the money... it's a wash for them instead of giving them the raise that they anticipated, particularly since it's going to be at the, you know, disadvantage to the residents as far as what they do, plus for services provided that they thought they were going to be reimbursed for and now they're not going to be reimbursed for it. I just wanted to make sure that this... the way he did the Amendatory Veto had nothing to do with that and we just have to look at it by the rule. Correct?"

- Hannig: "Yes, that's correct, Representative. The budget implementation Bill did not address that and would not change it for the better or the worse."
- Mulligan: "Well, it's always good to get a Budget Implementation Act passed before we get the new budget when we're that close, it's always... it's an interesting way of doing business."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Hannig to close."
- Hannig: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Indeed, this is the Budget Implementation Act that with our vote at this time will finally put this Bill on the statute books and finalize this chapter of our FY08 budget debate. So, I would simply ask for your 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Shall the House...

 Representative Dunkin. The question is, Ladies and
 Gentlemen, 'Shall the House accept the specific

 recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 783?'

 All those in favor should signify by voting 'yes'; those
 oppose vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who

 wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bob Molaro."

Molaro: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Seeing that Representative Lang is still in the room, now that we have solved mass transit and we just agreed with a unanimous vote with the Governor, I would call on Representative Lang. Let's call the gaming Bill right now while we're in the mood and do gaming for capital and then we could be done for the whole year. So... and... while... while Jim is still here, too..."

Speaker Lyons: "I think, Representative, we'll quit while we're ahead for today. The Chair recognizes Representative David Reis, David."

Reis: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "State your point."

Reis: "I object to Representative Molaro's Motion. We all want to get home and I don't want to belay that. While we're talking about funding and finishing up the fiscal year '08 budget, would like to draw attention and hope that the Governor would listen to our pleas to release the funds for the conservation district offices that get assistance in their operating money each year to help pay for staff and pay for their office rents and such. We are six (6) months into the fiscal year and none of our conservation offices throughout the State of Illinois have gotten any of their money yet because the Governor won't release those funds. They have a little bit of cushion in some funds that they

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

get from grain drill rentals and things like that that's help them cash flow through this, but we're getting a lot of calls from our conservation offices saying they can't keep their lights on anymore. We need to release this important funding. And they do waterways. They do no-till assist farmers with that. It's a conservation-minded money that the State of Illinois helps spend and the Governor needs to release those funds. enough time... enough is enough of this administration borrowing money on the backs of our Medicaid providers, our cities now, our conservation offices, and the such. So, we plea with the Governor and I hope everyone here will join me in urging the Governor to release these important funds."

- Speaker Lyons: "Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative John Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair. Now, that the 'bimp' has been finalized, does this mean the last Session is now officially over?"
- Speaker Lyons: "I don't have a direct answer for that, Representative Fritchey, but we'll... we'll look into that and get back to you."
- Fritchey: "So, Groundhog Day continues."
- Speaker Lyons: "Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."
- Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

- Black: "Yes. Could the Chair give me the odds on hearing a gaming Bill today? What's the latest line?"
- Speaker Lyons: "I think between slim and none, but we could also check with Representative Molaro, if he's still on the floor."
- Black: "Well, I'm always looking for an investment opportunity.

 I just wondered what the line was at this time. Not very favorable odds, I take it."
- Speaker Lyons: "Just keep the checkbook handy, Representative Black."

Black: "Always next to my heart, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Bost."

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

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry, Representative."

Bost: "Yes. I just wondered since we just finally did actually pass the budget to its fullest extent and it took that long to do it, do you think we should go ahead and stick around and start this year's budget tomorrow, go ahead and just put it through the cycle and just see what we can do?"

Speaker Lyons: "An awfully good idea, Representative, we'll take that under consideration."

Bost: "I mean, that's first time I've ever seen like a sevenmonth period that actually... after we passed it out of here to get it back."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, another inquiry of the Chair if I might."

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry, Representative."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

- Black: "I don't know where we are in the process. I mean, usually when we finish one Session, you know, we take some time and thank the staff, Democrat and Republican staff and all of those people who've helped us through this last... last year in the General Assembly, but I don't know if we're there yet. Is it time to thank everybody for all the work they did in the first year of the 95th General Assembly or should we wait to do that?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, I think it's always a good time to thank the wonderful staffs that the Democrats and Republicans have in the House of Representatives, but I don't know if this will be the actual final time..."

Black: "Yes."

- Speaker Lyons: "...that we will be coming together under this Session."
- Black: "I... I... Well, in case we are, just let me thank the House Republican staff for a job well done as always, the House Democrat staff for their usual outstanding job, and a special tip of the hat to the Governor's staff for keeping us in this state of confusion for these past several months."
- Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, seeing no further business to come before the House of Representatives, the House will stand adjourn... Representative Currie moves that the House stand adjourned into perfunctory schedule and we'll retire... we'll go into Perfunctory Session at the conclusion of this Session. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned. Safe trip."

206th Legislative Day

1/10/2008

Clerk Bolin: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introductions of Resolutions. House Resolution 892, offered by Representative Dunkin. House Resolution 896, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Joint Resolution 83, offered by Representative Reis. House Joint Resolution 84, offered by Representative Verschoore. House Joint Resolution 85, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. These Resolutions are referred to the House Rules Committee. Having no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned until Friday, January 11."