271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Speaker Lyons: "Good morning, everyone. The Illinois House of Representatives will come to order. Members are asked to please be at their desks. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend Ben Johnston, who is the pastor of the Grace Presbyterian Church of Peoria in Peoria, Illinois. Johnston is the quest of Reverend Representative) Schock. And again today we'll be honored, from also from Grace Presbyterian Church, Rachel Kramer will sing God Bless America. Members are asked to please silence their desktops. And Members and quests in the gallery are asked to please refrain from turning on cell phones or pagers and also rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Reverend Johnston."

Reverend Johnston: "Let's pray together. Our Father, as we bow our heads and our hearts, we come before You recognizing that Your word says, 'to be still and to know that I am God. I will be exalted among the nations. I will be exalted on the earth.' Father, even as Abraham Lincoln said of our nation in times of trial, 'we've become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and persevering grace, too proud to pray to the God who made us.' We've grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no other nation has grown, but we have forgotten God. Today we want to remember You and we want to remember our need for You. The setting aside differences, we do want to unite our hearts and pray for those in need. We pray for Senator Kennedy and his family. We pray for our President. pray for our Governor. Father, I also want to pray for this Body. We thank You for them and for the leadership

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

that they provide to this state. Father, even today I pray that You would give them a spirit of unity, camaraderie, and cooperation. Father, I pray that wisdom would guide each and every decision, that You would guard their steps with integrity. And Lord, I do pray for each one here, for their staffs, for their constituents. Lord, You recognized the burden of leadership. Father, You also know each and every individual and their needs, their personal concerns, their family needs. And I pray right now that they might have Your peace and Your grace and I pray that today would be a great day as they do the work for this great state. Father, we thank You for Your faithfulness to us. Lord, we do ask that You would bless this nation. We pray especially for those who are serving in our Armed Forces overseas, who are in harm's way. We pray for peace. pray that You would bring them home safely. And Lord, we ask Your blessing upon our nation and I pray this in the name of the One who is the way and the truth and the life, Amen."

Speaker Lyons: "And from the Speaker's Gallery, we'll be led in God Bless America by Ms. Rachel Kramer."

Rachel Kramer: "Sings God Bless America."

Speaker Lyons: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Danny Reitz."

Reitz - 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."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Speaker Lyons: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, Democrats."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Will Davis and Harry Osterman are excused today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Michael Bost, GOP."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that

 Representative Black and Watson are the excused on the

 Republican side of the aisle."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you Representative. Mr. Clerk, take the roll. There are 114 Members responding to the Roll Call, we have a quorum present. Representative Dan Brady."
- Brady: "Good morning, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans will caucus in Room 118 and then return here to the floor. A Republican Caucus now in Room 118."
- Speaker Lyons: "Dan, do you have any idea how long you will be down there, approximately?"

Brady: "I'm thinking... I don't know."

Speaker Lyons: "Hour, hour and a half?"

Brady: "Probably somewhere in the 45 minute range, give or take. Maybe about an hour."

Speaker Lyons: "About an hour."

Brady: "Yeah."

- Speaker Lyons: "Thereabouts, okay. So, we'll stand at ease to the call of the Chair."
- Speaker Turner: "The House will come to order. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on May 21, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration', referred to the Order of House Bills-Second Reading is House Bill 2759; 'recommends be adopted' is Amendment #3 to House Bill 6378, Amendment #2 to House Bill 6488, and Amendment #2 to House Bill 6561."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin, for what reason do you rise?"

Dunkin: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "State your point."

Dunkin: "Members of the Illinois House of Representatives, good morning. Today is a very distinguished honor for me to present for the very first time the wonderful sorority and fraternity, Zeta Phi Beta Sorority in our gallery to my left, and the brothers... the great brothers of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Incorporated, right here behind me as well. Welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield."

Dunkin: "This is an honor and a huge privilege for someone like myself to welcome them here for the first time, because the members of the Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Incorporated, are one of the world's renowned organizations that do a tremendous job of culture for service and service for humanity in every aspect of the community wherever they are, as well as the Zeta Phi Betas. And just a brief history of the Zetas and the Sigma. The... I'll start with the Zetas. From the sorority's inception the Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Incorporated, has had a long... has demonstrated an

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

interest in the serving the needs of the community, spanning the sorority's nearly thirty-year partnership with the March of Dimes to its relationship with the Human Genome Project, Zeta Phi Beta has been at the forefront of anticipating the ever-changing needs of society. within this framework that the International Grand Basileus Barbara C. Moore, proudly introduced the International Service Initiative for Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Incorporated, called Z-HOPE, Zetas Helping Other People Z-HOPE is an outreach service program that has six (6) primary objectives, corresponding measures of success and a mechanism for chapter recognition. The primary are objectives to provide culturally appropriate information activities according to the Z-HOPE program format, to foster collaborative partnerships community organizations with shared goals, to promote the opportunities for expansion in the Stork's Nest program, to facilitate community service and mentorship opportunities for members of the organization, to provide an equitable chapter recognition program for community service (sicservices rendered) and rendered, to provide a standard reporting format to concentrate efforts and demonstrate the The founders of Zeta Phi Beta organization's impact. Sorority were women who believe in the need for a new and different type of Greek-lettered organization and acted upon that need. To these women, Zeta was more than just an organization, it was a movement, a belief system that reflected at its core value the desire to provide true service, to embrace scholarship, to set a standard for

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

sisterly love, and to define the noble concept of finer womanhood. This belief has sustained and encouraged Zetas around the world to hold fast to the ideals initiated and developed by its earliest members. Today, we'd like to thank the women of Zeta Phi Beta Sorority for their service to the community. On the brothers' side of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Incorporated, a speech given by Abraham McCarthy Walker, who was also a charter member of our beloved fraternity said, 'I believe in the principles of Phi Beta Sigma and I will hold... I will herald and defend it against the world.' Our motto, culture for service and service for humanity."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin. Representative Dunkin, there's a Resolution you were supposed to do. I don't know what you're reading, but we're going to ask the Clerk if he'll read that Resolution right now..."

Dunkin: "I'm wrappin' up, your honor."

Speaker Turner: "...and we'll adopt the Resolution and you're through. Clerk, will you read the Resolution."

Dunkin: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Finish up, Mr. Dunkin. Go ahead, finish up."

Dunkin: "Our motto, culture for service and service for humanity. Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity has a long history of men in service, not only in this country, but the international community as well. A. Philip Randolph, the late great Harold Washington, who served right here in this chamber. Kwame Nkrumah, the former and late president of Ghana, sports figures such as Emmitt Smith, Jerry Rice, Karl Malone, and many, many more. It's our sister

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

sorority, that being that we're the only fraternity and sorority that is constitutionally bound to each other and that... that royal bond would have been remiss if I would not have concluded (sic-included) the great women of Zeta Phi Beta Sigma... Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Incorporated and this Just as Phi Beta Sigma has a great day of resolution. great history of members, so goes the wonderful grace and beauty of beautiful women of Zeta Phi Beta, Zora Neale Hurston, Esther Rolle, as well as a host of other influential women that have dedicated their life to bringing justice and a voice to all people. I stand here proud to be a member of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Incorporated, not only to service for community but servicing all over here in the world. So with that, Ladies and Gentlemen, again, I'd like to welcome the Zetas and the Sigmas to the Capitol here for this historic and first annual visit. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, you can now read the Resolution."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Dunkin. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Referred to the House Committee on Rules and introduction of ru... Resolutions. House Resolution 1328, offered by Representative Mulligan. House Resolution 1329, offered by Representative Dunkin. And House Resolution 1330, offered by Representative Dunkin."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Howard, for what reason do you rise?"

Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, I join with my legislative colleagues today in welcoming Zeta Phi Beta Sorority and Phi Beta Sigma

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Fraternity to Springfield. It is wonderful to see that my fellow members of the Panhellenic Council have come to meet and discuss with us issues affecting communities across our state. My Greek brothers and sisters, may this day be a productive one for each of you. I urge you to continue working to improve the quality of life for all of us. My best wishes especially go to staff members, Kish and Kelly, to my colleague, Representative Ken Dunkin and to my constituent, Judge Carl Anthony Walker. Thank you."

- Speaker Turner: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to move to the order of budget. And if you would take your seats and listen attentively... Mr. Clerk, on page 29 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 6377. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6377, a Bill for an Act making appropriations has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If... if it would please the Chair, I would simply ask that we adopt the Amendment and then we would debate the Bill on Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "Gary Hannig... Mr. Hannig moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 6377. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6377, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Let me begin by simply reminding everyone about the process that we've undertaken so far in putting together our FY09 budget. I think most of us are aware that as early as March we've had a number of regional hearings around the State of Illinois where we took our show on the road to visit various parts of the State of Illinois and seek out input as to what people wish to have in this state budget. We didn't simply ask them to come to Springfield and testify, we tried to go to them and get their input and I think we recognized that the nineteen (19) regional hearings were successful, that over forty-three hundred (4300) citizens attended, we had over twelve hundred (1200) witnesses, we had Representatives and Senators from both Parties participate. We had the normal hearings that the House of Representatives have where each and every agency came and presented their budget to the chairman and Members of the committee and all those other interested parties who wished to attend. We had the chance to ask questions, to get answers, to try to find options. We had an opportunity for advocates and opponents of proposals to come in and make their stat... their case as well. So now that time has gone and it's important for us as we face the last few weeks of this Legislative Session to begin the process of

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

actually crafting a budget that we can send to the Senate and on to the Governor. The approach that we're taking today in these budgets is a bit different than what we've done in the past. In the past, we often came here with one budget and one Bill that was agreed to by the House and the Senate and the Executive branch. But this is a different approach today, which reflects the views from the Members of the appropriation committee, the Members of this House chamber, and the members of people and groups who gave us input in this budget. The first budget that we're going to debate is what I would call frontline services budget, and this is the budget to pay for the salaries of those people who answer the phone, who send out the mail, who process the paperwork. These are people who are not in management, but these are the people that show up every day and do the work. It also includes a portion of the expenses that are necessary to keep these agencies open. It includes the rent, the utilities, some of the travel, those kind of items. So, in fact, if you take this operational budget and the next one that follows for management people, you'll have essentially put together... So, I understand that we have an important guest and so, Mr. Speaker, could I take this out of the record for a moment and we'll resume shortly."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman asks leave to take the Bill out of the record and the Bill will be taken out. Mr. Speaker in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if everyone could please take their seat, if the staff would retire to the

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

rear of the chamber. If everyone could please take their seats. We have a special quest today. We're very pleased today to greet the Consul General from Mexico to Chicago and to the Midwest region. We are all aware of the increasingly... the increasing relationship between not only the State of Illinois and Mexico, but the entire United States of America and Mexico. This has been reflected in the NAFTA agreement. It's been reflected in relationship between the countries regarding fighting the trafficking. In addition, the countries are working together concerning immigration and documentation of those living both here and in Mexico. Manuel Rodriguez Arriaga has recently been appointed as the consul from the Government of Mexico, stationed in Chicago. He's relatively new to this area, but he has a long history in the Mexican foreign service, serving in various locations all across the world and in Mexico City. He's come here today to offer remarks concerning the current relationship and the relationship into the future between the government of Mexico, the country of Mexico and the State of Illinois. So, it is my pleasure to give you Manuel Rodriguez Arriaga."

Manuel Rodriguez Arriaga: "Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you very much. Thank you very much for your very kind remarks. Honorable Michael J. Madigan, Speaker of the House of Representatives, distinguished Representatives of Illinois, it is my great honor as Consul General of Mexico in this part of the United States, to pay my respects to the General Assembly of Illinois through its distinguished

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

House of Representatives. Since its creation in 1818, the great State of Illinois has played a significant role in the building of this country as one in which freedom, equality of opportunities, and justice must prevail. General Assembly and its House of Representatives, particular, have consistently been a voice in Illinois's pioneering and progressive development, in its antislavery past and in the continued fight for the rights of women, children, and workers. This is a Legislative Body that has historically understood the value of immigration understands today that the promising future has to be built hand-in-hand, usina all of the valuable productive capacities and with fair and effective cooperation with other countries, beginning with neighbors both from the north and south. The government of Mexico's representation has deep roots in this part of the United States. establishment of its Consul General in Chicago in 1884, Mexico expressed a strategic interest in this region then experiencing an important process of economic expansion in which the initiative and work of immigrants was fundamental. The cumulative process of the Mexican presence in the Midwest which began in those years has produced a phenomenon that translates today into large communities that positively influence demographic, economic, and social progress. The phenomenon continues today even though in an uncertain ambiance sometimes adverse for Mexican immigrants. The absence comprehensive immigration reform has undermined what seems obvious to all of us, that our people are needed and are

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

productive. In contrast, Illinois's open responsible policies towards them are more appreciated than It is in the benefit of our two (2) countries for the good of our peoples and not only for that of our respective economies to find effective solutions immigration. Likewise, it is of utmost importance to work together in expanding the borders of North America's regional, economic, and social development. In June 2007, a report by the White House Council of Economic Advisors recognized that and I quote, 'Immigrants are a critical part of the U.S. workforce and contribute to productivity, growth, and technological advancement.' The report also found that the long grown impact of immigration on public budgets is prone to be positive. Projection of future taxes and government spending estimate that immigrants and their descendants could contribute about eighty thousand dollars (\$80,000) more in taxes than they would receive in public services. As in the past, immigrants display a strong work ethic and their children tend to assimilate in terms of language acquisition and educational attainment. Another relevant finding in the report is that immigrants have lower crime rates than natives. Mexican immigrants are a highly motivated and entrepreneurial work force already making an enormous contribution to the economy of Illinois. They account for a significant percentage of its total household income and labor force. They are a young population expected to increasingly fill labor gaps and positively contribute to the region's tax bases. last fifteen (15) years, history has proven that advances

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

in Mexican prosperity correlate to prosperity for the U.S. Bilateral trade between the U.S. and Mexico has quadrupled since the North American Free Trade Agreement entering into force in 1994. Mexico is now the second largest market for U.S. goods, accounting for a hundred and thirty-six billion dollars (\$136,000,000,000) worth of exports in 2007. U.S. exports to Mexico are today greater than those of the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands combined. At the same time, Mexico is the third largest exporter of goods to the United States. In accordance, Mexico's economic relationship with the State of Illinois has also witnessed a very positive development. Mexico is now Illinois's second largest trading partner, only after Canada, a neighboring country very close to this state; 7.4 percent of this state's exports go to Mexico, a market that has increased 6.5 percent in 2007. Moreover, in the first trimester of 2008 those exports increased by almost 11 percent. Last February, President Felipe de Calderón made his first working visit to the U.S. as President of Mexico. His program included four (4) states, one of them Illinois. Here he made his most significant statement on challenge that immigration poses on his government and on that of the U.S. Before the largest audience of the tour as well and in his meetings with the state and local the President stressed the government's authorities, commitment to contribute to the well-being of the Mexican communities in this country and likewise its willingness to work with U.S. institutions and people prepared to forge stronger bilateral relations in the political, economic,

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

and cultural spheres. He clearly recognizes the need to further Mexico's economic growth and employment. President offered to strengthen Mexico's consular network in the U.S, something that is already taking place with larger investments in human resources and infrastructure. Nevertheless, the consular general in Chicago with jurisdiction in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Indiana, was able to significantly increase its services last year with the same number of people and instruments that in 2006, producing 140 percent more consular documentation around hundred thousand (200,000) a year, widening protection of Mexican nationals' rights, and developing new answers to support that we're communicating in sensitive areas like education and preventive health. With a 30 percent larger budget in 2008, we expect to extend our services much further. Along with the human dimension of the consular work, our consular representation in Illinois looks to increasingly contribute to the dialogue, cooperation, and exchanges necessary to broaden relations between Mexico and this part of the United States. purpose requires strengthening communication authorities and constructing more bridges for strategic business partnerships as well as for collaboration between institutions dedicated to research, education, and culture. The support of this House of Representatives to those purposes could be very relevant. For years, legislative activity favorable to immigrants has projected the State of Illinois as a model to follow. tuition, the Consular ID Act, All Kids Insurance Act, and

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

the driver's licenses initiative are examples of these Today it might contribute to transcending position. finding formulas to encourage stronger economic cultural relations with Mexico. There is a great potential for that. Let's take advantage of it. After California and Texas, the states sharing Mexico's borders and a common origin, Illinois follows in our priorities due to the magnitude and progressive dynamics of its Mexican community its economy. Distinguished Representatives, coincidence and complementarity play today as a different other moments in our history role. Already in 1861 they became apparent with the election of Presidents Abraham Lincoln and Benito Juarez, two (2) fundamental characters in the making of our countries as sovereign and democratic states and with a solid aspiration for justice. In January of that same year, following instructions of President Juarez, the Mexican ambassador to Washington visited elected President Lincoln in his home in Springfield. Regarding this historical visit, historian Ralph Roeder has assured that in Mexico and I quote, 'it was perceived the importance of establishing a personal contact with Lincoln, a man whose origin, whose rise, and whose faith offer so many points of analogy with his own President Juarez and so many opportunities for a sympathetic understanding between Also, according to Roeder, this liaison with Lincoln was a bond of character and above all of a class character which offered a new guarantee for the future of our two (2) countries. It would be that purest bond of character that would secure the ties of mutual support for

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

both, in those days, dark days of the 1860s. The two (2) closest were interdependent. Mr. Speaker, distinguished Representatives, let's honor Lincoln and Juarez with our commitment to consistently encourage understanding and further interdependence between our two (2) countries as well as coincidence and complementarity between Illinois and Mexico. Once again, I very much thank you for the privilege of sharing this opportunity with you. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Madigan: "The consul general will be down in the well for a short time for those that may wish to visit with him before he leaves the Capitol Building. Mr. Turner in the Chair."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt, for what reason do you rise?"
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "State your point."
- Moffitt: "You know, for many weeks when we would have Quorum Roll Call, one Legislator was listed as excused. This morning that person was not on the list of excused, that being Representative Eddie Washington, and the reason, he's here today. Isn't it great to see Representative Eddie Washington back here on the floor. Good to see you. Good to see you back."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome back, Eddie. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 6377."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6377, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig to continue."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Just to briefly reiterate. We started the process back in March with hearings around the We've state. appropriation hearings here in Springfield, where agencies have had an opportunity to testify and we've had hearings here where advocates and opponents of proposals had an opportunity to testify, as well. In the past, I often presented a budget that was agreed to by the Legislative branch and the Executive branch. different approach. This is an approach that we here in the House of Representatives are taking, because we believe it's time that we move forward with the budget process. We believe that what happened last year, when we stayed 'til the middle of August and went on, and on, served no purpose. We believe that it's important that we get this budget done on time and we're prepared today to move forward. So, we put together this budget in several components. This Bill, along with the companion Bill that will follow, will deal with the operations of State Government. This particular Bill will deal with the operations that we would associate with those individuals who are not in management roles and the expenses associated with running the agencies, as well. The next budget will deal with the management personnel and the operations of the agency as well, and the third component of this budget will be a series of Bills that will deal with the grants that State Government make. Those items where we send

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

money out the door to schools or nursing homes or other providers to do work that we authorize them to do and reimburse them to do. So, this is what I would call the day-to-day operations of State Government. This runs across all the budget lines, except for higher education which will be handled in a separate budget. The total for this budget as amended, this budget as amended is six billion, seven hundred and twenty-seven million, four hundred and fifty-four thousand, two hundred and forty-two dollars (\$6,727,454,242) in GRF and fourteen billion, six hundred and seventy-three million, six hundred and fiftythousand, nine hundred and sixteen dollars (\$14,673,651,916) in all funds. This is an important part of keeping the doors open in State Government. most of us who've gone to appropriation hearings and looked at the Governor's proposed budget will not see anything in here that's new or unusual or surprising. It's really the nuts and bolts of what we need to do to keep State Government operating. So, Mr. Speaker, I'd... I'd ask for a 'yes' vote and I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Beaubien, for what reason do you rise?"

Beaubien: "I'd like to... Will the Sponsor yield, please? Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Beaubien: "I'm going to just establish some baseline questions.

You and I have talked. This budget is based upon the '08 budget. What... what was that number? I believe it was around 27.5 billion (27,500,000,000)."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Hannig: "I think you're in the ballpark. I certainly wouldn't
 dispute it, Representative."
- Beaubien: "Now, we're assuming some base growth, just out of the base revenues, what is that amount that you're assuming in your calculations?"
- Hannig: "I think that we would agree and I hope that you would agree that about 1.2 to 1.3 would be the number of increased revenue that would be available. That would include the sale of the tenth license, the impact of the loophole closures that we passed last year and is now law, the integrated tax program that the Department of Revenue believes will generate forty-seven million (47,000,000), and then the Federal Economic Stimulus Package are the components that I would put on the table. We also know that there were Member initiatives that were in the budget last year that were not in there this year. So there will be some additional room in that respect."
- Beaubien: "Okay. So, what I have for base growth is four hundred forty-eight million (448,000,000). The tenth license at five seventy-five (575,000,000). The business of revenues that came in last year's Senate Bill, a hundred and forty million (140,000,000), Department of Revenue computer update, forty-seven million (47,000,000) and the federal stimulus package, thirty-five (35,000,000) and that's how we get to the hun... one billion, two hundred and forty-five (1,245,000,000). What do you estimate the shortfall in '08 to be or is that part of your... your process?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Hannig: "Representative, we're really not addressing any shortfall in '08. We're just looking at an '09 budget as we move forward."
- Beaubien: "Okay. But do you assume there is some shortfall in '08, because there's been various estimates. Emil Jones says four hundred million (400,000,000). We've heard five hundred million (500,000,000). The administration says seven hundred and fifty million (750,000,000). There is some shortfall."

Hannig: "Well, Representative, we passed..."

Beaubien: "Whether you're addressing it or not, it's there."

- Hannig: "Yeah. So, we passed a budget last year and I don't think that the Governor ever said that it was out of balance. Now, some would acknowledge, including myself, that the economy nationwide has slowed down. The times are tougher and that perhaps some of those budget assumptions will not be met, but we haven't really even closed out this fiscal year. We're still in May. So, it's not totally possible to say, you know, whether or not we'll meet those revenue assumptions."
- Beaubien: "Okay. Thank you. What are the new expenditures that you're anticipating? I have around eight hundred million (800,000,000) for pensions, a hundred million (100,000,000) for higher ed and a hundred million (100,000,000) for union contracts. I'm talking about the whole package here. Is that approximately what your assumptions are?"
- Hannig: "Well, I think that when we talk about higher ed that certainly we can... we can give you that number. I don't

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- have it in front of me at this moment. This particular Bill and GRF comes to about 6.7 billion (6,700,000,000), if... if that's the question."
- Beaubien: "There's no additional funding for Medicaid in this budget, over and above last year's number? Is that correct?"
- Hannig: "I think there'll be an opportunity in some later Amendments. This... If you're talking about the general budget, the overall budget and not just this Bill, I think there'll be an opportunity to vote on increasing some Medicaid lines, but that would..."
- Beaubien: "But that's... that's not in the first three (3) Bills though. Correct? Or the first three (3) silos of your presentation."
- Hannig: "Yes. And... and I'm certainly willing to answer questions on... on the broad... the broad budget questions. This... this one (1) will deal with the day-to-day budgets. The next budget will deal with the... what we would call management budgets and those two (2) together, I would say are generally the... the nuts and bolts, the day-to-day operations of keeping the doors open here in the State of Illinois, with the exception of higher ed, which will be in the third budget and stand alone. And then we'll have some others after that."
- Beaubien: "All right. So, we won't really address the Medicaid issue in the first three (3)... first three (3) budgets."
- Hannig: "It's down the list a little bit, Representative."
- Beaubien: "And there's no additional school funding in these first three (3) budgets, is that correct?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Hannig: "There is... there's a budget that will deal with that, but not in... not in this one."

Beaubien: "All right. Any anticipated sweeps?"

Hannig: "Well, this is a spending Bill, so it doesn't authorize any sweeps, but... The answer is that we don't anticipate any sweeps. We certainly have always said we're open to the idea of working with your side of the aisle and the Senate and the Governor to look at reasonable sweeps for reasonable purposes, but there's nothing assumed in this budget."

Beaubien: "All right. This does not in any way address the 1.8 billion dollar (\$1,800,000,000) Medicaid shortfall that exists at this point."

Hannig: "This is... this is only the operations. It doesn't deal with grants."

Beaubien: "All right."

Hannig: "There'll be some opportunities, I think, as we go forward to deal with some grants that some would argue and will argue help address... will address that shortfall."

Beaubien: "Okay. I just again... I just wanted to set a baseline, get some numbers, what the total... total revenues are going to be and I anticipate that's your 27.5 and the 1.245 and we broke down how we reached those numbers. We talked about the first three (3) Bills not containing any Medicaid or school funding. And we're anticipating about eight hundred million (800,000,000) in pensions and a hundred million (100,000,000) in union contracts and higher education and that's... just kind... sort of built around the

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

budget. We really haven't talked about DHS increases, lower K - 12 increases in the first three (3) budgets."

Hannig: "Yeah. This... this budget... these two (2) budgets, these first two (2), these operational budgets are relatively flat. There may be some minor increases in a place here or there. We certainly have to annualize the AFSCME contract and I think you alluded to that. I don't know if it's a hundred million (100,000,000), but certainly it adds up to something. And I think we'd also concede on the front end, Representative, that it's not possible for us to put any kind of number in here for the ongoing negotiations between AFSCME and the Governor's Office. We are not a party to that in the Legislative branch. Typically, when those two (2) come to an agreement, they come to us with a number, and if it's a reasonable number we'll do a supplemental to insure that all state employees are paid at the rate that is agreed to."

Beaubien: "Well, thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Schmitz, for what reason do you rise?"

Schmitz: "Good morning, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Schmitz: "Speaker, it's a little difficult to hear. I'm battling a cold this morning, so hopefully and since we're dealing with such a large item, we could get a little order in here for just a few moments. Thank you, Speaker. Representative Hannig, it's... we started the day this morning, it's beautiful sunshine out. We've got a budget ready to go, things are looking good, and I've chatted with

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

my wife this morning. She said, 'What are you going to be doing today?' and I said, well, we're going to be talking about the budget and it appears that the House Democrats are ready to move along. So, with that, I told her my assumption is that there's some sort of agreement between the House Democrats and the Senate Democrats. Did I assume right?"

Hannig: "There is... there's not an agreement between anyone at this time, Representative. This is simply an effort by the House of Representatives to move the budget process along. We believe that... that these budgets make sense, that they address the needs of the citizens, and we'd like to move them to the Senate. It's a little bit like what we do with almost every other Bill in this chamber. We introduce it. We debate it. We pass it. What happens in the Senate, we're not sure of. We hope for the best. We encourage our colleagues over there to move those Bills. Sometimes they do and sometimes they don't and sometimes they change our product."

Schmitz: "Sorry, I'm feeling the air kind of coming out of the balloon right now. So, there hasn't been a meeting between the Speaker and the Senate President saying here's the parameters of the budget we're looking at?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, this is our work product. We are obligated as Legislators to pass a budget. If we could bring the Senator... the Senators on-board with that and the Governor on-board with that, I think that's a good thing to do. I prefer, in spite of the criticism that I often get, when I present a budget that's agreed to by the Executive

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

branch and the Legislative branch, I prefer that, but that's not the only way to do a budget. And... in the early days when I came to Springfield, this is how we always did the budget and it seemed to work pretty well and sometimes I hear people on both sides of the aisle yearn for those old days when we could vote on all the Bills and today we're going to get a chance."

Schmitz: "As we certainly will. And I would caution as we go through the verbiage of this to say that this is something that the House is going to pass. This is something that we've worked on. I mean... I know there haven't been any Leader's meetings and I got the note here this morning on my desk on all the statewide hearings on the budget, but it doesn't say on there how many Leader's meetings were and I chatted with Leader Cross a little while ago and his statement was to me there were zero Leader meetings. concerns me, because this is not a typical Bill, this is not something where a Member introduces and works on it in the House and moves it over to the Senate and finds a Senate Sponsor. This is the budget. This is where both chambers agree at some point to some spending parameters, some income parameters. And what I'm hearing right now in this testimony is that we haven't met those parameters. there been any discussions with them with the Governor's Office at all or the Governor himself on... on the proposals that you're bringing forward today?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, it's... it isn't up to the Leaders to necessarily pass a budget. That's simply one approach, and it has its critics. But another approach is that we,

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

as Members of this House with the Appropriation Committees, are empowered and I would argue obligated to pass a budget. Now, that's our obligation, to pass a budget before the end of May. Now, we can sit around this chamber like we did last year until August, waiting for the Leaders to come to an agreement and in the end they did not bring in the Governor. We had... we had a budget that only took in the Legislative branch and the Governor vetoed some of those items and held some of that money. But the point is there's a lot of ways that you can construct a budget, we think it's time to move forward with a budget and that's why we're here today."

Schmitz: "Speaker, it's starting to pick up a little bit again.

Mr. Speaker, it's..."

Speaker Turner: "If the Members could please bring down the noise level, it may make future questions not necessary. So, if we could just have a little quiet. Proceed."

Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. Representative, bear with me on..."

Hannig: "Certainly."

Schmitz: "You're exactly right. This is why the Bodies went to overtime last year. It's because the chambers aren't communicating and... and when you come in here today and are bringing forth, you know, different versions of budgets that the Senate hasn't seen, are we headed down that same road that we were headed last year into an overtime Session because there's going to be different versions that are going to go across the rotunda over to the Senate. You read in newspapers they're going to prepare a version.

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

What is the end plan here on terms of, you know, are they going to look at our proposal, are we going to pass their proposal? What's the program? That's the part I'm confused on."

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think what you said is... is correct. We're going to send a budget over to the Senate for their consideration. It's a House Bill. They'll have an opportunity to amend it. We would hope they could pass it without Amendments. But they'll send some Bills over here and we'll take a look at them. We've said publicly that if they send us Bills on a timely basis that are reasonable, that we would consider them. So, you know, that's all I think you can ask for from the other chamber, that they give you a reasonable opportunity to present your Bill and make your case and if it's a good case, that they pass the Bill."

Schmitz: "One of the concerns I have besides the lack of communication between the Speaker and the Senate President and the Governor as we deal through this is, we're looking at different, I've heard of different choices, tier 1, tier 2, tier 3, version a, b, c. You pick it. But what's the scenario that three (3), maybe four (4) versions go over to the Senate? Does the budget function if version 1 and 3 pass, but version 2 doesn't make it out of the House and... Because I remember some line items, half are covered in version 1, half are covered in version 2, maybe some are covered in the grants portion of the budget. If the Senate gets it and they only approve version c, can we get this thing to move?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Hannig: "Well, Representative, if you would help us pass all these Bills, it would make the Senate's life easier and we could avoid any potential problem that you might see."
- Schmitz: "So, my vote will help the Senate picking which version a, b, or c or all the above?"
- Hannig: "It'll help... it'll help avoid a potential problem that you spelled out, Representative."
- Schmitz: "Well, that's... I appreciate the answer, but I... it didn't really answer the question. Will the budget stand if the Senate picks one (1) of the three (3), two (2) of the three (3)? I mean, you could list the multiple scenarios, will the budget stand?"
- Hannig: "We... we tried to construct a budget that would stand on its own by itself, but also in conjunction with the rest of the budget. So, for example, these first two (2) budgets deal with operations, across all lines. If we pass them we know we can keep the doors open on State Government and then we're going to look at grants. So, then you have the various grants and there's going to be some opportunities for level granting... grant or higher grants. And this chamber can decide. Perhaps we'll send them both to the Senate, give them an opportunity to pick. But this is what we get elected to do, make choices."
- Schmitz: "Oh, I completely agree with you. We get elected to make choices and I think my choice would have been that the chambers would have worked together in a more cohesive manner and set out budget parameters and as we go to a deadline that we've known since we came to this chamber in January, we know it's the end of May. It's

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

constitutionally set. To not have a Leaders meeting to discuss about the parameters... And I don't need the schooling on Government 101. I understand we introduce Bills, the Senate introduces Bills and this is a new way to do it this year, but it's a confusing way for myself and a lot of my colleagues that there's no agreement on the parameters. We're dealing with some issues that... I think it's a shame, I don't think that's the way government should be run and I don't think it's the way that we should be dealing with the budget this year. I would caution the Members to say, you know, what happens if one (1) of the scenarios doesn't pass? Are we going to be back here in June? Representative, if... if these scenarios go through and we're dealing with deficit spending again, are we going to be sitting here in June or July or come back in November to deal with a budget that just won't add up for twelve (12) months?"

- Hannig: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the last part of the question."
- Schmitz: "If the Senate doesn't choose all three (3) versions or chooses one (1) or chooses none, I mean, is the chambers… are the both chambers going to be back here in June or July or in November to deal with a budget that just doesn't add up?"
- Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think our choices are we can do nothing and then we can become part of the train wreck that we went through last year and we can wait for, you know, lightning to strike and a budget to appear..."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Smith (sic-Schmitz), bring your remarks to a close. Continue Gary, but bring your remarks to a close."

Hannig: "Well, I would just simply point out that in a discussion that I had with the Speaker, a few days ago, he advised me that... that prior to the 1990s that his involvement as the Leader of our caucus in a budget was zero. That the budgeteers hammered it out, the chairman hammered it out, the committees hammered it out, and that's what we're trying to do here. We don't have to have the Leaders come to us and say that, you know, we... we reached an agreement. We can do it ourself and that's what this budget's about."

"And Mr. Speaker, I'll make my comments brief right Schmitz: I'll wrap it up. I think this is the exact train wreck that happened last year. The communication was nonexistent between the House and the Senate and the Executive branch. And by passing competing budgets over there when the Members aren't talking to each other and the appropriation committee people aren't talking. Zero Leader meetings. I mean, this is a nice, pretty piece of paper and it was a great document to read and I got a good chuckle out of it all. And all the people that attended throughout this state, but zero Leader meetings on... on determining the parameters of the budget, the spending. Representative Beaubien just outlined we're going to be in deficit spending again not passing a balanced budget. And I would caution the Members to look through all three (3)

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

of these versions before they cast their vote today. Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

Eddy: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Eddy: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're about to undertake a process where we approve the spending of the peoples' money and I hope everyone understands what's going on as far as appropriations and pays a little bit of attention to these items. Representative, you... you have mentioned that the first couple of budgets that are going to come out represent front-line workers and then management positions."

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "And yesterday, in Education Appropriations we heard line item information about the State Board of Education and the Education Labor Relations Board and what this Bill does, I think is... or these two (2) Bills are going to see is collapses all agencies by those two (2) categories into one piece of budget legislation. Is that right?"

Hannig: "I'm sorry, repeat the..."

Eddy: "Human Services, Aging, DCFS, all of the separate..."

Hannig: "For front-line operations."

Eddy: "And then there'll be one coming for management. Now, yesterday..."

Hannig: "Right. And then they be a third... a series of third..."

Eddy: "Right."

Hannig: "...budgets for grants."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Eddy: "Yesterday, when we talked about front-line services in the state board budget I asked the question as to whether or not this... this budget constituted an increase in head count. Now, the answer yesterday, I think was, and correct me if I'm wrong, that between this budget and the next budget those two (2), there are twenty-five (25) new positions that ISBE requested at these budget hearings that will be funded."

Hannig: "Yes. That's correct."

Eddy: "So, in fact, there is an increase in appropriation of about 4.6 million dollars (\$4,600,000) between those two (2) budget to fund twenty-five (25) new positions."

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "There's also in the Education Labor Relation Board budget the addition of about ninety-six thousand dollars (\$96,000) to staff one additional attorney, based on their request to the Appropriation Committee."

Hannig: "Yeah. That's gen... essentially correct."

Eddy: "Okay. So, that brings me to my question. Wouldn't you collapse all of these other budgets for front line and in the next budget as far as management, how many additional new positions does the total package represent? And how much additional money is in the budget to fund positions above the flat amount from FYO8?"

Hannig: "Representative, we... we've tried to listen to the agencies and where they could make a case, we would occasionally put some additional head count in, but, you know, thi... the numbers that we're looking at are not

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

significantly higher than last year for these budgets. The operations are essentially along a flat line."

Eddy: "Well, the only... the only comment I would make to that is that the 4.6 million dollars (\$4,600,000) plus the ninety-six thousand dollars (\$96,000) in these positions, that's money that if we didn't add those, as we look at other programs we might rather put that toward that. I understand that the idea is to listen to the agency a little bit here, but twenty-five (25) new positions at a time when we may not be able to fund other things, I mean, I just... I just want the Body to understand that there are increases in head count. There are not necessarily flat line items for positions, at least in two (2) of them..."

Hannig: "Right."

Eddy: "...and I don't know how much are in the others because I...

I wasn't in those approp meetings."

Hannig: "So, I would just say that with... with education funding we know that the State Board of Education, the headcounts are below where they were in the 1970s, we would simply say that they made a compelling case that we need to increase those headcounts."

Eddy: "That's fair enough. I mean, that's your... that's the determination you made regarding what was flat and what wasn't. I think more than anything else, I want folks to kind of pay attention a little bit here, so that when... when we look at these budgets and we talk about items being flat or not adding positions or generally that concept there are exceptions to that and maybe that money could be better spent in a... in the opinion of some in a place where it may

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

actually impact the classroom and children rather than additional positions at a bureaucracy. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, Representative Hannig to close."

Hannig: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would just remind people what we saw last year, when we were here 'til the middle of May and we were unable to come to any agreements between the four (4) Leaders and the We ultimately passed a budget that was all legislative in content. So, that certainly was a difference from what we had done in the past and this is a difference from what we've done in the recent past, but I've been here long enough to tell you that this is not so different from what we used to do back in the 1980s under Governor Edgar. So, folks, this is a beginning of a budget process. This particular budget helps us fund those dayto-day operations of State Government. It helps keep the doors open, it ensures that on July 1, there'll be money to make payroll, to pay the rent, to pay the utilities, to pay the postage, so that people who have to travel out into the State of Illinois and serve clients will have some money to do that. It's an important part of government and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6377?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there's 63 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 29 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 6378. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6378, a Bill for an Act making appropriations has been read a second time, previously.

 Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig and Amendment #3, offered by Representative Hannig, have both been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With the indulgence of the Body, I would ask that we adopt Amendments 1 and 3 and then we could debate the Bill on Third, so..."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Floor Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 6378. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair is the 'ayes' have it. And both Amendments are adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6378, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. So, could we clarify with the Clerk, Mr. Speaker, as to what Amendments were adopted?"
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, we want a clarification in terms of what Amendments were adopted."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendments 1 and Floor Amendments #3 were both adopted to the Bill."

Hannig: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the companion Bill to the first Bill that we passed. This is what I would call the management side of the equation. This is to fund the people who work in merit comp or work in other management kind of positions. It's to fund the amounts of money that we need to pay the rent, to pay the postage, to pay the operations of State Government for individuals who we would generally say are in management are certainly an important part of the positions in State Government. This budget is one billion, four hundred and ninety-three forty-three million, thousand, nine hundred eighty-six dollars (\$1,043,493,986) in GRF. Two billion, two hundred seventy million, four hundred and eighty-four thousand, six hundred and ninetysix dollars (\$2,270,484,696) in all funds. So, I would be happy to answer any questions and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6378?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? McCarthy? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6488. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6488, a Bill for an Act making appropriations has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have both been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Miller."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Miller."
- Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to withdraw Amendment #1."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #1 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook... I mean, the Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig, on Floor Amendment #2."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I'd ask the indulgence of the Body to adopt the Amendment, which is an agreement that Representative Miller worked out in the education... Higher Education Committee. And then I'd ask for the Gentleman to present the Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6488. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6488, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Miller, on House Bill 6488."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Miller: House, today I want to present House Bill 6488. It is the FY09 budget for higher education. Before I sort of present the budget I want to just comment on how we approached this budget in our committee. A few years ago when I became committee chairman, I realized and actually the committee realized, both sides of the aisle realized the fact that when the universities testified in front of us it really didn't reflect their need of their particular university or particular school. What he did was present what the administration had offered in terms of what they needed. So it didn't really reflect their true needs. And that the Board of Higher Education just really reflected what the administration wanted versus what the universities needed. Since that time, we have talked to the universities to say, look, we're here to advocate on behalf of you in a bipartisan effort. All of us want to make sure that we have some of the finest universities in the State of Illinois but also some of the affordable universities in the state of... in the whole country. And so with that, the Board of Higher Education came back with a different plan, a level plan of different levels, that we said to them, if you want more money from the State of Illinois basically,

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

what are you going to do with it? How are you going to spend the money and what is the plan for higher education in the state, particularly since this administration has given them flat line levels of ... of funding over the past few years. With that the Board of Education came back with a step... a five-step plan. Step one was a flat level plan. Step two was a 2... a 1 percent increase, totaling about 12.9 million dollars (\$12,900,000). Step three was a 2.8 percent increase, totaling 35.7 million (\$35,700,000). Step four was a 5 percent increase, 64.5 million dollars (\$64,500,000). And step five was... 5.5 percent increase with a 71 percent... with a seventy-one million dollar (\$71,000,000) increase. And so, through our discussions we had initiatives, too, in a bipartisan effort in the committee. There were issues of trying to match and gain federal matching dollars which is needed and only makes good public policy and good sense. There was issues from the committee that we wanted to try to diversify the bodies of the faculty of the university system. There was issues concerning... trying to make sure that a pipeline program was created to increase the graduation rates, from not just only children from the City of Chicago but children from all across the state, because truly if we're going to try to be competitive in a global market we have to make sure our higher education institutions are able to equip these students. And so with that and trying to be responsible and trying to work with Members on both sides of the aisle, we chose something at step level three (3). We had another series of hearings saying that to the

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

university system these are our desires as a committee what The Board of Higher Education has laid out a step level funding and how can we collectively come together to try to deal with the needs and be responsible to... to the children of the State of Illinois. So they were informed. Everybody was informed that we would come in at step level three (3), which is 2.8 percent level funding. Now, we have one of the finest community colleges systems in the country because the community college is the bastion of those children who are not going to attend a four-year education system and try to make sure that they have an opportunity to succeed, too. With that, we offered a 3 percent increase to our community college system. And so with that said, that is the methodology in which we approached the higher education budget. And I'm very proud of that. I'm very, very proud of that overall. With a 2.8 percent increase to the universities, universities will receive thirty-seven million, six hundred and thousand, five hundred and seventy-five (37,607,575). Delineated, each university will get based on percentage. In addition, there are other programs that were added. MAP funding was overwhelmingly supported by Members of our committee. That helps the most vulnerable population that was cut by this administration. We added and restored five million dollars (\$5,000,000) in MAP funding, excuse me, of Student Success funding back into... back into this budget. We offered the Health Science Education grant of four million dollars (\$4,000,000). Once again, that was an initiative brought to our committee.

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

MAP funding which helps every child in the State of Illinois and particularly those who are most vulnerable. Eighteen million dollars (\$18,000,000), we can get the best bang for the buck. And something I'm very proud of is 9.5 million dollars (\$9,500,000) of federal matching funds. every dollar that we invest into this, we receive twelve dollars (\$12) back. It only makes good sense and it's good public policy. So overall, the university system will receive thirty-seven million, (37,000,000)... Excuse me. Overall the universities will receive forty-six million, eight hundred and eleven thousand, six hundred seventy-five dollars (\$46,811,675). The community college system will receive approximately 10.7 million dollars (\$10,700,000) and the additional add-ons, excuse me, and that total will be ninety-seven million, three hundred sixty-nine thousand, two hundred dollars (\$97,369,200). This I believe helps every child in the State of Illinois. It provides a sense of direction where we want to go as a state for higher education and I would ask for support for this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from McDonough, Representative Myers, for what reason do you rise?"

Myers: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Myers: "I want to commend Chairman Miller of the Higher Education Appropriations Committee for working very hard this past year. In fact, I want to commend the entire committee for working very hard. We have a committee that's very dedicated to higher education and as Chairman Miller said, we want to make sure that we provide the

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

greatest quality of education for our students in Illinois that's quite possible. We have a great university system. We have a great community college system. We've had the second best needs-based financing program in the nation. And in the last five (5) years we've seen attack after attack on our higher education system. We worked very hard together this year, I think, in coming up with how we felt the higher education system should be treated. We've all had concerns that not enough money was being put into the Illinois Student Assistance Commission for the MAP grant programs and other scholarships. We've had concerns that the community college system were not receiving adequate funding in their equalization grants and their base grant programs and they were not receiving adequate reimbursement for financing or for educating our veterans. As well as the four-year institutions were not receiving adequate reimbursement for finance... or for educating our veterans. So all in all, I think that the committee felt very good about the budget that was coming out, 2.8 percent to 3 percent, based on different needs in different areas. And it is an amount that is very important to our entire higher education system. However, as we look at the overall budget that's being presented to us today, and then we take a look at the revenue sources that we have, that appear to be the only revenue sources we have, we put all of this together and we're putting together a budget that it is not realistic. And while Higher Education is presenting a very, I think, reasonable budget, based on our experiences over the last few years. When it's all added

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

up, we have no assurances that those institutions are going to receive their dollars. We've seen that instance this vear. The Governor says to the four-year institutions, withhold one (1)... one-twelfth of your yearly budget, because we don't have the money and he says to the community college system, you're not going to get about one-third of the amount of money that you should be So we can pass a budget today that puts one getting. hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) of 2008 into higher spending over education, unfortunately, we have no guarantee that the Governor will that there, based on the amount of projections that we're seeing in this particular year. my opinion, until we address a realistic budget approach, revenue balanced with expenditures, anything we do within this budget is going to be suspect. And my advice to all of higher education is don't spend your money yet, because if we pass this budget and we get a hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) of new money for higher education, I want to make sure that it goes there. But I have no guarantees that they will receive that additional one hundred million (100,000,000). I have no guarantees that they'll receive a base budget. So I think at this point, we just have to take a look and try to make sure that we sit down together and really make sure that any money that's appropriated in this particular setting, it gets to higher education. While I commend Chairman Miller on doing a fine job, I think that many of us over here on this side of the aisle have a lot of reservations about supporting any kind of

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

budget that increases any spending in this particular budget."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Patterson, for what reason do you rise?"

Patterson: "Will the Sponsor yield? I have a question."

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Patterson: "Committee Chair Miller, I was wondering if any of that 2.4 million (2,400,000) for various programs would go toward apprenticeship-type training?"

Miller: "I'm not clear... excuse me. I'm not clear on what apprentice... apprenticeship-type, excuse me, type training..."

Patterson: "Any kind of apprenticeship training. Vocational-type training."

Miller: "Well, at this point, there's nothing been designated in terms of a specific program in terms of apprenticeshiptype training. However, with the increase, the universities have some flexibility to create, promote, continue any program that they've established. Part of what we've tried to do is to make sure that sectors from all different walks, whether it's through the community college system or through the four-year universities, have some type of training program."

Patterson: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Miller to close."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just want to comment on the… on where we are in terms of higher education. As Representative Myers had mentioned, the introductory budget was flat for higher education in the universities and that's what they

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

presented as... as what they wanted. Now, we certainly could pass that and it, to me, is unrealistic and in terms of that's not what they really need. And what happens is, just so everyone understands, when we don't put our state coffers into higher education, then it becomes a tax on our kids who attend the schools. Tuition goes up, fees goes up, that's just the way it is and that's just reality. As far as guarantees are concerned, the Governor has proposed to hold back one-twelfth of payments already. And that's what we have now. So I can't argue what the Governor will or will not do. Whether the hundred million (100,000,000) will stay in. Will the Senate stay in, as arguments that Representative Hannig had made earlier. I don't know. I think if anything we're trying to do is make sure that our children are educated in a global market and our children have... are still able to attend some of the finest universities and also that the university systems are economic engines in our... in certain communities, but our children all go to these universities. This only makes sense. We talk about investments in the future. We talk about trying to do the right thing. We try to talk about good public policy. This is good public policy. It was wisely crafted and supporting this is... is having higher education, your state university, your community college going to the right direction. By not supporting this you are in an argument of what's going to happen. At some point, when somebody is already said that we deserve level flat line funding, you're already at a disadvantage. By not supporting this, you're saying we're going to increase

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

that disadvantage more. This only makes sense. This was done in a bipartisan way with support and hopefully... hopefully support and input from parties on both side of the... sides of the aisle. I would ask Members for a favorable vote."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6488?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 50 voting 'no', 1 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On House Bill 6455. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6455, a Bill for an Act making appropriations has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6455, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This begins the portion of the budget that deals with And in House Bill 6555 (sic-6455) these grant levels are essentially flat and they're for the Department Financial and Professional Regulation, Employment Security, Commerce and Economic Opportunity, Commerce Commission, Military Affairs, and Labor. The total amount of GRF appropriated by this Bill is thirty-six million, three hundred and eighty-one thousand, four hundred dollars (\$36,381,400) and six hundred and ninety-eight million, five hundred and twenty dollars ninety thousand, (\$698,090,520) from all funds. So, this is a number of grants for these agencies that are essentially at a flat level compared to last year. I'd be happy to answer any questions and I ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6455?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, shall take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 5... 51 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6421. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6421, a Bill for an Act making appropriations has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair is the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6421, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill addresses grants for the same agencies. Financial and Professional Regulation, Employment Security, Commerce and Economic Opportunity, Commerce Commission, Military Affairs and Labor, but it has some increases and so the total that we would appropriate in this budget is forty-eight million, one hundred and seventy-one thousand, nine hundred (48,171,900) in GRF and seven hundred ninetytwo million, seven hundred eighty-six thousand, and fiftydollars (\$792,786,053) in all funds. three appropriation committees met. They've heard testimony. some cases they've told groups that they would try to accommodate their needs and in other cases not, that they could not. But this is the product that this committee wished us to adopt on this House Floor and send to the

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Senate. So, I'd be happy to answer any questions and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Schmitz, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Schmitz: "Thank you. Representative Hannig, we're keeping a tally over here. Trying to keep adding everything up and make sure we're doing it right. Is this forty-eight million dollars (\$48,000,000) and some change above and beyond the fiscal '08 level?"

Hannig: "That's... this is the total, Representative. I think the... the previous budget, which were the same agencies at the flat level, was thirty-six million (36,000,000) and some change and this one is forty-eight million (48,000,000) and some change. So, if you do the math there's an extra twelve million (12,000,000)."

Schmitz: "Okay. So, this is twelve million (12,000,000) over the flat level spending of the first..."

Hannig: "That's correct."

Schmitz: "...the first two (2) Bills we discussed. And it covered DPR... You were rattling through them pretty quick.

I'm sorry."

Hannig: "Yeah, I'll read them again. The Financial and Professional Regulation, Employment Security, Commerce and Economic Opportunity, Commerce Commission, Military Affairs and the Department of Labor."

Schmitz: "Thank you, Mr. Hannig. Thank you, Speaker."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise? Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6421?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there's 61 voting 'aye', 53 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6433. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6433, a Bill for an Act making appropriations has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6433, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. These are the flat grants. Or that is, these are grants that are essentially at the same level as the '08 budget for the Department of Natural Resources, the Department of Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency, Emergency Management, and the Historic Preservation. The total GRF is twenty-three million, four hundred and seventy-six thousand, eight hundred (23,476,800), the total in all funds is two hundred and thirty-nine million, seven hundred and fifty dollars (\$239,000,750). Sorry, two hundred and thirty-nine million, seven hundred and fifty thousand, four hundred and seventy-eight dollars (\$239,750,478). And so that's the grants for these agencies. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis, for what reason do you rise?"

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Reis: "Representative, could you specifically break out the grant that's going to the Department of Natural Resources in your proposal for next year versus what was in there for this year?"

Hannig: "So, there are a couple of reapprops that are... that are significant in number. There's urban fishing program, the federal grant for resources, conservation workshop, the reclamation of surface-mined lands, U.S. Geology Survey, National Flood Insurance Program, and the flood plain map modernization. Those are the ones that..."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Reis: "In terms of just total dollars, how much will the Department of Natural Resources be getting under this proposal as opposed to what was given to them last year?"
- Hannig: "It's essentially the same amount, Representative, under this proposal."
- Reis: "Well, we've been all hearing stories, especially from downstate Legislators about how we're going to have to increase camping fees, that was approved in JCAR yesterday, a forty million dollar (\$40,000,000) hit on Illinois-drilled oil, a 5 percent tax on gross. And are we safe to assume that those won't be needed anymore because their grant is going to be flat lined and the same as last year?"
- Hannig: "Well, Representative, we've assumed for purposes of revenue that none of the proposals that the Governor has given us in Agriculture and Natural Resources become law. So, we... we made it clear, that if it required a vote of this Legislature, it wasn't going to happen."
- Reis: "So, again, is it safe to assume we don't need these camping fee increases that they said that they were going to impose yesterday?"
- Hannig: "Well, Representative, this is... this is an appropriation Bill and we couldn't increase fees in this Bill. But to answer your question, it's not the intention of... it's not my intention to increase any of those fees. And I've tried to speak clearly on behalf of my caucus that we're opposed to them."
- Reis: "Okay. Now, is there any Department of Agriculture in this? Or would that be another Bill?"
- Hannig: "No. It's... it's in here, as well, Representative."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Reis: "And how much is it for next year versus this year?"

Hannig: "It's essentially the same, as well, Representative, in this particular proposal."

Reis: "Is there any caveats that the Governor has to release that money to our important Ag programs?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think one of the things that..."

Reis: "I know how important agriculture is to your district, too, and we just don't want to see a repeat as to what happened this year."

Hannig: "Representative, if there's a way we can avoid it I'd be happy to work with you to do that. I think what we have to recognize is that in the checks and balances that exist in the Constitution, the Governor has the right to veto items and the Governor has the right not to spend items, unless they're driven out the door by some kind of formula. So, the budget only acts as an upward break on what the Governor can spend. He can't spend more than we authorize, but he often can spend less."

Reis: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Schmitz, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Schmitz: "Representative Hannig, keeping track again. This is basically the tier one or the first level. The next Bill that will be coming through will affect these agencies at a higher level?"

Hannig: "Yes. That's correct."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Schmitz: "So, this is the zero. There's no additional over FY08 in this Bill you're presenting right now?"

Hannig: "Essentially, no additional new money."

Schmitz: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "From Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

Eddy: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, you described earlier that there... you used the word essential..."

Hannig: "Virtually?"

Eddy: "Yeah. Does that only..."

Hannig: "Is that better?"

Eddy: "...does that refer to most instances where there's any line item difference? It has to do with a reapprop."

Hannig: "Well, we... we do include reapprops, Representative and... and, you know, so what I'm trying to say I guess, is that it's... it's... the purpose of this Amendment to be as close as we can to last year's level. It may disagree by some small amount, so that's why it's not always an exact..."

Eddy: "Well, let me ask it this way because here's my concern.

I think we all, in rural parts of the state, received hundreds of letters from 4-H kids."

Hannig: "Correct."

Eddy: "University of Illinois extension programs, Soil and Water Conservation districts, so I guess what I want to make sure is, when you use the word essentially the same, specifically for those programs and others, is it at least

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

the amount of last year's appropriation for every one of those programs?"

Hannig: "Yes."

Eddy: "Is it at least the amount of last year's appropriation for all line items?"

Hannig: "So, I'm advised that the answer to your question is 'yes'. That they're all at least at last year's level."

Eddy: "Okay. So, basically, if there's a difference, it's an upward difference based on a reapprop or..."

Hannig: "That would be correct."

Eddy: "...or some other type of a..."

Hannig: "But we tried very hard in this particular budget to be even with last year."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6433?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 21, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- for floor consideration' is Amendment #1 to House Bill 6380."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6415. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6415, a Bill for an Act making appropriations has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6415. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6415, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill would appropriate grants for the same agencies as the previous Bill: Natural Resources, Agriculture, EPA, Emergency Management, and Historic Preservation, but at a higher level. This Bill would appropriate a total of thirty-five million, one hundred and fifty-four thousand, five hundred dollars (\$35,154,500) in GRF and two hundred sixty-three million, five hundred and six thousand, five

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

hundred (263,506,500) from all funds. This is after the agency... this is after the appropriations committee took hearings... had hearings, took testimony, they made a determination as to what they thought was reasonable for these budgets and this is the product of that decision. And so I'd be happy to answer any questions and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, what do... for what reason do you rise?"

Eddy: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, compared to the previous budget for the same agencies, this appears to be about twelve million dollars (\$12,000,000) more. Do you have that total?"

Hannig: "Yes. It's... this is thirty-five one (35.1) and the previous one was twenty-three four (23.4)."

Eddy: "So, your increase is twelve three (12.3)..."

Hannig: "About twelve (12). Yeah."

Eddy: "...12.3."

Hannig: "About twelve (12). Yes. In round numbers."

Eddy: "Can you be specific as to where those increases over the baseline budget are in this document?"

Hannig: "In the Natural Resources would be up by five million (5,000,000). Historic Preservation by a little under five million (5,000,000). And Agriculture by almost two million (2,000,000). So, that's roughly your twelve million (12,000,000)."

Eddy: "Between those three (3) departments."

Hannig: "That's correct."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Eddy: "So, if the tally goes on... if the calculations continue then the total amount to add to the additional calculation for this Bill only is 12.3 million dollars (\$12,300,000)."

Hannig: "That's correct. Yes."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6415?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'aye', 54 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6566. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6566 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6566, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Again, these are grants that are as close as we could appropriate to the 2008 budget level. It's for the Attorney General's Office, for the Department of Corrections, Juvenile Justice, Fire Marshal, State Police, Criminal Justice Information Authority, and Violence Protection. The total in GRF is nineteen million, two hundred thirty-seven thousand, one hundred dollars (\$19,237,100) and the total from all funds is one hundred and twelve million, seven hundred and twenty-four thousand, four hundred dollars (\$112,724,400). So, I'd be happy to answer any questions and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Schmitz, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Schmitz: "Representative Hannig, this was the… you said it's close to last year's level as possible. Does this include any anticipated AFSCME union contract increase?"

Hannig: "No. This is... this is the grants. So, these would...
these would not deal with those operations, but I think I
tried to make clear in the opening... in my opening that if
and when the AFSCME union settles with the Governor that,
as we have in the past, we will honor that contract and we
will make adjustments in the budget."

Schmitz: "So, this is last year's flat level grants. Then the next Bill we'll see is the next tier?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Hannig: "The next one will be the same agencies at a higher level."

Schmitz: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is,
 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6566?' All those in favor
 vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now
 open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record.
 On this question, there's 63 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no',
 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The
 Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Biggins, for what
 reason do you rise?"

Biggins: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm having a little problem maybe you could send a mechanic or some specialist in this equipment here to my desk. My 'green' button's not working today."

Speaker Turner: "We'll have them check it out."

Biggins: "And I need some help. So, if you could send somebody back, you know, appreciate it very much."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Biggins, there are... there's a way we can correct it immediately if you want to vote oral, we can take your oral vote while your switch isn't working. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Sullivan, for what reason do you rise?"

Sullivan: "Well, Mr. Speaker. There must be something over here because I'm having the exact opposite problem. I think I've worn out my 'red' button. Can you send someone over here to help me work on this? Thanks."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Speaker Turner: "The same offer to you. We will take oral verified Roll Call if you'd like to, you know, vote 'green'. No. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks, for what reason do you rise?"
- Franks: "My learned colleague, Mr. Biggins, I didn't have a 'green' switch for my first six (6) years here. It's really overrated. You don't need it. It's okay."
- Speaker Turner: "Okay. Back to work. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6565. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6565 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "And Representative Hannig moves that the House adopt Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6565, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 This proposal would deal with the same agencies that we just mentioned in the previous Bill: the Attorney General's Office, the Department of Corrections, Juvenile Justice, Fire Marshal, State Police, Criminal Justice Information

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Authority, and Violence Protection. It would appropriate a higher dollar amount as determined by the appropriation committee after they've heard testimony from agencies and from advocates, as well. The total amount that would be appropriated under this proposal would be forty-one million, five hundred and seventy-two thousand, one hundred dollars (\$41,572,100) in GRF and one hundred and thirty-five million, fifty-nine thousand, four hundred dollars (\$135,059,400) from all funds. I'd be happy to answer any questions and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Biggins, for what reason do you rise?"

Biggins: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, but my name was used in debate. So, I missed... the Gentleman that used it, we had a dialogue together about this other topic. Reminds me back several years ago when we had a cloning Bill. And I voted against cloning. And in fact, I remember the reason I did it was because when I first heard about the practice of cloning I was so angry I was nearly beside myself."

Speaker Turner: "Na... Na... The Gentleman from Crawford,
Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise."

Eddy: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, once again, for purposes of the abacus, are we about 12.3 million additional dollars (\$12,300,000).

Is that math pretty close, compared to the flat budget for the same departments?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Hannig: "Actually I... I would say more like twenty-two (22,000,000). Perhaps your abacus is missing a bead there but..."

Eddy: "I see that. Nineteen (19) to forty-one (41), that's exactly right. I was just checking to see if you were paying attention or just saying yes all the time. We had a bobble head doll ready to put there, but..."

Hannig: "It was a trick question, wasn't it?"

Eddy: "...every once in awhile we just have to check.

Representative, one other quick question regarding the DOC line items."

Hannig: "Yes, Sir."

Eddy: "There... there isn't any current Department of Corrections facility that's budgeted less money in either one of these budgets than is current? There's been some rumblings about certain facilities recently. Is everything funded at least fully?"

Hannig: "Yeah. This is just about the grants. So that isn't exactly the right place to ask the question, but to answer it, the answer is yes, you're correct."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Schmitz, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Schmitz: "Leader Hannig, our analysis is showing about 26... 26.3 difference from the flat line."

Hannig: "Well, it went from..."

Schmitz: "The zero growth, version A, tier 1."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Hannig: "I had from 19.2 to 41.5 which to me is, and just without my calculator, is around 22."
- Schmitz: "Yeah. I'm not understanding the 19.2, but I want to make sure we have 12.5 for CeaseFire, 3.1 for State Police grants for current videotaping interrogations. And then my question is, we have four million (4,000,000) to Corrections for forty (40) community-based reentry programs. Can you explain those briefly?"
- Hannig: "I'm sorry. Which one did you wish? The community..."
- Schmitz: "It's an appropriation here of four million (4,000,000) to Corrections for forty (40) community-based reentry programs throughout the state."
- Hannig: "All right. So, I've been advised that this is a statewide program for forty (40) statewide community-based reentry programs to deal with... to help people who are coming out of the penitentiary deal with the transition into the... into the real world."

Schmitz: "So, this is a new program?"

Hannig: "It's new; that's correct."

- Schmitz: "Okay. I... I guess in a macro sense, as we've been rolling through these we have the baseline budget and then we have the next level. Is... isn't the intent on your side of the aisle to pass a baseline today or isn't it the intent of your side of the aisle to pass a secondary budget which it increases spending over last year's appropriations?"
- Hannig: "Yes. So... so, for example, in this item, in these grants, that the previous budget we passed for these items were rough... roughly baseline. That is, if you mean

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

baseline to mean at last year's level and then this is an approach that the committee would suggest would be higher.

And I think we've tried to make that clear."

Schmitz: "I... That I... I understand that point. I mean, I was looking at it from... we're looking at it as an add-on of 12.5 million (12,500,000) for CeaseFire, but I think last year's CeaseFire was about six million (6,000,000). So, was that incorporated into the baseline at six million (6,000,000) and we added six (6) for the second?"

Hannig: "I think it was not in the '08 final budget because it got that magic Veto pen."

Schmitz: "The Governor vetoed it."

Hannig: "Yeah."

Schmitz: "So, it... as I... if I understood you correctly, the intent is then to pass a different budget, your baseline and a secondary budget over to the Senate and we'll keep rolling through these agency by agency."

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct."

Schmitz: "So... so, two (2) budgets?"

Hannig: "On the grants... on the grants we're going to have approach of what is relatively flat and then what is... what committee Members feel is more appropriate."

Schmitz: "Do we anticipate an additional revenue stream to handle these next tier of grants that we're proposing here?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, we're open to suggestions, if you would like to share some thoughts with us."

Schmitz: "Well, I... I guess I would kind of be open to suggestions, as well. Do we have a revenue stream that's

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

going to handle these... these tier 2 or level B or whichever version's going to get passed out of here by your side of the aisle? Is there a revenue stream attached to these next level of grants that we're debating?"

Hannig: "So, Representative, these are... Yes. These are spending Bills and these are multiple approaches. I think we're trying to move them to the Senate so that they have some options. Obviously, the end game is that we have to have a balanced budget, but I think in the beginning as we work through this, the Senate may propose any number of alternatives that makes the numbers work or in the final analysis, the Governor does have an obligation to make the balance... to make the budget balance through his Veto pen. But what we're trying to do at this part of the... of the budget negotiations or the budget debate is to simply provide some options to the Senate."

Schmitz: "So, I'd... I actually got a chuckle for the budget negotiations. Is this... so the intent was to get this over to the Senate, then the Senate would find the revenue stream to handle the additional level of the increased spending?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, yeah, the Senate, I'm... I'm advised that the Senate is looking at a number ways to find additional revenue through pension obligation bonds. Perhaps, they're interested in some things, as well, that they haven't shared with us, but it's certainly possible that they might."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Schmitz: "So, the Senate's looking at additional revenue enhancements while the House is giving them the spending portion of it?"
- Hannig: "It seemed like a good idea to me. We'll provide them with some help on how to spend it."
- Schmitz: "It's an interesting process this year. I do give you that point. And I thank you for your indulgence."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6565?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the roll. On this question, there's 60 voting 'aye', 54 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We have House Bill 6361. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6361 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6361, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This proposal would appropriate moneys for the Comptroller, the Court of Claims, the Department of Revenue, the Secretary of State, State Board of Elections, the Supreme Court, the State Treasurer, the Law Enforcement Training Standards Board, the Department of Transportation, the Arts Council, and the Appellate Prosecutor. These would be the grants that these agencies make roughly at the same level as last year. So, I'd be happy to answer any questions and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Schmitz, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Schmitz: "Mr. Hannig, this introduction that you have right here, does it include the FY09 General Assembly COLAs?"

Hannig: "I'm sorry. I couldn't hear your question."

Schmitz: "Does this include the FY09 General Assembly COLAs?"

Hannig: "No, it does not, Representative."

Schmitz: "And this is generally flat. It's an '08 rolled into the '09?"

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct."

Schmitz: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis, for what reason do you rise?"

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Reis."

Speaker Turner: "Reis."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Reis: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Reis: "Representative, in this Amendment on this Bill, you are funding the downstate transit. Is that not right?"

Hannig: "Yes. That's correct."

Reis: "Our analysis shows that this would be funding at the 2008 level. Kind of negating the CTA bailout that increased those to 65 percent. Could you offer any comments on that?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think there's... first of all, there's a continuing approp. I understand that... that's associated with that, but this was a flat budget. So, I mean, for the most part, we tried to look at grants and hold them flat in this proposal. Now, there'll be some increases in the next item that I... that I speak of but..."

Reis: "So that means Members on your side of the aisle are going to vote 'yes' to cut a deal that was cut with the Chicago Transit Authority bailout and return them to 19... or 2008 levels."

Hannig: "Well, Representative, in this proposal the RTA and CTA grants are flat as well, but the advantage that we have as downstaters is we have continuing appropriation. So, if this part of the proposal would become law, we would still get our money."

Reis: "But not at the levels that was settled in that CTA bailout."

Hannig: "Continuing appropriation would mean that the... that the people who are entitled to the money don't need the appropriation, they can simply go to the substantive law

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

and they'll get their money. It's the same as with our pensions. We... if we didn't... even if we didn't appropriate a penny's worth of money to the pension systems, they would still collect the money under the continuing appropriation language."

Reis: "Well, it's our understanding that the Governor's introduced budget increased it to the new levels that was decided in that... that settlement, but this budget doesn't do that. It returns it back to the old levels and should this go over to the Senate and pass and become law, we're going to be taking money from the downstate transit."

Hannig: "No. They will go and collect it under the continuing appropriation, continuing appropriation. So, they've got a..."

Reis: "Could that be blocked by the Governor?"

Hannig: "Pardon me."

Reis: "Could that be blocked by the Governor?"

Hannig: "I think the way the continuing appropriation works is that someone who believes that they're entitled to the money can present their case to the Comptroller along with the case law that says that you're entitled to the money and the Comptroller will pay the money. He's obligated to pay the money. The same thing would happen with our... our contribution to the pension systems. If we appropriated something less than the certified amount, then they would come in and ask for the certified amount."

Reis: "Well, we just want to make sure that everyone knows what they're voting on here. And from a legislative intent standpoint, it makes it sound like you're wanting to go

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

ahead and fund those at the old levels. We all know the games that goes on in the second floor. And the last thing we would want to do is have you voting for a Bill that reneges on something that was passed as part of a settlement for our downstate transit. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6361?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?"

Stephens: "Something's up. I... I have a copy of a Motion to reconsider on House Bill 6488, signed by a M. Madigan. I... I assume that's Michael Madigan, Speaker of the House. And I wonder what's going on. This happens to be the Higher Ed approp And Representative Hannig maybe could shed some light on this. But I've been around here for a few years and although most of what's being done this year is unprecedented, this reminds me of a time when we really over politicized, and now if you use that phrase in 2008, you know you're really talking about over politicizing. But I'm just a little suspect about a Motion to reconsider, and I don't know, but I know you wouldn't be part of this, Mr. Speaker and my Democratic colleagues, surely you wouldn't be drug in to a plan that would say, you know what, maybe we should reconsider the districts that didn't

271st Legislative Day

- vote 'yes'. Maybe you would want to punish a university that happened to have a thoughtful Republican in the area. I sure hope that's not true, Mr. Speaker. I sure hope that's not true. Yes, you can laugh all you want about thoughtful Republicans; we're just a bunch of bumpkins over here, that's right. But Mr. Speaker, I challenge you not to let shenanigans take place with this particular Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from McDonough, Representative Myers, for what reason do you rise?"
- Myers: "I also raise the question, the reason why a Motion to reconsider has been filed. I think all of us strongly support higher education, but when it's part of an overall budget we do have some serious concerns about it. And I would hope that an issue isn't related to where a particular institution is located in any particular district because higher education is higher education for the good of all of the state and I think should be considered that way."
- Speaker Turner: "On page 31 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 6429. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6429 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "And Representative Hannig moves that the House adopts Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6429, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This deals with the department... I'm sorry. This deals with the Comptroller's budget for his grants that he would make as well as the Court of Claims, Department of Revenue, Secretary of State, and the Elections, Supreme Court, Treasurer, Law Enforcement Training Standards Board, Transportation... the Department of Transportation, Arts Council, and the Appellate Prosecutors. And I would simply add that these amounts are what the committee would reflect to be the appropriate amounts. It would include full funding for the downstate mass transit districts as well as the RTA and CTA. And I'd be happy to answer any questions and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Smith (sic-Schmitz), for what..."

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Schmitz: "Representative Hannig, what is the overage on this Bill from the fiscal year '08 levels?"

Hannig: "I'm actually advised that the amounts that we spend on GRF decline and the reason for that is because when we did the RTA deal last year we created some dedicated funds that are now being used to displace what used to be GRF money

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

that went to the mass transit systems. So, according to the numbers that I have, the budget for GRF would be three hundred and thirty million, twenty... three hundred and thirty million, twenty-two thousand, nine hundred and thirty-three dollars (\$330,022,933) versus a flat grant budget of three hundred and thirty-three million, eighty-one thousand, seven hundred and sixty-one dollars (\$333,081,761). And I specifically asked our staff about that, because it didn't look right to me that that number would decline. But they explained to me it was because of the RTA/CTA Bill that we passed last year, dedicating funds for that purpose."

- Schmitz: "Second off, Leader Hannig, is... does this addition or new Bill include the fiscal year '09 General Assembly cost... COLAs?"
- Hannig: "I don't think the General Assembly's in this particular budget, but when we get to it... Yeah. The COLAs..."
- Schmitz: "The reason I ask is I thought we were in the Comptroller a minute ago and I thought that was included in the Comptroller's lines."
- Hannig: "These... I'm sorry. These are their distributed grants. You're... you probably were right to ask the question, but the answer is 'no'."
- Schmitz: "Okay. And thank you. What... Mr. Hannig, what budget would the... the '09 COLAs be under?"

Hannig: "6378."

Schmitz: "6378."

271st Legislative Day

- Hannig: "House Bill. Those would be the cost-of-living adjustments, yes. Not a raise, but the cost-of-living adjustments that are calculated."
- Schmitz: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Hannig. And Mr. Speaker, I would request, should this receive 60 votes, we would request a verification."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"
- Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Eddy moves the previous question. And the previous question... 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair is the 'ayes' have it. And the previous question's put. The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig to close on House Bill 6429."
- Hannig: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As I suggested when I began to debate the Bill, that the Comptroller, the Court of Claims, the Department of Revenue, the Secretary of State, the Department... the State Board of Elections, the Supreme Court, the Treasurer's Office, the Law Enforcement Training Standard Board, the Department of Transportation, the Arts Council, and the Appellate Prosecutors are all a part of this Bill. Now, when the committees met over the course of the spring, they were faced with any number of options... I got a southern Illinois drawl. So, the committees met. They've heard a lot of... they've heard a lot of debate on these agencies. Clearly, there's some important issues that they had to try

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

and define, the advocates for any number of these groups were here. They talked about the needs. We debated, for example, the importance of the downstate mass transit system. What it would mean to those Legislators who lived south of I-80. What it would mean to us as downstaters in our effort to try to get mass transit in the State of Illinois up to the standards that we had all wished for and And it seemed to me that the committee hoped for. initially had some concerns as to whether or not that was an appropriate way to address the issue, but in the end I'm very happy and proud to know that the committee was willing to fund the downstate transit system at the appropriate amount as... as we agreed to last year as part of the RTA and CTA deal. In fact, the staff has advised me that after much consideration and thought that the committee actually raised the amount that would be available for our downstate districts. Suggesting that they do understand the importance that this provides, not only to the downstate districts that we as downstaters represent, but through the... throughout the State of Illinois in general, as we try to make this state competitive on a world stage. So, I would ask, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that you consider this appropriation, that you recognize that in one of the rarest cases we are presenting a budget that we would term the higher budget, the inflated budget whatever someone might say about it. But it's actually at a lower level than the flat grant budget. So, this is one of the few times I think that those of you, on either side of the aisle, who've been perhaps unwilling to vote for

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

additional appropriations could actually vote 'yes' on this Bill and clearly make the argument that this is the smaller of the two (2) Bills dealing with these agencies. Ladies and Gentlemen, it seems to me that we need to move forward with this budget. We need to send this Bill over to the Senate in a timely basis, so that they'll have an opportunity to consider it on a timely basis. It is only a House Bill in the House. But I think that if we do that in good faith, that if we send this ... these budgets to the Senate and take the time to explain to them what it is we're trying to do here, what it is we're trying to avoid here, and how important it is to the people of the State of Illinois that we have a budget in place by the end of May, perhaps not a perfect budget, but certainly a budget that we can ensure will allow us to open the doors of State Government on July 1, to ensure that our school districts will get their money, to ensure that senior citizens and those who are in need can provide... will be provided with the state services that are so important to them that many of them have come to rely upon. When I think... if we can do that, I think, Ladies and Gentlemen, the people of the State of Illinois will understand that perhaps this budget or no budget is a perfect budget. That's why we have supplemental appropriations to change those items as we go along, but that this budget does address the fundamental needs that we in the House of Representatives and I believe our colleagues in the Senate and I certainly hope our Governor shares, so that we can pass this and be in a position to adjourn come the end of May. So, Ladies and

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Gentlemen, I would hope that you would join me and overwhelmingly approve this budget and send it to the Senate for their consideration. And I'd simply ask for your 'yes' vote."

Turner: "So the question... Seeing no further Speaker questions, the question is, 'Shall the House Bill 6429 pass?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'... Well, let me first of all say that there has been a request for verification. So, every Member should vote his or her own switch and their switch only. So, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 6429 pass?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'nay' and 0 'presents'. And a request for a verification has been requested. ${\tt Mr.}$ Clerk, read the names of the affirmative."

Clerk Mahonev: "The following Members voting affirmative: Representative Acevedo; Representative Arroyo; Representative Beiser; Representative Berrios; Representative Boland; Representative John Bradlev: Representative Rich Bradley; Representative Brosnahan; Burke; Representative Chapa Representative Representative Collins; Representative Colvin; Representative Crespo; Representative Currie; D'Amico; Representative Monique Davis; Representative Representative Dugan; Representative Dunkin; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Flider; Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative Franks; Representative

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Fritchey; Representative Froehlich; Representative Golar; Representative Representative Gordon; Representative Hamos; Representative Hannig; Representative Harris; Representative Hernandez; Representative Holbrook; Representative Representative Howard; Jakobsson; Representative Jefferies; Representative Jefferson; Representative Joyce; Representative Lang; Representative Joe Lyons; Representative Mautino; Representative May; Representative McCarthy; Representative McGuire; Representative Mendoza; Representative Miller; Representative Molaro; Representative Nekritz; Representative Patterson; Representative Phelps; Representative Reitz; Representative Riley; Representative Representative Ryg; Representative Representative Smith; Representative Soto; Representative Representative Verschoore; Representative Turner; Washington; Representative Yarbrough; Representative Younge and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "I request that the staff retire to the rear of the chamber, that every Member be in their seat and we will now proceed with Representative Smith (sic-Schmitz) with the verification. If the Members will be in their seat, we can move through this verification relatively easy. Staff to the rear of the chamber. The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Schmitz."

Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. I will go as slow as I possibly can through these names. I do want the record to reflect that in no time would... it is my intention to verify Representative Washington and Representative Patterson. So

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

those two (2) Gentlemen are hereby deemed to be here and their names will not show up on my list. Start off, Representative Acevedo."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Acevedo, the Gentleman's in..."

Schmitz: "Collins."

Speaker Turner: "...the Gentleman's in his chair."

Schmitz: "Representative Collins."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady's standing in... near her chair."

Schmitz: "Representative Gordon."

Speaker Turner: "Gordon is in the podium."

Schmitz: "Representative Mendoza. I see her. Representative Froehlich."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman's in his chair."

Schmitz: "Oh. I was... I was looking on the wrong side, I'm sorry. Thank you, Speaker. That concludes it."

Speaker Turner: "And on this question, there are 63 'ayes', 51 'noes', 0 'presents'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6519. Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6519, a Bill for an Act making appropriations has been read a second time, previously.

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6519, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6519 are... is the Department of Aging budget. These are grant lines as passed in last year's budget, including the Governor's Vetoes, without caucus projects. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Mulligan: "Representative, is this flat grants that they've gotten before? What's in your Bill?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes. It is."

Mulligan: "It's just Aging?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct. Just the Aging budget."

Mulligan: "So, anything extra that anybody wanted will not appear in this budget, it'll be in what we call the Christmas tree Bill."

Feigenholtz: "That will be in the next one."

Mulligan: "That'll be the next one."

Feigenholtz: "The growth budget is..."

Mulligan: "So, is this just strictly Aging and nothing else?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Mulligan: "Did you... were you privy to discussing with the department their current budget and where they'd stand?"

Feigenholtz: "I've had ongoing discussions on various aspects of the Aging budget, on and off."

Mulligan: "So, did the Governor allow the Aging... Department of Aging to speak to you about what currently is their level of money that they've spent for FY09?"

271st Legislative Day

- Feigenholtz: "I think that you and I have both been reviewing this budget very, very carefully because there are some programs that are very important to us and Members of our committee. I think that advocates make it very clear where their needs are, where the growth in program is. So, there's been ongoing discussion with them."
- Mulligan: "So, if there's anything extra that people had wanted, it would not appear here, this is just flat."
- Feigenholtz: "That is not in House Bill 6519; however, it will be in the next budget that we do."
- Mulligan: "All right. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6519?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6520. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6520 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

271st Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6520, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6520 is the '09 introduced basically with additions based on hours of hearings that the Human Services Appropriations Committee held. And I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."
- Mulligan: "So, Representative, my understanding is now we're going to have several Christmas tree Bills and this is the first of the heart's desire for Aging."
- Feigenholtz: "Representative Mulligan, I would rather refer to this Bill and other growth Bills as growth Bills. As you know, we have great needs and we have advocates that come to our committee and articulate what is going on in their not-for-profits, the kind of services that they are providing and it is my belief that many of the elements of this legislation and this budget include many things that all Members of the Human Services Appropriations Committee would be interested in supporting."
- Mulligan: "What's the different amount between this budget and the last budget?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Feigenholtz: "One hundred and forty-five million dollars (\$145,000,000) ish."

Mulligan: "Ish? Give or take a little ish, here and there."

Feigenholtz: "It's a little ishy."

Mulligan: "Is that a new term that I've missed in our budget talks? So, it's a hundred and forty-five million (145,000,000) in growth."

Feigenholtz: "It is."

Mulligan: "And in your visionary process or that of your visionary staff, where do you intend to get the growth?"

Feigenholtz: "Well, we'd be glad to entertain any revenue enhancement suggestions that you or any of your caucus Members might have, Representative."

Mulligan: "Well, I think that's more your... As we've been reminded quite frequently this year, you're in the Majority. So, I'd think seriously that those are the Bills that will come out from you. Basically, how much time did we spend negotiating last year? You and I together, on what would happen in the budget, particularly in August?"

Feigenholtz: "Eleven (11) months."

Mulligan: "And many hours on weekends."

Feigenholtz: "Right. Night times and weekends."

Mulligan: "And many missed Cub games..."

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Mulligan: "...for you."

Feigenholtz: "Right. And this year we had about as many hours worth of hearings that you were a very active participant of, most of the time, when you didn't have laryngitis, and asked many questions and listened hours at a time, as we do

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

every year in the Human Services Appropriations Committee, to the specific needs of various providers."

Mulligan: "Well, Representative, you and I have listened to many years. And I've been here sixteen (16) so it's really many years of listening to them, but that's not the point. The point is listening to them, entertaining what they want, and having a serious discussion of what would go into a budget that comes out of this House of the General Assembly are two (2) different things. And I would suggest strongly to you that you have no idea what we would do with a revenue stream this year, nor have we negotiated on anything that would come out in any of these Bills. That these are your Bills and that we have had no input as to what should be in them. So, that's a point that I'd like to make very strongly. To the Bill. There's a lot of reasons why we are voting 'no' on these Bills, but the main one is we have had zero input. There has been no negotiations on our part. There's a lot of expectations providers are lost when you for that don't have negotiations or significant negotiations. There are a lot of people that we represent that are not represented at the table this year because this half of the General Assembly, on the Republican side, has not been asked to participate. If there is any revenue stream that has been anticipated or how we would spend that, I don't think that's been defined, nor is the money that we would spend on anything new spread out on a spreadsheet to see where we want it going. we can't go there, why should we vote for it? anticipate that the Senate's going to do anything with

271st Legislative Day

- these? And are we creating questions for providers? I would say yes. I would urge a 'no' vote on this."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6520?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'aye', 53 voting 'no' and 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6523. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6523 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6523, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6523 is the Human Services budget, flat from '08, and the Illinois Council of Developmental Disabilities. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Mulligan: "Representative, is this Bill contains... like a flat budget from Department of Human Services or is there anything different in there than... than that?"

Feigenholtz: "These are flat grant lines as passed in last year's '08 budget, including the Governor's Vetoes and without any caucus projects, Representative."

Mulligan: "I'm sorry. What was the sta... sentence without?"

Feigenholtz: "Without any caucus projects."

Mulligan: "Okay. So, this is what would be there eliminating any community project money which we normally do each year and nothing is carried over and so this is... this would be the flat budget?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Mulligan: "Do you have any idea... You're sending certainly a wide spectrum of Bills over to the Senate. I'm presuming that... no, I won't presume. I have no idea what you anticipate happening with any of these Bills, but you're certainly giving them a wide choice. What do you anticipate if they pick and choose certain Bills and then don't go anywhere with them? Will you come back with another version?"

Feigenholtz: "We're hoping the Senate will pass it and that we'll be home on May... on June 1, Representative, for a host of reasons that you and I discussed a little earlier. I dare not speculate what the Senate will do."

Mulligan: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass 6523?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now

271st Legislative Day

- open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We have House Bill 6524. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6524, has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "And Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6524, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6524 is... begins at the '09 introduced, basically, with additions based upon the hours of hearings that we had in the Human Services Appropriations Committee over the last few months. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will. She will."

Mulligan: "Representative, this Bill... it's my understanding this Bill is all the growth that you anticipate for DHS.

How much is it total?"

Feigenholtz: "Roughly, five hundred million dollars (\$500,000,000) ish."

Mulligan: "I have to talk to you about what language you're using there. So, roughly, five hundred million dollars (\$500,000,000). I notice that there are some things in this budget and some things in the last budget that are similar, so I'm presuming that when there's a line item that raises a COLA or does something, the original budget that you passed just previous to this, for that department remains the same and this is the budget that if any of the new things that where asked for are included in. Correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct. There's a lot of things in this budget, Representative Mulligan, that we intended on funding in the '08 budget that were vetoed by the Governor, things that you and I and the Members of the committee have been interested in funding, as well as some additions. The DASA, COLA, and waiting list is addressed. We're removing people from the PUNS waiting list so that we can serve more people living with developmental disabilities. We're funding more capacity for mental health and addressing issues of their waiting list, and as you can see, certainly, the children's mental health partnership... We've included the Governor's introduced four million (4,000,000) for supportive housing and a long list of others."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Mulligan: "Thank you. To the Bill. All of these projects are very nice and once again I'd like to speak to the reason why some of us who have worked long and hard on these issues for a number of years will be voting 'no'. The 'no' vote consists of the fact that we have had not one moment of real negotiation on any of these issues. The fact of the matter is revenue is down and there's no anticipated way of paying for any of these things. I think the issue should have been out for everyone, both sides of the aisle, to speak to, to decide what we could actually afford to fund and what we can't. The object of having different providers in and asking them what they want is not to feather your nest for the coming campaign, or to include them that... what they're going to get or to tell them that we're not voting with them. The object is to work with them in order to significantly pass what they need or to figure out how the money is going to be spent. That certainly was not done this year. The fact that you're sending out a huge Bill which creates anticipation of many programs that people need that will probably never see the light of day or funded, is really a cruel way of doing a budget. It has no common sense to it. It certainly is political. It has nothing to do with reality. For those of us that have worked in this Body, and I have for sixteen (16) years, on some of these issues, it's a real insult. It certainly is an insult to the providers that come here year after year, come to all kinds of different events and expect to be helped. We have a Governor who for the last several years has gone to human service providers and asked

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

them to show up day and night at different places, stand behind him and then lobby us on issues. Now we carry it one step further. This year House Democrats had hearings and where they asked all these people to show up again, stand behind them, go to us and lobby for issues that may never see the light of day. When you are a provider in Illinois you can be sure of one thing, you're going to be abused. You're not going to get your COLA. You're not going to be paid on time and you're going to have people lie to you. To put out a Bill like this is certainly not the way to do business here. Particularly for some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who have honestly worked on these issues for years, I would think they would have some trepidation in putting out things that promise things that will never happen and certainly sending them over to another Body that does not agree with us and taking it completely out of control over what's important in this budget and what isn't. I urge a 'no' vote. I urge that you do not promise people what you cannot deliver. The question of when you do a budget clean up is very unclear. So, what we do is we go out of here promising people things they'll never see, hoping it sees the light of day through campaign and then coming back after election in November and trying to figure out how to cut a budget. What a bunch of baloney that is to feed to hardworking people, who constantly have the state budget balanced on their backs, who constantly are not paid on time with outstanding money and other promises who come here year after year hoping for us to solve problems. There are many

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

people, particularly in the Human Service Appropriation Committee, on our side, that aren't the people that go there because it's the new place to put somebody. They've been there for years and they work hard on these issues. And to totally eliminate them and the fact that they've negotiated in good faith, both with the other side and with providers, is a travesty. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall...' Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a great deal of respect for the Minority spokesperson of the Human Services Committee, but I would like to respond very quickly to some of her comments. I don't disagree with the fact that we have issues with people anticipating payment. I think that we've had some very difficult days with people getting paid in the State of Illinois. I'm sorry that you look at this Bill the way you do. I look at it completely differently. I look at it as an opportunity to put providers in the game to work with the Senate and try and get some of these issues that have been for years ignored and unaddressed to the forefront. As you know, all of these Human Service providers are constantly competing for dollars. Very often they fall into second place to the education funding budget and so now they have their first opportunity to get up to the plate and try and get some funding for the programming that they work hard on and for the people of the State of Illinois to try and get more kids off of the disability list and to try and get more people mental health services. So, I see this differently. I see it as the glass being

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- half full, Representative Mulligan, and I'm sorry that you feel the way you do. I encourage everyone to vote... to vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Turner: "So the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6524?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We have House Bill 6521. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6521 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Move the Bill... Read the Bill,
 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6521, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6521 is the HFS flat budget. These are grant lines that pretty much passed in last year's budget, including the Governor's Vetoes, without any caucus projects. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Mulligan: "Representative Feigenholtz, is this HFS flat?"

Feigenholtz: "It is."

Mulligan: "If this passes, what's the anticipated payment cycle for Medicaid bills?"

Feigenholtz: "Payment cycle will increase by about twenty-four (24) days."

Mulligan: "How do you assume that it will decrease by twenty-four (24) days?"

Feigenholtz: "The value of a day, as you know, is twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000). So, it's calculated on twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000)."

Mulligan: "My understanding was that you were not addressing the Medicaid backlog in any way. Is that so?"

Feigenholtz: "No."

Mulligan: "So how much money did you put in to cover the FY08 shortfall and how much money you are anticipating..."

Feigenholtz: "Flat budget, Representative Mulligan. Twenty-four (24) day increase in the payment cycle."

Mulligan: "So it will be how many days total then? If it's ninety (90) and ninety-seven (97) right now, is it going to be twenty-four (24) added on to ninety (90)?"

Feigenholtz: "Hundred (100) days."

Mulligan: "A hundred (100) days after it's approved, which could be what, six (6) months? You obviously have no idea."

Feigenholtz: "Could be."

Mulligan: "Okay. So, this is a flat budget and you're assuming it's going to add twenty-four (24) days to the payment cycle of all the human service providers that you asked to

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

come to all your hearings and to come in the last couple weeks and talk to you about how good the Democrat budget was going to be for them. I guess we have to reconsider that maybe."

- Feigenholtz: "Representative Mulligan, this legislation keeps the lights on and keeps providers paid. If we don't pass this budget, they will not get paid."
- Mulligan: "I think paying people and paying people are two different ways of looking at it."
- Feigenholtz: "I... I agree with you."
- Mulligan: "And I do think that kind of holding peoples' feet to the fire over whether they come and tell you what they want or don't, or whether they're going to get paid or not, when it's the obligation in the good faith of the State of Illinois to pay bills that they've been incurred that are from a entitlement program through the Federal Government is not a way of doing business. Do you have an idea and what have you put in this flat budget for penalties on prompt payment, which we always have a hard time getting out of the department."
- Feigenholtz: "We've inquired... we've requested that number from HFS and have yet to receive it. I think you and I both asked that question in committee about two (2) months ago."
- Mulligan: "Were you allowed or did the Governor allow the Department of Health Care and Family Services to talk to about what their current state of affairs is in order for you to put together this budget?"
- Feigenholtz: "We... you and the director and I met in my office a while back. Do you recall that?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Mulligan: "I recall, but we weren't negotiating what was going to be in the budget. We were discussing what their problems were, which were multiple."

Feigenholtz: "Right. But this is a flat budget, Representative Mulligan, there's really nothing to negotiate."

Mulligan: "Well, I think there's always something to negotiate.

Obviously, if you get the budgeteers together in a room you come up with what you think the revenue's going to be and then you start looking at what's important, what needs to be done, and what has to wait until we have the adequate money. Or you come up with a budget implementation Act..."

Feigenholtz: "That was with the last Governor."

Mulligan: "...that figures out... That was with the last Governor. Unfortunately, to negotiate with him might not be good and the next one may... never mind we won't go there. Anyway, I do think that this is a little bit of a problem when you can't get an answer from the agency on what their budget includes and then you're shooting in the dark as far as what the budget's going to be. And then you go out and you tell providers we're here to help you. I guess there... once again there's help and there's help. Thank you. We can move on to the next one, unless there's other questions. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Feigenholtz: "Representative Mulligan..."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Bellock, for what reason do you rise?"

Bellock: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I just think..."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Bellock: "...that there needs to be somewhat of a comment on the recent audit that came back on this program and the irresponsibility of the Medicaid problems in Illinois. We have tried several Bills and the agencies have always said, oh, we do that, we do that. Well, this is to extend the Medicaid payments which are already so far behind. We have 1.5 billion (1,500,000,000) of unpaid Medicaid bills and now we have an audit that has come out with ver... troubling problems in thirteen (13) areas in these agencies. So, I think it's something that we absolutely need to address and not extend the payment of the bills further for twenty-four (24) days."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6521?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Speaker in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to take a brief break. And we have a special treat for everybody. Those of us in Illinois who followed the championship seasons of the Chicago Bulls, Michael Jordon, Scottie Pippen, you probably remember the man to my right who was the man in the middle, as they used to say, Bill Cartwright. So Bill, as you can see, everybody appreciates what you did for the Bulls and for Illinois and your time

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

with the Bulls and we would like you just to render some brief remarks."

- Bill Cartwright: "Wow. What a reception. You know, it's always funny to me that it has been a little while since we won... won our championships and everything's a real battle, from start to finish. I came to Chicago in '88 and was very, very fortunate to be drafted by a little short fat guy or traded for Jerry Krause and him and Jerry Reinsdorf and a guy by the name of Phil Jackson. We just had a very great team and I was just very, very fortunate to be a part And one of the reasons why I'm down here is representing a group called Allendale that we're trying to raise some funds for and, you know, I felt that was another So, I teamed up with them and we're great... great team. very fortunate and hopefully, we'll do some great things. So, thank you and go get 'em."
- Speaker Madigan: "For those of you that would like to spend some time with Bill, he's going to be right down here in the well. Representative Turner in the Chair."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook (sic-Crawford),

 Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"
- Eddy: "Thank you very much. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "State your point."

- Eddy: "Representative, I say we call the Senate and we schedule a basketball game immediately to make up for the debacle the other night in the softball. And we got a guy we can feed the ball to in the post."
- Speaker Turner: "That's a good point. In fact one of the Senators are here, Senator Raoul, who has asked for that

271st Legislative Day

- challenge. I wasn't quite certain that we were going to be ready today, but it's certainly worth considering. Mr. Clerk, I think we can proceed while the photos are being taken here. We have House Bill 6526. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6526 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6526, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6526, it's the HFS growth budget. It is essentially the '09 introduced basically, with some additions after hours and hours of hearings in the Human Services Approps Committee. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Of course, we're never going to hear what any of this says and

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

that's as good a tactic to use as any. Because we have the illustrious Mr. Cartwright here, but I still think that the overage in the HFS budget is important. I asked if she'd yield, but unfortunately..."

- Speaker Turner: "Just consulting with staff right now.

 Representative, she said she will yield. Your question."
- Mulligan: "The question, Representative, is how much of this is the Christmas tree Bill for HFS? What's the total amount?"
- Speaker Turner: "Representative... Turn on Representative Cross.

 Leader Cross."
- "Mr. Speaker, we're about to be at a billion five (1,500,000,000) over... out of balance on a budget. This next Amendment deals with almost seven hundred and fifty million (750,000,000) in new growth and I am very, very excited that Bill Cartwright's here, but I'm wondering if maybe we ought to take a break for 15 or 20 minutes or a half hour and then we get back to the peoples' business. I think everybody should have an opportunity to meet him, but if we're going to do serious business and continue to start running and continue to run a budget that is so out of whack and so... No. ... so out of balance, we're not going to participate in this. Now if... you either can take a break, we can go to caucus, we can adjourn. I don't care, but at a billion five (1,500,000,000), we're starting to talk about a little money. Even from your side, I would think. Now..."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Cross, I believe Representative Feigenholtz was prepared to answer the question that she had asked."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Cross: "Which... No one's paying attention. With all due respect, let's give our... let's give our guest some attention. Let's take a break for 15 minutes. He's part of the World Champion Chicago Bulls. I'd love to do that, all I'm saying is stop for a few minutes. Give us 10."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Cross, we will stand at ease 'til the call of the Chair."

Cross: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Members should not leave the chamber. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCarthy, for what reason do you rise?"

McCarthy: "A point of information, please."

Speaker Turner: "State your point."

McCarthy: "A point of personal privilege, actually, so. Thank you and I appreciate your attendance... I appreciate listening up during the recess here. But I did want to recognize a group that came down from Chicago today from the Saint Bede Catholic School, at 83rd and Kostner, with their principal, Rick Guerin. So, let's give them a warm House of Representatives welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield. The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?

Turn Representative Stephens on."

Stephens: "I just wanted to see how it was going. Are you doing all right?"

Speaker Turner: "Very well."

Stephens: "All right. How many more minutes do we have?

'Cause I think you can take him."

Speaker Turner: "About 3."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Stephens: "I think you can take him, one on one. I got a hoop in my office."

Speaker Turner: "Been here too many minutes. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Molaro, for what reason do you rise?"

Molaro: "Thank you. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "State your point."

"I just think we'll be remiss and we have Bill Cartwright here, if we didn't mention for those of you, and Art, I know you're one of us, just like myself, '91, '92, and '93 was the first three (3) years that they won. And I got to tell you, I don't think I missed a game. Definitely not miss a playoff game. For those of you who missed those three (3) years, it had to be the most exciting time in Chicago sports, watching the Bulls play. And I... Michael Jordan did not do it alone and Bill Cartwright was a big part of that. But the reason I am standing is I have a daughter that goes to the University of San Francisco. And I was out at the University of San Francisco and I know Bill is busy taking his pictures, but they have this big banner of Bill Cartwright that they retired his number at the University of San Francisco, nice Catholic university. And I just want to say that the people down there haven't forgot him... forgotten him and what a great time it was those three (3) years. What a great time. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The House will come back to order. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6521. Read the Bill. Mark? 6526. I apologize, 6526. Read the Bill."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6526, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from... Third Reading. Read the Bill again, Mr. Clerk, or was that the Third Reading? The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6526 is the HFS growth budget. Again, the Governor's '09 introduced with some additions based on hours of hearings in the Human Services Appropriations Committee. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mulligan: "Mr. Speaker, was this the Bill we were on when we..."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative, this is the same Bill we were on, right."

Mulligan: "What happened to the HFS Bill?"

Speaker Turner: "This is the HFS Bill."

Mulligan: "This says DHS."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "House Bill 6526 is the Department of Health Care and Family Service growth budget, Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Okay. They just changed the title on the screen.

All right. So, when we go back to... I think the question I was asking you was how much does this add up to for the growth budget?"

Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry."

Mulligan: "How much does this add up to for the growth budget?"

Feigenholtz: "Nine hundred and fifteen million, five hundred and ten thousand and three hundred dollars (\$915,510,300)."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Mulligan: "Staff is telling me that somewhere or other something got lost in the translation. They have like seven hundred and fifty million (750,000,000) and you're telling me that it's nine hundred and fifteen million (915,000,000)."

Feigenholtz: "That's correct."

Mulligan: "Compared to the flat or..."

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Mulligan: "Does this include any of the shortfall from '08?"

Feigenholtz: "No."

Mulligan: "So, this is strictly all new for FY09? How do you intend to address the shortfall from FY08?"

Feigenholtz: "This includes the liability. It will be at seventy (70) days after we pass this budget, just like we are now."

Mulligan: "So, you think that by adding this money in and is some of this... Instead of just increases for providers and things like that is some of this for the Medicaid budget?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes. This will bring cycle down and deal with liability."

Mulligan: "So, some of us are... I'm getting two (2) different figures from the people around me. One's 1.5 billion (1,500,000,000) and the other one is seven hundred and fifty million (750,000,000) and then you gave me nine hundred and fifteen (915,000,000). I mean I think this points out a really good fact about the way we're doing the budget. It's a little imprecise to say the least."

Feigenholtz: "Rosemary, our staff will be more than glad to share the math with your staff."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Mulligan: "That would be novel for this year. Although, they've been willing to share after they've done it. We haven't been consulted before it was done."

Feigenholtz: "I believe that they have shared it."

Mulligan: "They have shared when it's done, I will say that.

So, I don't want to criticize your staff, who I'm sure works long hours just like our staff does. Although some of the goals are not similar, particularly this year.

Okay. So, let's error on the high side 1.2 billion (1,200,000,000) add-ons for HFS. Gee, Barry Maram must be jumping in the aisle. Do you honestly think that this is going to happen?"

Feigenholtz: "We can hope."

Mulligan: "You know, you and I both are Cubs fans, hope is part of our make-up, what can I tell you. But I think they have a better chance of winning the pennant than we do of getting another 1.5 billion (1,500,000,000) into HFS this year. I would be curious to see what kind of a 'bimp' Bill you're willing to sponsor that's going to come up with this money. That should be very interesting. Do you..."

Feigenholtz: "I'm sure I'll be the first they show that to, too."

Mulligan: "I'm sure. I think some of the providers you're promising would like to see that, too, aside from the fact that this is a little pie in the sky."

Feigenholtz: "Well, as I said earlier, Representative Mulligan, since the Governor has a propensity to exact reduction Vetoes, this Bill gives the providers an opportunity to petition both the Senate and Governor to keep them at this

271st Legislative Day

- level. It's a framework. It's a way... it's a place to start. And at least it's out there. As you know, some of the rate increases for physicians, for pediatric specialists, for hospitals, for long-term care, we've had people come to our committee year after year after year and ask for rate increases that they have not received in over a decade. So, I think the fact that we have a document that actually can articulate how huge the Human Services needs are in the State of Illinois is a good thing."
- Mulligan: "I think that's a very interesting premise. Mr. Mapes was kind of shrugging. I'm sure that since he did such a great job in renovating this chamber, he probably has a room lined up where they're going to put the press to run off the money for Illinois, otherwise, how are we going to pay for it? It certainly would be interesting."
- Speaker Turner: "Represent... The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?"
- Stephens: "Just for the purpose of continuity, I wanted to yield my 5 minutes to Representative Mulligan."
- Speaker Turner: "And your 5 minutes is accepted if she needs it. Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to go over the general premise of what's going on here one more time, as far as what's happening to our side of the aisle. Number one, there have been no significant negotiations with either our budgeteers or with any of the Members of the Human Service Approp Committee that would justify these Bills or us being part of them. A lot of what's in them is pie in the sky, if it happens I'd be very surprised. Quite

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

frankly, to promise providers things that they're never going to see and to not have a reasonable plan is really a cruel way of doing a budget and holding out for them what we're... what's going on here in the General Assembly. fact of the matter is, and I wish the newspapers would certainly take note, these are Democrat budgets being sent a hostile Democrat chamber, with a dysfunctional Democrat whole package of what the Governor's going to do and what not. Representative Feigenholtz and I spent hours last year negotiating what we thought were fair things that would happen in the overtime Session. Even that was crucified at the end and things weren't going. So, think that these things are all going to be back in there, is actually a big scam on the providers. Not only that, to make them come out to hearings repeatedly where, although I appreciate the memo we got on our desk, the hearings this year Republicans were not invited to. Advocates have been told either to share or not share with us or to pressure the Democrat Members to vote so that we didn't have to. The fact of the matter is, this is the worst I have ever seen in my sixteen (16) years, as far as how we're going to negotiate. Read it and weep has never been a negotiating tool as far as I can tell and that's pretty much what's happened this year. So, if anybody on your side thinks that this is a good way to do business just so you can go home, campaign, or actually try and do mail pieces through the end of the campaign and then try to come back here and solve what is a total fiasco of a budget, I think they ought to think about what's going to happen in November.

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

In this Body, we run every two (2) years. The election is going before it's even over the first time. So I think that will be a problem for a lot of people in this chamber is how are they going to provide for what happens, what are they going to have happen when it goes over to the Senate and it's not sustained. And as providers had said to me at the beginning of the year, how do we get things if the Governor's for it, the Speaker won't be; if the Speaker's for it, the Governor won't be. How do you negotiate something for your Human Service agency when you know that we're going to balance our budget on your backs once again? How do you actually ask them to come out to a hearing repeatedly, and they feel that they must appear, because if they don't they have no hope of being included in anything. This is a horrible way for the people that we represent and if you think by us being here and excluding us, you're excluding us personally, you're not. You're excluding the people that we represent. You're excluding the Human Service providers that over the years we have tried to help. You are excluding so many people in the State of Illinois from voices that care about them that this is really ridiculous. If you want to carry the feud to the point of excluding people and particularly good groups of people on our side that have worked for years in special areas like Human Services, Early Childhood Intervention, all the things that go into making the state a better state, just ask them, how have they been over the last five (5) or six (6) years? Are they any better? Certainly, they're not and by putting out sham budgets like

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

this is really, really discounting the value that they provide to Illinois, particularly, the money that is philanthropically given in their own areas in order to keep afloat because we don't pay them enough. This is really a travesty. I would urge a 'no' vote again to signify the fact that we understand this is a bunch of baloney. We understand this isn't going to happen. We understand it's going to be one heck of time before you put together something that's a real document. I would hope that people would understand that what we're doing here is a false way of representing the people in Illinois that care about the most vulnerable people that we serve the most. This is really a sad day."

- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks, for what reason do you rise?"
- Franks: "I was enjoying the speech. I'd like to yield 5 minutes to Representative Mulligan."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady refuses. Now, Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "I'd like to thank the Representative; he certainly knows quality when he hears it. And I have often wanted to give him some of my time, particularly in the Senior Pharmaceutical Board. It's always nice to hear someone that's out there and knows where it's at, particularly in the candidates he backs."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6526?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no', and 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege, if I could have the attention of the Body."

Speaker Turner: "State your point."

Eddy: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have now reached 1.6 billion dollars (\$1,600,000,000) in additional spending on budgets that increase. That's before a five hundred million dollar (\$500,000,000) hole. So we have reached the two billion dollar (\$2,000,000,000) mark, the two billion dollar (\$2,000,000,000) mark in red ink."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?"

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

No one in this chamber is surprised. No one in Illinois will be surprised. I've said time and time again this year that many of the issues that we are making the worst of are because of failed leadership by elected Democrats. I point to the fact that you are the Majority Party. And I wonder if you accept that role of leadership. I wonder if the Senate, who is in a extraordinary Majority accepts that role of leadership and responsibility. I wonder if the... every statewide officeholder, they're probably lighting candles on cakes in various offices on the second floor and maybe ov... in your offices. We can't even balance last

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

year's budget and now you bring us two billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000) right off the bat. We are... we aren't even finished vet and we're two billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000), two billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000) plus in the hole. We haven't solved any of the crisis before This doesn't get us caught up in public aid payments. This doesn't handle the pension crisis. I don't know how much worse you can make Illinois, but if I've been paying attention to some of my reading economically, in various categories, we rank anywhere from forty-second to fortyninth in the United States as far as job creation, a place to bring your business, a place to bring your job, to do To hopefully, make a profit, but more importantly, to employ Illinoisans. This morning and again last week, we gave you an opportunity to deal with an issue that is important to every family in Illinois. You think... you called it pandering to the voters. I'll tell you what, when the voters demand action it's incumbent upon us to do something reasonable and responsible in response to their needs. And you sit there and do nothing and you mock us because we're pointing out the fact that you're two billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000) in the hole before you start. and Gentlemen of Illinois, that is Democrat Ladies leadership and there they stand proud of themselves, proud to be in debt, proud to be ruining our state, proud to be chasing jobs out of Illinois and proud of the fact that when we put down a half million dollars (\$500,000) of carpet in this chamber we forgot to use Scotchgard. If you don't believe..."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Speaker Turner: "Thank you..."

Stephens: "...if you don't believe me, spill something on the carpet..."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative."

Stephens: "...and see if it soaks in."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative, and you should not be recommending that people come in here and spill stuff on the carpeting. We know the rules. Thank you. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6542. Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6542 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6542, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6542 is the Illinois Department of Public Health budget. These are flat grant lines that where passed in last year's budget, including the Governor's Vetoes, without caucus projects. I'd be glad to answer any questions, again."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what..."

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."

Mulligan: "This is a flat budget? Sara? Flat budget?"

Feigenholtz: "Flat."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Mulligan: "Did you know that the Department of Public Health has lost its six hundred thousand dollar (\$600,000) grant from the Federal Government that they've been having for the last several years, my understanding was they didn't fulfill the promises in the grant and this is things that go towards special studies..."

Feigenholtz: "For what, though?"

Mulligan: "...different diseases."

Feigenholtz: "What particular..."

Mulligan: "Well, I think there's some for arthritis and there's other areas. So, if you've put... if you've included that in your flat budget, are you going to be six hundred thousand dollars (\$600,000) off, right to begin with?"

Feigenholtz: "Did they lose it for FY09? Do you know what cycle they're on? If it's..."

Mulligan: "That was my understanding from what..."

Feigenholtz: "Rosemary, it's my belief that this..."

Mulligan: "...some lobbyist told me."

Feigenholtz: "I would imagine that every department loses federal grants all of the time. I don't know typically how they compensate for those losses and how they correct them. I've not heard anything about it."

Mulligan: "Well, if it's included in your budget, then I guess you have to figure out if you're going to fund that or not. But it seems to me, they've been... they've been pretty good about sharing with us, when we talked to them, and so I don't know, in your closed-door meetings that you've had the last several weeks putting together budgets, I'm not quite sure if they came to you or you just were talking to

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

advocates. So, I'm curious as to how you put this together."

Feigenholtz: "This was... I did not talk to them. Again, any conversation that I had with the Department of Public Health aside from perhaps a few personal conversations with mutual friends are... were had in front of you, Representative."

Mulligan: "All right. So, that they're not... Your budget is just your budget, as a flat budget from... as introduced by the Governor or this past year?"

Feigenholtz: "'08"

Mulligan: "'08 without any Member..."

Feigenholtz: "Member or..."

Mulligan: "...initiatives in there."

Feigenholtz: "...caucus project."

Mulligan: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6542?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 50 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6543. Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6543 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."

271st Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "And Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6543, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6543 is the Illinois Department of Public Health growth budget. It's essentially the Governor's '09 introduced with some additions. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."
- Mulligan: "Representative, this is the wish list or things that people des... have desired over the last number of years. Could you tell me if that's the case and how much it adds up to?"
- Feigenholtz: "The total is an additional thirty-six million, three hundred and seventy-six thousand, five hundred dollars (\$36,376,500), exactly."
- Mulligan: "Well, I wish we..."
- Feigenholtz: "Is... is that the number you have?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Mulligan: "...had been able to discuss that with you because obviously, there are some very good things in all of these, but the hope of them being funded is rather slim and so I still urge a 'no' vote. But at some point there are many of us, particularly on that... on our Human Service Approp Committee, that would like to sit down and talk to you about how we handle these things. Unfortunately, we weren't included this time and this is an excessive amount of money considering the general forecast for state revenue."

Feigenholtz: "Representative, there are so many things in this Bill that you are interested in that were in the '08 budget that were vetoed by the Governor from RMED to perinatal, access to health, all kinds of wonderful things that we've been fighting for together. It's unfortunate that you are unable to support this."

Mulligan: "Well, Representative, as you know, I've supported a lot of these things and last year when you and I spent hours and hours of going over with a small amount of money that was being allocated to us, we figured out how to do it. This year we're not privy to that and it does seem to me unfortunate because then we have no idea what's going to happen in the Budget Implementation Act or we're taking the people of Illinois and what's going to happen and certainly by sending this out over to the Senate we're then getting rid of every bit of control that we have over what actually goes in that budget. So, I think that's unfortunate, even though I agree with you, there are probably many good things in there. There are many good

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

things I'd like to support. Many good things the people know that they can't afford, so that don't spend the money on them if they don't have it."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Tryon, for what reason do you rise?"

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to ask the Lady a question about her Bill, if she will yield."

Speaker Turner: "She will yield."

Tryon: "Representative, since I did not have an opportunity to review this Bill, I don't know exactly all of it's content, but I received a lot of... of concern about the basic health grant from our local health departments in the way that the money is being distributed to each individual local health department. My understanding is, in the past, half of that money's been divided up by county and the other half has been based on population and the first proposal made in the appropriation Bill was going to do away with the division of the basic health grant by population. I want to know is that in this Bill?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative Tryon, there's an additional five million dollars (\$5,000,000)... the good news is there's an addition five million dollars (\$5,000,000) in this... in this budget for local health protection grants, based on the formula."

Tryon: "Are we keeping the formula? Is the formula still going to be the basic health grant as divided by population?"

Feigenholtz: "That's exactly how the formula is constructed, yes."

Tryon: "So, there's being... there's that... has..."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Feigenholtz: "The new five million (5,000,000)."

Tryon: "What... Okay. There's one basic health grant. Okay. Half of the money, in the past, has been divided by county. The other half has been divided by population. Is all of the money being divided by population or is it all being divided by counties, what... how's the basic health grant working?"

Feigenholtz: "It's both."

Tryon: "It's both. Okay. So, you're saying you're... you're adding five million dollars (\$5,000,000)..."

Feigenholtz: "But that is the funding formula, Representative Tryon. The way the funding formula is structured, it's both by county and by population."

Tryon: "And... and you're not changing that, but it's adding five million (5,000,000) to the part of the basic health grant that..."

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Tryon: "...is distributed by population."

Feigenholtz: "And formula."

Tryon: "Okay."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6543?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there's 61 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6546. Read the Bill."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6546, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6546, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6546 is the DCFS budget... flat budget which are grant lines as passed in last year's budget, including the Governor's Vetoes, without any caucus projects. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

- Mulligan: "Sara, you'll be happy to know I'm losing my voice again. Is there... this is a flat DCFS budget, right?"
- Feigenholtz: "It is."
- Mulligan: "Does it account for the fact that we may not have the federal okay to do subsidized guardianship any longer?"
- Feigenholtz: "It does not. It's flat."
- Mulligan: "And is there any anticipation of how much that will cost if we have to fill that hole in the budget?"
- Feigenholtz: "I think that... we could both have staff make that inquiry. I don't have that number right off the top of my head."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Mulligan: "All right. So, we may be starting off a little bit in the hole here to begin with if that doesn't happen. I... I haven't..."
- Feigenholtz: "Well, we're in the hole 'cause it's flat."
- Mulligan: "...had an update from them as to whether they're getting it or not. All right. So, this is a flat budget minus any potential community projects that were in there."

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

- Mulligan: "And this is what you're sending over to the Senate?" Feigenholtz: "Yes."
- Mulligan: "I haven't asked this, but I thought it's probably a good question to ask and it's not a trick question, it's just one I'm interested in knowing for the simple reason that we haven't any input. But have you or your staff had any discussions on the Bills you're sending over with the Senate Democrats?"
- Feigenholtz: "The Senate Democrats have a chart of all of these budgets that we're passing and yes, there's been ongoing conversation."
- Mulligan: "So, is there an ongoing conversation or is there an ongoing disagreement or what anticipation do you have on how welcome some of your glorious budget Bills going over there or going to be accepted?"
- Feigenholtz: "Are you asking me again what the crystal ball of the budget is going to... what's going to happen?"
- Mulligan: "Yeah. You certainly took the crystal ball out of our hands. So, I'm assuming maybe you know something more than we know and that this will actually... some of it will

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

actually happen, but I'm just curious as to what will happen or you're just takin' a shot at it."

Feigenholtz: "As I said earlier, Representative Mulligan, I think that this... the next budget, the growth budget, for DCFS is an opportunity for providers and foster care families as we will discuss when House Bill 6547 is up on the board. We'll have an opportunity to petition and discuss some of the long-awaited needs of foster care parents, as well as the needs of group homes. I know that people have been wearing the carpet out in your... on their way to visit you about these issues for sixteen (16) years and here's an opportunity for them to do diligence and try and keep these items in the budget and convince the Senate and the Governor that they are worthy."

Mulligan: "I think that would be a very interesting conversation that I would like to observe, but aside from that, I guess we'll move on to the next one. I would urge a 'no' vote. I do not think this... this is what is a good idea for DCFS for the simple reason they do have multiple problems. We're not sure how they're going to handle some federal issues and I think that from some of the hearings we've had in the past two (2) years there are potential problems with that agency that could use a little bit... a different type of budget than we've done in the past. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass 65... House Bill 6546?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

271st Legislative Day

- voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 50 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6547. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6547, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves that the House do adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6547. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6547, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6547 is the DCFS growth budget. It is basically the '09 introduced with some additions based on hearings that the Human Services Appropriations Committee held, not only here in Springfield but across the state. The essential additions that are noteworthy are a twelve million dollar (\$12,000,000) foster care rate increase and some additional supports for adoption and group homes."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Mulligan: "Representative, this is the add-on for DCFS or the wish list?"

Feigenholtz: "The growth budget, I like to call it, Rosemary, growth budget."

Mulligan: "Growth, okay, and when you've explained to me how revenue is going to grow then perhaps we can consider it a growth budget. But I'm just wondering how much is in this growth budget."

Feigenholtz: "Was that a question? What was this... this..."

Mulligan: "Yes. What's the total amount of your Bill?"

Feigenholtz: "The total cost of House Bill 6547 is one billion, sixteen million, two hundred twenty-nine thousand, two hundred dollars and thirty-seven cents (\$1,016,229,200.37)."

Mulligan: "It's how much over the flat budget?"

Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry?"

Mulligan: "How much over the flat budget is it?"

Feigenholtz: "Thirteen million, six hundred eighty-six thousand, one hundred (13,686,100)... and no cents."

Mulligan: "So, thirteen million (13,000,000) give or take a few pair of ruby slippers, right."

Feigenholtz: "Right. Foster..."

Mulligan: "Okay."

Feigenholtz: "...care was twelve (12) and there was a little bit more growth in adoption lines."

Mulligan: "You know, I really wish that some of us on our side of the aisle had had the ability to sit down and talk to

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

you about what was realistic and what the current budget situation is, because each of these contain some provisions that are really important to the people of the State of Illinois, but unfortunately we did not have that ability to have that discussion. Although, we did last year to some extent, this year House Republicans were totally excluded. I can't say that enough. I'd like it to be noted. I don't think we have the choice and I don't think we're trying to bamboozle any providers or tell them that we're doing something that we don't think is possible to do."

Feigenholtz: "Rosemary, you're starting to hurt my feelings. You know, you always can call me. I always answer your calls and e-mails and most are very late at night. We're both working very hard and I don't recall getting any in the last few months. So, you know, my door is always open to you."

Mulligan: "Sara, that goes two (2) ways and when there are times when you cannot get figures that we get, we share also. So, just so that goes both ways and you understand that. I get what's going on here. I don't particularly blame you. We've always been friends and I think we've had the best interests of the people of this state in mind, but I don't think the way we're characterizing the budget this year has anybody interests in mind. I think it has political background and political complications that cause a problem as opposed to helping the Human Service providers and the people that are really the most vulnerable in the State of Illinois."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6547?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We have House Bill 6544. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6544, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6544, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6544 is the Veterans' Affairs flat budget. These are grant lines passed in last year's budget, including the Governor's Vetoes without any caucus projects. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."
- Mulligan: "Representative, this is the no growth budget, correct."

Feigenholtz: "That is correct."

271st Legislative Day

- Mulligan: "Does it include the sixteen million dollars (\$16,000,000) that the department asked for, for veterans' health care that was in the Governor's introduced budget?"
- Feigenholtz: "We already... There's eight million (8,000,000,000) in this budget and we passed the other eight million (8,000,000,000) in the Ops budget."
- Mulligan: "In which budget?"
- Feigenholtz: "The nonfrontline worker operations budget."
- Mulligan: "It's my understanding was that money was to go for the new program for posttraumatic stress and brain injury."
- Feigenholtz: "The Warrior Assistance Program was in the nonoperationals budget that we already passed."
- Mulligan: "All right. That's what I needed to know. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6544?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 50 voting 'no', 0 'presents. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, we have 65... House Bill 6545. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6545, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those

271st Legislative Day

- opposed say to... say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from... The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative, hold on. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill a third time."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6545, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6545 is the Veterans' Affairs growth budget. It's essentially the '09 introduced with some additions based on hearings. Especially noteworthy, there's an additional six million dollars (\$6,000,000) of general revenue to finally fully fund LaSalle Veterans' Home headcount, so that we can actually open up the beds in this facility. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."
- Mulligan: "Representative, this is the growth budget and how much money is in that?"
- Feigenholtz: "The total is sixteen million, nine hundred and seventy-seven thousand (16,977,000)."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Mulligan: "That's the addition over and above the published budget."

Feigenholtz: "Six million (6,000,000) over."

Mulligan: "It's six million (6,000,000) over..."

Feigenholtz: "And that's for the LaSalle Veterans' Home."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing..."

"The goal behind doing budgets like this, quite Mulligan: frankly... to the Bill... is to put a lot of us on bad votes. And none of us on our side of the aisle deny veterans any amount of money that goes into the budget this year. fact many of us have asked for some of these and served on committees where we looked at the budget. The issue here is not so much the veterans' money. The issue is will there be money there to pay for these things that we're promising them. Why were we excluded when some of those homes are in the area of Representatives that are on our side of the aisle? It should have been a fair discussion because there are some discussions that we've had, particularly, who will be the provider for PTS and brain injury that we worked on and changed the department. To be excluded from this is an unconscionable thing. We have many veterans including Representative Watson who's serving there right now and our side of the aisle deserves a fair place at the table to discuss this. It's really a shame and so we will urge a 'no' vote until we're at the table to discuss how this money is spent."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?"

271st Legislative Day

- Stephens: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I couldn't agree with the Lady more and I would add that... that maybe there is something worse than... I mean, this isn't just about a bad Roll Call. The fact of the matter is that when you're offering this money today, you're making a promise that you know you're going to break. You know you're going to break. And if there's anyone in Illinois that we should give special respect to, it's those people like Jim Watson and all those veterans who have served in all those past wars. Making them a promise and then not keeping it, is the worst of public policy."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6545?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 50 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We have House Bill 6347. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6347, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6347, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This would be the grants that the State Board of Educations makes to our local school districts. This would be at a level that would reflect no growth: seven billion, twenty-three million, four hundred sixty-five thousand, three hundred dollars (\$7,023,465,300) of GRF; two billion, one hundred and sixty-four million, fifty-nine thousand and nine hundred dollars (\$2,164,059,900) of non-GRF would be in this budget. I'd be happy to answer any questions and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Bassi, for what reason do you rise? The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Eddy: "Representative, we discussed this flat number in committee and I wanted to make sure for the record we discuss some of the issues related to federal funds, because there are a couple of line items that the State Board of Education introduced as increases in their budget, likely counting on additional federal money and Title I and some child nutrition money and reading, as well as a couple of other Title IV. If this budget, the flat budget, is passed, the authority doesn't include those federal increases. So your plan would be..."

Hannig: "It would incre... it would include the basic amounts, but if there are increases that we would anticipate we would get from the Federal Government, it does not include

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

those. But those are projections and if they... if the money's actually here we can always do a supplemental."

Eddy: "Okay."

Hannig: "In fact, we've got a supplemental from the Governor, not on this issue, but on a number of issues where we've captured more federal money and we need to spend it and appropriate it."

Eddy: "The... the other issue has to do with the effect of a 'flat budget' on a couple of areas that are important to Members. One is the foundation level. Now, on a flat budget, because of increases in corporate personal property replacement funds and local EAV aggregate, there is actually, even though this is flat, an increase in the foundation level?"

Hannig: "That's correct, Representative."

Eddy: "And if I recall collective... correctly, excuse me... that was estimated to be about a hundred and twenty-eight dollars (\$128)."

Hannig: "Yes. That's correct."

Eddy: "The other effect and the misnomer, I believe, about this being flat is the effect it has on mandated categoricals, because flat funding for mandated categoricals would mean that although they were pretty well 100 percent funded this year, except a couple of 99.6 areas, with this flat budget, mandated categoricals actually will be prorated at around 93 or 94 percent, according to the State Board of Education?"

271st Legislative Day

- Hannig: "Yes, that's correct. The cost will go up and if we continue j ust to appropriate the sta... a static amount, then it will be prorated."
- Eddy: "Okay. So, beyond those areas which are kind of the... the highlight areas in the education budget for most... The foundation level's very important, the mandated caegoricals... There were a couple of other additions. My understanding is those additions were to items that were amendatorally vetoed out of the budget, but were overridden and placed back in the budget. So, this version carries those and that's the only real increases along with the reapprop for text book?"
- Hannig: "Yes, Representative, so when... when the Governor vetoed an item and we restored it, we considered it as part of the budget."
- Eddy: "Thank you very much for the clarifications on what flat really means in this case. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Bassi, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bassi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."
- Bassi: "Okay. Representative, is this... is this the... the level three (3)? Is that what we're looking at here?"
- Hannig: "Could you... I couldn't hear your question."
- Bassi: "Is this the third piece for the education budget? Is that what this is?"
- Hannig: "Yes. We've already passed the first two (2) Bills that we've passed included the operations over at the State

271st Legislative Day

- Board of Education. So these are the grants that would go out to our school districts."
- Bassi: "So, these are the grants. And... and am I right, that it's about a hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) over last year's budget... over the '08 budget."
- Hannig: "We think it's about seven hundred thousand (700,000) in GRF, roughly, but..."
- Bassi: "Seven hundred thousand (700,000). Okay. Over last year's. Okay, but last year's budget, we are hearing that were... that were going to be twenty-third and twenty-fourth payments which amounts to about three hundred and eighty-seven million dollars (\$387,000,000) is going to be pushed off into July. What happens if that's the case? Is there any kind of way to see if that's going to get filled?"
- Hannig: "Well, Representative, the... the last two (2) payments are actually... will be from the '09 budget that the Governor advances to the school districts in '08. Now, that's his choice and some Governors, most Governors choose to make that advance payment. But the statute doesn't require it and that's why Governor Edgar in tough times decided not to. And we don't know what this Governor will do. He still has time to make the payment and I urge him to make the payment. I think your side of the aisle would agree with that."
- Bassi: "We have... but... but we're hearing that Superintendent Koch is... to letting his people know not to expect those two (2) payments. Is there anything in the budget that will fill that... that hole in, because it's a pretty big hole."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Hannig: "Well, Representative, we will appropriate under this Bill an amount equal to what we appropriated last year and in the Bill to follow some additional moneys and so..."

Bassi: "But it's only a hundred million (100,000,000) additional moneys or seven..."

Hannig: "Well, in this Bill. Yes, in this Bill."

Bassi: "...seven hundred thousand (700,000)."

Hannig: "But..."

Bassi: "That's not going to fill the three hundred and eighty-seven million dollar (\$387,000,000) hole."

Hannig: "Well, Representative, that... that's... that's a decision that the Governor makes on the '08 budget that actually will come from this budget. So, we have to appropriate that amount of money so he can advance those payments."

Bassi: "But we've already got a five hundred million dollar (\$500,000,000) hole for this budget. So, maybe he's using that to fill in."

Hannig: "No, I think, Representative, if we don't pass a budget, then he has a hard time advancing payments when he doesn't have a..."

Bassi: "When he doesn't..."

Hannig: "...budget, but if we pass a budget then he has a choice.

He can either advance the payments or not advance the payments. So, it's important that we have passed a budget to him to give him at least the choice, otherwise, he'll simply say it's our fault 'cause we didn't give him a choice."

Bassi: "Okay. What about the... the federal funds that haven't been released as yet? I mean is that... does that impact

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

this in any way, shape, or form? There's almost... there's over eight million dollars (\$8,000,000) for the Safe Routes to School that haven't been appropriated."

Hannig: "So, this is a budget that would reflect spending for '09."

Bassi: "Only. Okay, this is '09."

Hannig: "Only."

Bassi: "Okay, but these were federal funds from '08 that were not appropriated along with twenty-six and a almost... well over twenty-six million dollars (\$26,000,000) that has not been expended as yet from last year's budget for programs including: teacher mentoring, gifted rural initiative, after school programs, community organization programs, hard to staff schools, Classroom Cubed, the Franklin School, Henry Raab School, Abraham Lincoln School, Agassi School, Alcott School, Audubon School, Bell School, Blaine School, Burley School, ...Conley School, Drummond School, Hamilton School, John School, Meyers Prescott School, Carter School, Lakeview, Lane Tech, and Lincoln Park High School, as well as the Chicago Youth Center and the Concerned Organization Who Cares. These are all organizations that were not given money from this budget, the twenty-six million dollars (\$26,000,000), so that... where's that money gone to or going?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, this fiscal year will not end 'til June 30, and then there'll be a fiscal period of about thirty (30) days where lapsed period items can still be processed. So, I don't know that it's fair to say that

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

they... I mean, it is fair to say they haven't gotten their money yet..."

Bassi: "Right."

- Hannig: "...but we don't know what will happen in the next forty-five (45) or sixty (60) days. So, they still have an opportunity to make their case to the Governor to release their money for this year. Now, with the budget we're looking at now would do, would provide for additional money for '09 for July 1, and on. So, it's two (2) different fiscal years."
- Bassi: "I... I do understand that. My concern is that this fiscal year hasn't been... is... has a hole in it already and we're talking about redoing the same budget for next year which doubles the... the amount that's in the hole and... and to me it appears to be a cruel promise to people who think they're going to get money and then it's not going to come. And that's my concern, Representative. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"
- Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, if you'd indulge me. I have a point of question of clarification. I know I've already spoken, but it would just take one minute to clear up."
- Speaker Turner: "I didn't realize you had spoke already, but go ahead."
- Eddy: "I reported myself, I'm sorry, but... but I just have a quick follow-up. Representative, the twenty-third and twenty-fourth payments that are accelerated from July into June were nonetheless appropriated for and counted in the FY08 budget as a spending item as an appropriated item.

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

So, that three hundred and eighty-seven and a half million dollars (\$387,500,000) was put in the budget so that the Governor could advance that payment."

Hannig: "And so... As we go forward, we're trying to appropriate
 money for '09."

Eddy: "Okay. Now if..."

Hannig: "So that there'll be..."

Eddy: "...if we're going to... if we're going to appropriate enough though, in theory you would need the three hundred and eighty-seven and a half million dollars (\$387,500,000) reappropriated because it wasn't... if it doesn't get... if it doesn't get..."

Hannig: "Well, see... and we don't know that, Representative."

Eddy: "I understand that."

Hannig: "So... so if the Governor... you know, we went for a period of time where the Governor was saying we're not going to release money to Soil and Water Conservation District..."

Eddy: "I understand."

Hannig: "...that they can close their doors. That the Extension Service wouldn't get any money, but he changed his mind."

Eddy: "I... I understand that and I... I understand and I hope he does. I hope that we have a letter advanced and the money is appropriated. I guess the only point would be if it's not, this appropriation then would be short that amount of money if all we've done is put twenty-four payments worth in the next budget, because we'd kind of be permanently delaying that in terms of the appropriation. And that's the concern. That was the clarification I wanted."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Hannig: "Okay. So, I think that what we would need to do is first of all we have to see how it plays out."

Eddy: "Yes."

Hannig: "And if the Governor makes the payment I think we can all say thank you, Governor, but if he doesn't make the payment then we'll be back and probably have to urge the Governor to make the payment and do a supplemental."

Eddy: "Okay. That was my point that that also could be the subject of a supplemental along with those federal funds..."

Hannig: "Right."

Eddy: "...or those other issues after it plays out. Okay."

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6347?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there's 63 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6348. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6348, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment it adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6348, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This budget would increase the amount that we send to our public school districts by about five hundred and fifty million dollars (\$550,000,000). We would increase the foundation by four hundred and eight dollars (\$408) per student. We would man... we would fund the mandated categoricals at 100 percent. We would increase the reimbursement rate for special education teachers from their current level ninety-five hundred (9500) to the current... from the current level to ninety-five hundred (9500) and noncertified teachers would be increased as well. So, we go from ninety-five hundred (9500) to ten thousand (10,000) and from thirty-five hundred (3500) to four thousand (4,000) for the noncertified. We'd also increase the ADA block grant and along with a number of other items, including gifted education, special education transportation, and others. And I'd be happy to answer any questions. And I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Bassi, for what reason do you rise?"

Bassi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

271st Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."
- Bassi: "Okay. Representative, what was the school safety block grant last year? The ADA grant."
- Hannig: "I'm advised that ADA would increase under this proposal by ten million, one hundred thousand (10,100,000)."
- Bassi: "Okay. So, but aren't we allowing private schools to access this grant now?"
- Hannig: "Yes, so this would get us up to the thirty-nine dollars (\$39) per pupil that... that we have statutory set."
- Bassi: "Okay. So... so, in other words, this... this is the wish list... this is the wish list Bill that increases the spending anot... an additional five hundred and forty million dollars (\$540,000,000) that... that the committee actually did not have an opportunity to see until yesterday and voted out on a partisan Roll Call? Oh, this is an Amendment; it never even came through committee."
- Hannig: "I'm advised that this is a Bill that... that the committee worked out. It is about five hundred and fifty million dollar (\$550,000,000) increase for schools."
- Bassi: "Did this Bill come through committee?"
- Hannig: "I think it came straight to the floor, Representative, a shell Bill with advance from committee."
- Bassi: "Oh, that's why I didn't see it. Okay. I guess and... and this is the wish list that is going to take the general funding for state aid up to three hundred dollars (\$300) per pupil."
- Hannig: "Three hundred dollars (\$300), that's correct."

271st Legislative Day

- Bassi: "Okay. Boy, that's a great wish list. And it's going to fully fund the mandated categoricals instead of actually cutting them as Representative… one of the other Representatives was saying earlier."
- Hannig: "Yeah. So, if you didn't like the previous one, this one's much better."
- Bassi: "And we're going to fund it how?"
- Hannig: "Representative, we fund these out of general... out of the General Revenue Fund."
- Bassi: "But the General Revenue Fund is already five hundred...

 has a five hundred million dollar (\$500,000,000) hole from
 this year, let alone next year."
- Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think we'll collect probably twenty-five billion dollars (\$25,000,000,000) or so for our General Revenue Fund in the next twelve (12) months so hopefully, we could... we could find this money in there."
- Bassi: "I'm looking at the tally that's going through here and we're already at two (2) or three (3) bill... two and a half billion dollars (\$2,500,000,000) over what we thought we had of that money. So, the concern is... Can I call my school districts and tell them they're going to get this money?"
- Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think that if it becomes... if it becomes State Law, then you can tell them that you'll get the money. We still have to pass it in the Senate. We have to pass the 'bimp' Bills."
- Bassi: "But... but what happens if we don't have enough money to fill all that? Are we going to come back here in November and have to do a November surprise?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Hannig: "Well, Representative, we're looking at the… the spending Bills. And we're giving Members a chance to debate them. We're giving them some choices. We had a Bill that was at a lower level. Many people on your side of the aisle didn't like that. I assume that they wanted to see more money, so this gives them an opportunity to vote for that."
- Bassi: "Well, if the earlier ones didn't match up and this one is a wish list, then it's really out of... way over budget, isn't it?"
- Hannig: "Representative, it's along the lines of what we passed last year. It's actually less than what we passed last year and everybody voted for it, that I'm aware of, for the most part last year."
- Bassi: "But we apparently didn't have enough money last... I'm sorry, I'm berating the point. Thank you, Representative, I appreciate your indulgence."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, just out of curiosity because we hadn't seen this. What... what happens with early childhood education under this particular version? 'Cause I think it was flat in the last one."

Hannig: "It's up... it's up by forty-five million (45,000,000)."

Eddy: "It's up by forty-five million (45,000,000). Okay."

Hannig: "Right."

Eddy: "I just... I wasn't sure, because I hadn't seen it."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Hannig: "So, just... just so you understand, they wanted like
 sixty-eight (68)."

Eddy: "I understand that. Yeah, I remember the original request."

Hannig: "Yeah. So..."

Eddy: "Let me ask you a question, Representative. There's a lot of us on the House Floor that would really like to believe that this type of funding might be able to take place whether it's for human services for projects that we've championed over the years or education. When we do a budget in education there are certain legal requirements that we have to follow. Thirty (30) days prior to the passage of the adoption of a budget, we have to have a tentative budget. By the end of the first quarter, we legally have to adopt a budget. Here's my question. If you were planning on revenue from the state next year to actually do a budget in a school district, do you believe that this is a good bet that there's revenue to fund this type of a increase that's being projected in this?"

Hannig: "Well, I would hope so, Representative, but I mean the pur... the process is that we have an obligation to pass a budget, we, in the House. The Senate has an obligation and the Governor has an obligation. Now, all three (3) of those are separate and I would say if the Governor signs the Bill, then we have an obligation to send the money to the school districts."

Eddy: "But doesn't our obligation go beyond just passing a budget? Doesn't it go to providing a realistic figure so...

You know what happens in schools..."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Hannig: "Well, Rep..."

Eddy: "...people do budgets and they hire teachers and sometimes people move to a school district or they add classes and we affect the lives of people with the number that we're And last year's a good example that money may or may not come. My question is when Representative Beaubien earlier discussed with you the potential for total new revenue next year, you guys... I mean the two (2) of you had some pretty close figures. We looked at base growth, a tenth license possibly, one-time revenue, some annualized business taxes, some additional Department of auditing money. That totaled about 1.2 billion dollars (\$1,200,000,000). So far we're at 2.2 billion dollars (\$2,200,000,000) in red ink next year and this is maybe going to become 2.7. The point is, is this nothing more than a hoax, a cruel hoax to those who are counting on this money? How can we in good conscience sit here without revenue or with revenue at projected 1.2 and double the amount of spending?"

Hannig: "So, Representative, what we've tried to do is put together budgets that we believe address the needs of the state. We've also recognized that even within our caucus and within this House, there are differences of opinion. So, in the grants line, we've tried to look at grants that are generally flat and then grants that are at a higher level. Now, that's the plan that the House Democrats put together. Now, I have yet to see a plan from the House Republicans on what they want us to do. They're against spending more. They're against spending less and they're

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

against staying the same. Now, you can be against all you want to, but we have a obligation to pass a budget and that's what we're doing today."

Eddy: "I can tell you what we are against. We're against the cruel hoax on school children and teachers and the developmentally disabled. We're against a hoax."

Hannig: "Well, then show us what you think would be a good budget, Representative."

Eddy: "We need a realistic budget."

Hannig: "We have not seen a single budget on any subject from your side of the aisle."

Eddy: "This is not realistic. We have deficit... Let me get back to my question. Representative Hannig, if you were doing one of those budgets, if it were you that were making the promises at the local level would you promise this kind of money to a school budget and would you then feel responsible if the revenue doesn't show up? What would you do? What would you do with the children?"

Hannig: "Representative..."

Eddy: "Would you carry out the hoax or would you do a realistic budget?"

Hannig: "Compared to your budget, this is the best that we have, Representative, because you have no budget."

Eddy: "Representative..."

Hannig: "So we're working to work to put a budget together that makes sense."

Eddy: "Representative, that's absolutely disingenuous to stand up today..."

Hannig: "It is not, Representative."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Eddy: "...and say we haven't offered a budget..."

Hannig: "Where is it?"

Eddy: "...when during this process, we've had no input. You can't have it both ways. You can't say that we don't have a plan when you don't return the phone calls."

Hannig: "Representative..."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6348?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Biggins, for what reason do you rise?"

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "State your question."

Biggins: "If a Member votes 'no' all day long in this chamber, are they eligible for a per diem?"

Speaker Turner: "No."

Biggins: "Thank... thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6349. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6349, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6349. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Floor Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6349, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Amendment deals with the problem with special education. As you know, special education costs are eating up the budgets of our local school districts. Particularly in the suburbs, where I live, where we have very little in the way of state aid. The mandates from the State and Federal Government to our local schools are making it very difficult. This is why school districts all over the state have had to go to referendum over the last many years, because of the high cost of special education. This Bill will deal in many ways with that by raising the personnel reimbursement substantially so that school districts can afford to provide the services that kids so desperately need. I urge your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6349?' All those in... all those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Nekritz. The

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Clerk shall take the roll. On this question, there's 64 voting 'aye', 49 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Schmitz, for what reason do you rise?"

Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. I rise in a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "State your point."

Schmitz: "I rise to bring good news to the Body that right now...

I got about 3:08 on my watch... as the budget clock keeps
ticking we're at 3.1 billion dollars (\$3,100,000,000) over
last year's budget. So, we got another couple hours, I'm
sure we could hit five (5) if we keep going."

Speaker Turner: "On the Order of... On page 35 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 6516. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6516, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill again."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #1 has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "We'll move it. So, adop... Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6516. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

271st Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6516, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill is a request from the University of Illinois to fund the campus in Chicago that is used for medical purposes. And it would appropriate 25.5 million dollars (\$25,500,000) for the purposes of the teaching labs that exist in that community, some of the finest in the world, where they train doctors and even dentists to... to practice in the State of Illinois and throughout the country and throughout the world. So, this is the request from the University of Illinois. We put it in a stand-alone Bill. It's an important item on their agenda and I think that we need to move forward with it. So, I would be happy to answer any questions and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6516?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'aye', 54 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6561. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6561, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor

271st Legislative Day

- Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Hannig."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6561, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

 Each year we have a certain amount of money that's available for what's called pay-as-you-go capital and this Bill would appropriate and reappropriate the amounts from the previous years for those type of items. And so that's all the Bill does. And I'd be happy to answer any questions and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Eddy: "Will the Sponsor yield for a guick guestion?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, the GRF necessary to fund the capital projects is flat. Is that what I heard you say? This is just a..."

Hannig: "Yeah. This is... this is non-GRF's funding... funding.

These are items that..."

Eddy: "There's no GRF to pay for the capital. This is just plain capital without..."

Hannig: "Yeah. These are pay-as-you-go capital projects..."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Hannig: "...and the reapprops."

Eddy: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Lake, Representative May, for what reason do you rise?"

May: "Question, please. Yes. I'd just like to check, Representative, that OSLAD and NAAF were funded at the thirty-four and fifteen million (34,000,000 and 15,000,000), is that correct?"

Hannig: "Yes. That was on Amendment #2."

May: "Okay. And there will be no sweeps in the 'bimp' Bills.

Is that correct?"

Hannig: "Not in this Bill. That's correct."

May: "Okay. But it's... Okay. So this is full funding of OSLAD and NAAF. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Cross, for what reason do you rise?"

Cross: "Just an inquiry of the Chair. Representative Hannig...
Or will the Sponsor yield?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Cross: "Representative Hannig, I'm a little... and I'm not trying to be..."

Hannig: "Yes."

Cross: "...argumentative, I'm just curious. You just did a Bill a minute ago for the University of Illinois at twenty-five million (25,000,000) and now you're doing some pay-as-you-go capital. Was the twenty-five million (25,000,000) for the Chicago Medical Center for any capital needs?"

Hannig: "I'm advised it was for classroom improvements,

Representative."

Cross: "So, physical improvements."

Hannig: "Pardon me."

Cross: "Physical... physical improvements to classrooms?"

Hannig: "Laboratory improvements."

Cross: "So, structural improvements. Okay. All right. I just was curious about that and that's all I need to know. Thanks."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6561?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Coulson. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there's 62 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Lady from Grundy, Representative Gordon, for what reason do you rise?"

271st Legislative Day

- Gordon: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "State your point."
- Gordon: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to point out that at 3:17 p.m. Central Standard Time, that at this point in the nation, in our wonderful United States country our... our war debt for the Iraq war is over six hundred billion dollars (\$600,000,000,000). Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "And the Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens, for a rebuttal."
- Stephens: "Well, I... I wondered if we were on the order of federal business, because if we are I'd like to talk about, you know, for instance, what has the Democrat Congress done about that situation. I mean, they demagogue for two (2) years about how everything was going to change when we got a new Congress. Well, Nancy Pelosi doesn't seem to have done much. So, maybe the Representative should run for Congress and get everything fixed or maybe Obama will take care of it all. He seems to be backing off going yeah... yeah. Maybe he will and then again maybe he won't."
- Speaker Turner: "On page 62 of the Calendar, we have House Resolution 1199. Read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 1199 congratulates the eighteen thousand (18,000) members of the Chicago-based Institute of Real estate Management on the seventy-fifth anniversary of the organization."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Jefferies.

 Take it out of the record. We'll come back. We'll come back. On page 50 of the Calendar, Representative Howard,

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Connie Howard, we have Senate Bill 2474. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2474, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Howard: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 24..."

Speaker Turner: "...74."

Howard: "...74, it calls for the renaming of one of the special games of the lottery for the late Carol (sic-Carolyn) Adams. Carol (sic-Carolyn) Adams was the head of the lottery and she died after a long breast cancer illness. She had been in that position for four (4) years and she helped implement the special lottery games including Ticket for The Cure. She was especially proud of this game which generated, prior to her death, nearly three million dollars (\$3,000,000) for research. We think that it would be a fitting tribute to Carol (sic-Carolyn) Adams for the Ticket for The Cure lottery game to be renamed the Carol (sic-Carolyn) Adams Ticket for The Cure lottery program. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 2474?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We have House Resolution 1199, Representative Jefferies. Read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Jefferies: "Thank you, Speaker. And to..."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 1199 congratulates the eighteen thousand (18,000) members of the Chicago-based Institute of Real Estate Management on the seventy-fifth anniversary of the organization."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Jefferies."

Jefferies: "Thank you, to the Chair. And to my Members, I ask for an 'aye' vote on this. This is congratulatory to eighteen thousand (18,000) members of the Chicago-based Institute of Real Estate Management on their seventy-fifth anniversary and for proclamations to be done for June 1 through the 7. Thank you and I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Jefferies moves for the adoption of House Resolution 1199. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Representative Biggins, on House Bill 4699... 4699. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4699, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and fellow House and Lady Members as well. House Bill 4699 deals with people that suffer a stroke. I had one, many of you know that, three and a half years ago. And technically, it requires that the Department of Public Health to develop a working group to advise the department on primary stroke center systems. The Bill also provides that the group shall develop and submit a statewide stroke assessment tool to the department

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

for final approval. It requires that the stroke assessment tool be deter... disseminated to all the EMS systems. As a stroke survivor, this is a very personal issue with me. Every stroke survivor has their own story and that story depends on what kind of treatment received and how soon after the stroke occurs. Our late colleague, Larry McKeon... Mr. Speaker, could you ask for a little order, please? Thank you. Our late colleague, Larry McKeon, suffered a fatal stroke very recently, as we know. We eulogized him yesterday. He was in his house at night, reading. He had a caregiver with him that was asleep. He had a stroke and no one knew, so he didn't get any immediate care. I was fortunate because I had one of these things to have it in the State of Illinois building, that's right, in the Thompson Center, in the city county building at the stroke assit... effect right there. The city county building in Chicago, the three and a half years ago, I had Pat Quinn and former Commissioner Murphy assist me, just happened to be walking in at the time I fell, lost consciousness and was taken right to Northwestern Memorial Hospital. I am... I'll be happy to answer any questions anybody may have about this Bill. We'll have... maybe we'll have Mr. Patterson speak in a minute. But if anybody has any questions about the Bill, I'll be glad to take them."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill... Representative Biggins."

Biggins: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to close, if I may."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Patterson. Hold on."

271st Legislative Day

- Patterson: "Mr. Speaker, I urge an 'aye' vote on this piece of legislation. It is very important. I am a witness to why this Bill is so important. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to add one thing. If you're transported to a hospital that does not... that is not equipped for taking care of a stroke patient you will not receive help. I was fortunate and blessed to have a relative who had completed an internship in a particular Chicago hospital and she was familiar with stroke patient care. If it were not for that, I would have been allowed to lie right there on the table and pass away and I would not be here today seeking words to express how important this Bill is. So I'm asking my colleagues to join with me and give an 'aye' vote to the Sponsor's Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Biggins to close."
- Biggins: "Mr. Speaker, would you do one more thing? Would you take those names up on the board, the first two (2), would you reverse them as you just did? I just put the slip into you. Mr. Patterson's now the Sponsor of this Bill and I hope we all give him an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 4699?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'aye', 0 'nays', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is

271st Legislative Day

- hereby declared passed. We have House Bill 5126, Representative Acevedo. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5126, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Okay. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Acevedo."
- Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5126 amends the Vehicle Code to require scrap processor, a recyclable metal dealer, to require a vehicle or junk vehicle to record name, address and driver's license number of the persons from whom the vehicle is received. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook... or the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"
- Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the attempt to move me, but that's the Cook, a wonderful place. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."
- Eddy: "Representative, I just want to make sure House Amendment 1 and 4 are the only two (2) Amendments that were adopted.

 Is that correct?"
- Acevedo: "Yes, Representative, only 1 and 2. I mean, 1 and 4. I apologize."
- Eddy: "Okay. 1 and 4. With the adoption of 1 and 4 is there any opposition remaining to the Bill?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Acevedo: "No. I... I believe the reason we took out 2 and 3 so... the... we wouldn't have no opposition and I believe it's a agreed on Bill."
- Eddy: "Okay. So those that in the scrap metal industry who had some objection, now have removed that objection with these Amendments."

Acevedo: "I... I believe so."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 5126?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 21, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor consideration' for House Amendment #1 to House Bill 3738, and House Amendment #2 to... for House Bill 6380."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 6380."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6380, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Riley."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Riley, on Amendment #1."

271st Legislative Day

- Riley: "I'd like to withdraw Floor Amendment #1."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman requests to withdraw Amendment #1. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Riley."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Riley, on Amendment #2."
- Riley: "...ask adopt Amendment #2."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman asks leave to adopt Amendment #2 to House Bill 6380. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6380, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Riley."
- Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 of House Bill 6380 is a very important one, actually for the entire metropolitan area. And what it does is allocate moneys to the Cook County tax reactivation project, which is a project that has done wonders in terms of getting delinquent properties back on the tax roll and helping to make communities viable. Especially communities that, you know, have had some problems with development. So I would ask for the adoption

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

of this Bill and if there's any questions, I'd be more than happy to answer them."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a bit of a problem on our side regarding the analysis to this and I wanted to make sure, short of having that up on the screen, that everybody understood what this Bill does again. This is a spending Bill, an appropriation Bill. Is that right, Representative?"

Riley: "It does appropriate moneys for this purpose. That's correct."

Eddy: "And how much?"

Riley: "One million, five hundred thousand dollars (\$1,500,000)."

Eddy: "So it's a one million, five hundred thousand dollars (\$1,500,000) appropriation from the General Revenue Fund to the Department of Revenue for the Cook County reactivation project."

Riley: "Tax reactivation project."

Eddy: "Can you tell us what the tax reactivation project is specifically."

Riley: "Well, as I spoke to earlier, Representative, this is a program which benefits all of the Cook County area and what it endeavors to do, it allows the purchase of properties, essentially by the Cook County Assessor's Office and it allows them to go back on the tax rolls. This is something that communities have taken advantage of, both

271st Legislative Day

- disadvantaged communities and other communities to be able to put delinquent properties back on the roll. And it's..."
- Eddy: "Representative, sounds like a good program. Let me ask you the question, though, I think that a lot of us have on our mind. If this is a program for Cook County... that benefits Cook County, why isn't it part of the Cook County budget?"
- Riley: "Well, this pro... this project specifically helps communities that are a part... say, there's about twenty (20) communities that are a part of this project and this project has expanded over the years. The actual communities who participate in it actually have, you know, their own financial participation with it. So this is just an assistance program."
- Eddy: "So... so do those communities and does Cook County stand to benefit from the activities of the reactivation project once the property is obtained and/or acted on?"
- Riley: "Well actually, Representative, you can say that the participating communities are the ones that will gain. Because first of all, they'll have... they'll have blighted properties changed into viable businesses, number one. Number two, they will get a tax benefit by having these properties back on the tax roll and incidentally, there will be a benefit to Cook County, but to all of the other taxing bodies that can avail themselves of the fact that these properties will be back on the roll."
- Eddy: "Well... To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a million and a half dollars (\$1,500,000). It's a million and a half dollars (\$1,500,000) in General Revenue

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

that's being used for a specific purpose to support a project that sounds reasonable, but the question is, why isn't this being funded by the county if it is a county project? Another million and a half dollars (\$1,500,000), not going to move the needle up from 3.1 billion (3,100,000,000) for sure, over a million and a half (1,500,000). We... we simply cannot afford a million and a half dollars (\$1,500,000) for another project. Unless there's an accompanying revenue Bill that shows how this is going to be paid for, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Miller."

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

Representative Riley, this is... this program has been established how long?"

Riley: "As far as I know, it goes back to, I believe, the year 2000."

Miller: "And it... and it affects southern Cook County?"

Riley: "I'm sorry."

Miller: "If affects southern Cook County?"

Riley: "Well, it affects southern Cook County. Originally, it was to benefit just southern Cook County. The program has done so well it's been, you know, just aggregated up to be able to benefit the entire county."

Miller: "To the Bill. I would... I'm in strong support of this legislation. This is something that's been very important to our communities: Representative Will Davis, Al Riley, Bob Rita, myself, and others, George Scully and others, in which we've taken properties that have been dilapidated

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

been able to give them a little boost and have benefited the community. One for instance, I can think of, is a Dunkin Donuts in the City of Harvey, which if Representative Davis was here he'd articulate the point, that it has become a profitable business and has been added to the community, one of the poorest communities in the State of Illinois. This is good investment. It's smart and we need to do this. I ask for 'aye' votes."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Pritchard, for what reason do you rise?"

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Pritchard: "Representative, if... if this sounds like a program that deals with delinquent property, why isn't it going through a sheriff sale and sold to someone in the private enterprise that would take the property and upgrade it?"

Riley: "Well, Representative, I'm sure that that... that that can be done and probably has been done, but you know, there are properties... If you drive down... Well, really any community. Maybe any community in this state, but certainly in the southern suburbs you'll see parcels of land that have just, you know, laid fallow for a long time. You'll see other properties that have just... nothing... nothing has been done with them at all and not only is it a blight and an eyesore, but we know all the other attendant social problems that go along with it. And so, this is just an endeavor..."

Pritchard: "But what happens in all of our counties is the county treasurer takes that property where property taxes

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

are not being paid, where it may be delinquent and they put it on a sheriff sale and someone buys it. If no one wants to buy it, it doesn't have economic value. Why can't we let the private sector deal with this? Why must we put state funding into a project like this that could be handled individually?"

Riley: "Well, it's my understanding that that has been done before, frankly. So, I'm, you know, I'm just wanting to continue the... the project on, but the private sector is, in fact, involved. A matter of fact, there have been times where communities have been able to provide, you know, abatements to private corporations that have come in. One of the examples that Representative Miller has given and they've been able to put a blighted property, changing it to a very viable business. So the private sector is involved in this."

Pritchard: "So, if this is a program that's been going on since the year 2000, how has it been funded up until now?"

Riley: "I'm sorry."

Pritchard: "If this is a program that's been ongoing for eight (8) years, how has it been funded before now?"

Riley: "It would stat... Well, partially with state money, Representative."

Pritchard: "Excuse me, I didn't understand."

Riley: "Partially with state money and with the work of a lot of different units of government."

Pritchard: "If this is a... a sound program for the county of Cook, why don't we do it for the other ninety-nine (99) counties in the State of Illinois."

271st Legislative Day

- Riley: "I would think that it would be good. Though geographically and demographically, last time I checked, I think Cook County represents a large chunk of population in the state. To the extent that it's replicatable (sicreplicable), I think it would be good."
- Pritchard: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're dealing with a budget that's way out of balance. And here's another example of a very special interest project rather than a project that maybe ought to be made into some type of state program and let all the counties in the state try to get into a program like this, rather than limiting it to just one. I would ask for a serious reconsideration of this Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 6380?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 3738. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3738, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 3738. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3738, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is... this is the budget implementation Bill that would be parallel with the no growth budget items that we passed earlier in the day. It would provide for transitional assistance to our schools. It would increase foundation level by the one hundred and twenty-eight dollars (\$128). It would provide for the poverty grant hold harmless, it freezes the Medicaid rates after we adjust it for them this year. It has a University of Illinois Hospital Service Fund, and a number of other items that I believe that we did in the past that we're doing again this year, including some mental health contract language that's in the Bill for the first time. So, I'd be happy to answer any questions and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Eddy: "Hi, Representative, how are you?"

Hannig: "Okay."

271st Legislative Day

- Eddy: "Good. Could this be... I think I heard you describe this as the no growth 'bimp' implementation or the budget implementation for the no growth or..."
- Hannig: "This... this would be the budget implementation we would need if the Senate were to adopt all the lower grants that we just passed."
- Eddy: "This literally 15 minutes ago is the first we have seen of this, so. I have a... I just have a question. How many of these implementation Amendments are we going to see?"
- Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think as the budget process moves along we may very well see a different one to reflect changes that may be made in the Senate. So, let's say for example, that the Senate goes with the higher state aid formula, well, we would have to adjust the general state aid number upward. Right?"
- Eddy: "So, for purposes of the budgets that this Body has acted on, how many 'bimp' Bills do you anticipate rolling out today to implement those budgets?"
- Hannig: "Right. So, today this 'bimp' Bill will be the only one that we would debate today and this would be at the lowest spending level and that would allow us to keep the doors open. That would be a budget that at the very least would keep the doors open."
- Eddy: "Thank you. Do you anticipate a 'bimp' for the budgets that increase the line items? Not today, but even... do you anticipate us seeing that?"
- Hannig: "I... I would just simply say that if... if the final version of a budget would be different than what we passed today or some variations of what we passed today, then we

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

would make adjustments accordingly, Representative. But this would assume that the lowest grant levels were accepted by the Senate and we could keep the doors open with that level and this budget implementation."

Eddy: "Okay. So specifically, for the implementation to an area that we all kind of understand and that has to do say...

Every... every year when we increase the foundation level appropriation, we also have to pass implementation language that increases the foundation level. This Bill increases that foundation level one hundred and twenty-eight dollars (\$128) so that, that no growth appropriation can be implemented, unlike last year when we didn't do the implementation for a long time, we had to wait for the increase. This takes care of that."

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. Same with... with all of the other necessary appropriated line items as it relates to specific language to implement any increases. And that's all this... that's all this is intended to do?"

Hannig: "That's all this is intended to do, Representative."

Eddy: "Okay. So back to my... my question, a budget that included three hundred dollars (\$300) on the foundation level would require a totally separate implementation Bill in order to enact."

Hannig: "Well, it would only require that we change that part of the Bill, the other parts in the budget implementation Bill that don't relate to school funding, for example, would still remain the same."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Eddy: "So, if... if this passes and goes to the Senate and there's some type of a change in the Senate to that foundation level to reflect a different part of the menu..."

Hannig: "Right."

Eddy: "...that's been sent over, then that would come back over here for a concurrence before that... that item could be implemented."

Hannig: "Well, it would... it would take an additional action by this House. Now, perhaps they could send it back for a concurrence, perhaps we would do it on a different Bill as a stand-alone adjustment. But clearly, you're correct, Representative, that we would have to adjust it upward and this House would need to take a vote."

Eddy: "So final action would have to come from us on any of those menu items based on changes. This only does that flat. Thank you very much..."

Hannig: "This would be the minimum. Thank you."

Eddy: "...for the explanation and I appreciate it. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Mulligan: "Representative, it appears that our staff just got this Bill. Is there any reason we're doing it this way?"

Hannig: "For doing it which way, Representative?"

Mulligan: "The fact that it's dumped on our desk 15 minutes before we're asked to vote on it."

Hannig: "You know, I'm..."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Mulligan: "Tradition."

Hannig: "I think that most of this language is almost boilerplate things that we do every year and I tried to highlight that there were a few items that I thought were different, that dealt with the University of Illinois Hospital Service Fund and the mental health contracts. But I think the rest of it, which my staff says was shared with your staff earlier and some of which actually came straight from... from the Governor's budget implementation language, I think a lot of this we do every year, Representative."

Mulligan: "The definition of 'cooperation' is an act or instance of working together or acting together for a common purpose or benefit of joint action. I think this is very interesting. Is this part of the take your choice of the A, B, C, or D budget and that's the 'bimp' Bill that'll be used and once you pass it what will happen after that? I mean... And what if they choose one from column A and one from column D, then where do you go next with all of this? I mean, this... this is kind of an interesting way of... of doing things and I mean interesting in the worst kind of way."

Hannig: "Was that a question?"

Speaker Turner: "Was that a..."

Mulligan: "So you don't care how it happens just so it's... And which one is this is the A 'bimp', the B 'bimp', the C 'bimp'..."

Hannig: "This is re... this is the budget implementation language that would correspond with those grant lines that were at the lower levels, Representative."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Mulligan: "So at the lowest level which would be Bills 1, 2, and 3 of each of the..."

Hannig: "Yes."

Mulligan: "...Bills that were discussed and this is if the Senate chooses to do any of those plans and then pick up this 'bimp' and of course, we were so good about 'bimps' last year, it really was helpful and then to somehow put this together unless they amend it and then we figure out where we're going here with the State of Illinois and its finances."

Hannig: "Representative, if we pass this, we can say that we've got all the budget Bills and the budget implementation language in the Senate. That we've finished effectively passing a budget here in the State of Illinois from the House of Representatives' point of view."

Mulligan: "Well, at least you're uniform in the way you've done this and pretty much not sought our help or much of a discussion, so I guess probably where we'll be is where we've been on the rest of it. Something we've not been included in. Something that we find hard to work for when you don't include us in any of this and something that may or may not pass or be a figment of your imagination by next week."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?"

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Stephens: "I was... Have you read your Bill?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Hannig: "Yes, Representative."

Stephens: "And when did you get a copy of it to read it?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think that the… the Governor's Office gave us their language for this today and our staff had prepared a budget implementation language with some changes in the drafts sometime this week. I don't… my days seem to run together."

Stephens: "So, when did you get your copy? I'm just trying to find out how fast of a reader you are. You said that you got the language today?"

Hannig: "Have I... Could you repeat the question, Representative?"

Stephens: "I'll go all the way back. When... have you read the Bill?"

Hannig: "Yes, Representative."

Stephens: "And when did you read it?"

Hannig: "The staff provided me with copies of the budget Bills and the budget implementation Bills from time to time and I try to read them. I'm not certain which day."

Stephens: "When did you finish reading it, I guess?"

Hannig: "I seem to be rereading it from time to time."

Stephens: "Okay. We're narrowing it down. Time to time, would that include today?"

Hannig: "Well, it seems sometimes the same questions are asked and I give the same answers and I reread the same parts.

Very complicated Bill."

Stephens: "Well, it's a hundred and thirteen (113) pages and I kind of like to read legislation on occasion and I know that you read it all the time and I was just trying to

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

compare our reading habits. I wonder, do our rules or does the Constitution allude to a time that a Bill shall re... be on a Member's desk before it's voted on?"

Hannig: "Representative, I'm... I'm not a constitutional expert, so I would have to say I don't know the answer to that question."

Stephens: "Well, maybe... maybe I... You've been here longer than I, should I ask the..."

Hannig: "Perhaps the parliamentarian..."

Stephens: "...parliamentarian for that question."

Hannig: "Perhaps the parliamentarian could help you with your answer."

Stephens: "And if this Bill is not in compliance with any of those rules should we take it out of the record? Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the parliamentarian. Is there a rule as to how long a Bill shall lay on a Member's desk before it's called and voted on?"

Speaker Turner: "Hold on Representative, we're trying to buy a little time."

Stephens: "Well..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, you want to state that question one more time?"

Stephens: "No. I withdraw my question. I think I've made my point. Let me just show you one thing."

Speaker Turner: "Turn him..."

Stephens: "Last year you expected me and each of my colleagues to read this in just about a... I think we had about an hour. We took a caucus and we went downstairs and we broke it up and tried to read it and... My director says hold it up

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

again. The point is, you know, you're in charge. You can do whatever you want. We would just like a little courtesy. We asked to have things debated that were... even if we know we're going to lose the debate, we still like to air out some ideas. We'd like to have the budget, you know... I hope when Republicans are in charge next year that we have a smaller budget implementation program and a smaller budget. I hope that we do what Jim Edgar did which is what you should do now and that is start to say no, when we're already at 3.1 billion dollars (\$3,100,000,000) over and now you're telling us this is the way you're going to spend it and I have no chance to amend it. Wasn't invited to any meetings to help create this document. It's pretty frustrating for us, should be embarrassing for you. And I withdraw my question."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters, for what reason do you rise?"

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Winters: "Representative, I've actually had about 15 minutes to start to delve into this and I'm on page 15, I believe, line 16 and it looks to my analysis of that paragraph from line 7 to 21, it looks like last year and this year we have capped the amount of transfer from Road Fund to the Department of State Police at a hundred and six million (106,000,000) that we went from ninety-seven million (97,000,000) to a hundred and six million (106,000,000). Our analysis, however, says it is capped. That we are... are only doing it at 97.3 million (97,300,000) for State Police

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

and the Secretary of State at 128.7 (128,700,000). Are those approximately the numbers that we are going to be transferring from the Road Fund to State Police and Secretary of State? Something approximating two hundred and fifteen million (215,000,000), excuse me, two hundred and twenty-five million (225,000,000)."

Hannig: "This is the same as last year, Representative."

Winters: "Well, I would point out to the Members of the House that our gas tax... the sales tax on gasoline has been going up enormously. Springfield reported today the gas tax or, excuse me, the gas price in Springfield is over four dollars (\$4). I saw a Missouri Web site that said the average price of gasoline in Missouri is three sixty-eight (3.68) and in Illinois it's three ninety-six (3.96), I believe, almost thirty-eight cents (\$.38) difference We are receiving enough additional between our states. sales tax into the General Revenue Fund that we don't need to divert money from the Road Fund over to State Police and Secretary of State. We have the money in the Road Fund. We could either give back that sales tax to the public or we could actually patch the roads. And two hundred and twenty-five million dollars (\$225,000,000) will patch a lot of roads. And yet, this budget implementation Bill that we're faced with voting on, after having seen it for less than 20 minutes continues the Road Fund diversion, saving the GRF from oblivion because we know how badly out balanced that is, but it's not saving the motoring public from higher gas taxes and it is not fixing our roads. What are our priorities here? What are our priorities?

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

should be, improve the infrastructure of our state. There is no capital plan even being discussed at this point because the House Democrats are afraid to trust the Governor. That is the reason that we have in the press, the Speaker has given, is his caucus doesn't trust the Governor; therefore, nobody in the state can capital. Grow up. We've got... we've got a Governor. Negotiate with him. Return his phone calls. Initiate a phone call. We have to get beyond the petty bickering, the hurt feelings. We have to negotiate across the chambers and across to the Executive Mansion, if it's ever occupied. We need a capital plan. We have the money here, not to divert from the Road Fund. We can fix some of our potholes with the money that instead you're diverting with this budget implementation Bill. I urge a rejection of this Bill, showing the Speaker that this chamber can think on its own two (2) feet. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3738?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'aye', 49 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lyons in the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on page 47 of the Calendar, Representative Frank Mautino has House Bill 5578. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

271st Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5578, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, take that Bill out of the record on the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, on page 51 of the Calendar, Representative Connie Howard has Senate Bill 2879. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2879, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Recognize the Lady from Cook, Representative Connie Howard."
- Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2879 amends the Department of Human Services Act requiring that the Illinois Department of Human Services and the Illinois Department of Corrections work cooperatively with community organizations and service providers to identify local providers of services and to develop informational material for families and children of incarcerated parents. These materials would be designed to inform those children and families about the social services that are available to them, including visitation programs, family counseling, mentoring, school-based programs, and other programs identified by community organizations that work with families and prisoners. I will take questions at this time."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 2879 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

the record. On this Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Barbara Flynn Currie has House Joint Resolution 113. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Barbara Flynn Currie."

"Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. ALS or Currie: Lou Gehrig's disease is a fatal illness of the neurodegenerative kind. People who are diagnosed with ALS are generally dead within two (2) to five (5) years. It is a disease that causes the loss of motor function and creates atrophy of mus... of the muscle system. It makes it difficult for people who are victims to breath, to talk, to It's a heartbreaking disease, a tragic disease for victims and their family. This Resolution names the month of May ALS awareness... Public Awareness Month and it memorializes Congress and the President to increase funding for research so that one day there might be a cure for this dread ailment. I'd appreciate your support for adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of House Joint Resolution 113 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House Joint Resolution 113 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, on page 52 of the Calendar, Representative Marlow Colvin has Senate Bill 1879. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1879, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Clerk, on page 18 of the Calendar, Representative Colvin has House Bill 5467. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5467, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Colvin."
- Colvin: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, on the subject of House Bill 5467, it's my intention to leave that Bill on Second Reading for the time being."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on the request of the Sponsor, remove... return House Bill 5467 to the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, on page 45 of the Calendar, Representative David Reis has House Bill 4403. Representative David Reis. Clerk, take that Bill out of the record. Mr. Clerk, on page 51 of the Calendar, Representative Fritchey has Senate Bill 2872. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2872, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative John Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. I request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Eddy: "Representative Fritchey, could you give us a brief explanation of the Bill?"

Fritchey: "The legislation would codify the Attorney General's ability to file lawsuits on behalf of the state as parens patriae, essentially allowing them to bring certain antitrust actions, et cetera, on behalf of the people of Illinois. We believe they have the authority to do this already, but this will simply clarify that when they maintain that class action antitrust suit that they would do so on... on the behalf of the state and its respective municipalities, townships, and other subdivisions."

Eddy: "Okay. So this is... this is something that generally speaking is accepted practice that you're attempting to codify and that's basically it."

Fritchey: "Yes, Sir."

Eddy: "Just when you see Fritchey laying like that you really have to make sure that's all that's..."

Fritchey: "For good... for good reason."

Eddy: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Fritchey to close."

Fritchey: "As I said before."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 2872 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 48 of the Calendar,

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Representative Art Turner has Senate Bill 2275. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2275, a Bill for an Act in relation to minors. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Leader Art Turner."

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen... Mr. Turner: Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. to you today Senate Bill 2275 and I know we've been talking a lot about budget and budget busters and what these... the various appropriation Bills are going to cost the state and there's been some question and concern as to if this legislation is actually going to cost the state. think that the money figure put on what we're trying to do for our youth, in particular our juveniles, under the age of eighteen (18), there is no dollar figure that we can discuss. And what House... what Senate Bill 2275 does is that it raises the age to bring the seventeen-year-olds into juvenile court for misdemeanor offenses only and I repeat it is for misdemeanor offenses only. The effective date of this Bill would be January 2010. So, it would be not... be an immediate implementation. The minors charged with misdemeanors and a felony would be... minors charged with a misdemeanor and a felony would be charged in the adult court, but a minor charged with just felony... with misdemeanor only would remain in a juvenile court if he is under the age of eighteen (18). And that's the reason... I should say and I move for the passage of this legislation. There are thirty-eight (38) other states in the nation who,

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

right now, have this practice and I think that Illinois ought to be one that's doing the same thing. The other thing that this Bill does is it provides a task force that will look at... to develop a plan as to raise the age for felonies. This is not a requirement that this plan would ever be implemented, but this task force will study looking at whether we should raise the age for felonies. This Bill in particular only deals with misdemeanors and it would say that a kid eighteen (18) and under would be remanded to the juvenile court system and not the adult system, if, in fact, he commits a misdemeanor. And I move for the adoption of Senate Bill 2275."

Speaker Lyons: "This Bill's on Short Debate. We have numerous Representatives looking to speak. The first person is Representative Patti Bellock, the Lady from DuPage."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just to the Bill." Speaker Lyons: "To the Bill."

Bellock: "I want to thank Representative Turner for bringing this Bill back. Those of us that served on the Juvenile Justice Task Force, a lot of us are very committed to this because we have seen that that was one of the number one missions when we separated two (2) years ago and made the major change in juveniles in Illinois. We switched to two (2) systems, the Juvenile Justice and the Adult Department of Corrections. This was one of the other major initiatives of that task force and it was to treat juveniles seventeen years old, most of them just juniors or seniors in high school, to go to the juvenile court not to the adult court. Right now, a seventeen-year-old gets

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

tried in adult court for a misdemeanor and just has a fine and goes home, but the point is that fin... that is on his record forever and that's what we're trying to alleviate That seventeen-year-old has a record forever. know that those people that are... go to adult prisons, 38 percent of them repeat within one or two (2) years. that is what we're trying to accomplish here is to treat a juvenile as a juvenile. Thirty-eight (38) other states in the United States have this, including the Government treats eighteen-year-olds as adult, seventeen-year-olds. Six (6) other states, of those twelve (12) that do not have it, have this legislation pending right now to change it to eighteen (18). So, I'm asking for your support. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Dennis Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I know that you had talked about the number of only two hundred (200) cases being impacted in the state. I know that number was discussed last year and I had some questions about that number and I can tell you in DuPage County alone there'd be like eight hundred (800) cases that would be moved from the adult courts into the juvenile courts and I believe in Cook County the number's about three thousand (3,000). Have you seen what numbers it might cost the county of Cook to implement this program? Have you gotten a letter from the State's Attorneys Office with respect to that?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

"Representative, I did not get a number from the Turner: State's Attorneys Office regarding the cost and I know that there's been some debate as to what the actual numbers are. I know that in 2005 there were only two hundred eighty-five (285) seventeen-year-olds that were on probation statewide for misdemeanors. I'm not certain what that number is, I'm just... and I understand what you're saying and you tend to be emphasizing the cost and how much this is going to cost and I keep saying that the cost, whatever the cost is for the dealing with a juvenile... dealing with our kids who are not adults, but to not... to put them... keep them in a juvenile system, whatever the cost is that it's worth it. To put them in the adult system, although we may save a few bucks, the kid that we lose going to that system. I don't think it's fair for us here in Illinois to do that."

Reboletti: "Representative, I appreciate that. I'm looking at some numbers from the State's Attorneys Office of Cook, it's about nine hundred thousand dollars (\$900,000) to implement the program. I know there's, obviously, some very difficult financial problems over in Cook already with the situation that they've just balanced their budget. And I know that DuPage County had some issues also that they just addressed and I know that may cost them into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. What about opportunity for individuals who are charged as seventeenyear-olds with misdemeanors, why can't they be sentenced to supervision which would then allow them to expunge that Why don't we just follow that procedure as it is right now because not everything is a mandatory conviction

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

that stays on your record forever. Why can't we just follow the same system and help these individuals with expungements?"

Turner: "Representative, we're not trying to remove that provision, in fact, we're encouraged when the state's attorney does that, especially if the kid warrants supervision. So we're not trying to remove that provision, we, in fact, would like to see that stay in place."

Reboletti: "Representative, I'm sorry, I apologize."

Turner: "It's just our belief that we should not be moving these kids into the adult court system. That... that's the premise from which we're introducing this legislation."

Reboletti: "And I can appreciate that... that perspective. Do you have any concerns that as we see gang activity that as the gangs do become familiar with this, and this will happen, that they will look towards the seventeen-year-olds to do some of those crimes, because they know that they will be transferred into a juvenile court system where those convictions would not be on the record. Do you have any concerns about that?"

Turner: "Well, if the gangs are doing something or the crime is a misdemeanor crime, then that says that it's not the most serious crime in town and so I... I would, you know, I'd be... I would question whether the gangs are going to do that. I mean, I just... it would still allow us the opportunity to help that seventeen-year-old. If we got him in the juvenile system we could do some things that might be able to help him and deter him from listening to the gang members. Now, if the gang members have him do something

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

that's a felony, then that kid will be treated or moved to the adult court. But I think in the case of misdemeanors, that we are better served. As you say in regards to the cost, this Bill will not be implemented 'til the year of 2010, so we've got a little time yet to continue to work on numbers and I venture to say that if I've got a vote on a capital Bill, which I'm still questioning as to what I may intend to do. That if I got to vote on a capital Bill, I think that the money that we spend in this state that we ought to spend some on human capital and I think our kids are the best investment in terms of capital, if there's any dollars that'll be spent in this state."

Reboletti: "Representative, I appreciate that sentiment also and I would agree with you on that. One last question. Do you have any concerns about the constitutionality of the measure when we treat seventeen-year-olds for misdemeanors in one particular way and we treat seventeen-year-olds that commit felonies in a different way? Wouldn't that be a violation of due process and equal protection and the same treatment across the board.

I mean, these same questions I asked last time or last year was that either we should have seventeen-year-olds all in the juvenile system or remain in the adult system. Do you have any constitutional concerns?"

Turner: "We... we currently have..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti, your 5 minutes are up. Representative Turner, please respond to that final question."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Turner: "Yeah. First of all, I'm not an attorney so when you start talking constitutionality I just let my high-priced lawyers argue that before the Supreme Court or the Appellate Court. But I'm just... we... right now, we have mandatory transfer and that doesn't appear to be a question of constitutionality. You know, it doesn't stop the... And this is a state rights issue, so how we handle our kids is an issue that varies from state to state and I just think that this is the right thing to do for us here in Illinois."

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

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative Turner, I compliment you and the Juvenile Justice Task Force for dealing with a very critical issue. I was skeptical when we divided up the justice system to adults and juveniles, but I see that there are a number of benefits that we're already accruing. One of my concerns is, though, that we still do not seem to be funding our policy choices. For example, the juvenile justice facility that is in... near my district, and I have some residents that work there, say that there isn't enough dollars to treat juveniles as juveniles. To deal with the educational needs and the counseling needs and the trade skill development needs. So, shouldn't we be concerned about the cost impact of this kind of policy shift?"

Turner: "Representative, I agree with you, there should be some concern, but should we then not... should we just send them

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

to the adult penitentiary and drop them in there where we're doing nothing to help that population currently? I agree, there is probably some fiscal concerns. We've got from now 'til 2010 to figure those concerns out. I think that our kids should be a priority and we should not be waving this banner of how much this is going to cost when we look at the long-term affect of what it means to our kids and trying to deal with them as kids versus throwing them into the adult penal pop... penal population."

Pritchard: "I have always admired your idealistic attitudes and goals, but I think we have to be a little bit pragmatic Because in my particular case, our county uses facilities from Kane County and Kane County is an opponent of this Bill because they realize that if we increase the age we're going to have more juveniles in our juvenile facilities and those facilities are at the dangerous level of being at capacity. Certainly, in Kane County's case. And by changing this law, there's as to much, my sheriff called me today to say we're going to be excluded from using the Kane County juvenile justice facility. there's going to be some immediate impact and I think it's rather rash to move forward with a policy change that doesn't have dollars to help counties deal with this. This is another unfunded mandate, if you will, that the state is looking at that's going to have impact on our counties across the state. And it's going to change the way that we treat juveniles that they're not going to be able to get incarceration where parents can visit them near their home. They're going to have to travel hundreds of miles to find a

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

facility that can deal with them. I think that we ought to be a little bit cautious here and perhaps form a task force to deal with the impact and to understand the impact before we move forward with an unfunded mandate. I use... urge this Body to be extremely cautious here and to ask to hold this for a period of time until we have a better understanding of its impact on counties."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Chapin Rose."

Rose: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Lyons: "He's ready for questions. The Sponsor yields."

Rose: "Representative, I appreciate the... I really do, your opening salvo about this not costing the state anything. The problem is, it's going to cost the counties an awful lot. I mean, we just got done cutting a three billion dollar (\$3,000,000,000) hole in the budget and counting and now we're going to tell our counties to bankrupt themselves. Your county alone is over eight hundred thousand dollars (\$800,000) in increased costs just for the state's attorney. That doesn't count the juvenile detention center, the other court system things you need to have and eight hundred thousand dollars (\$800,000) for Cook County. But Representative, and you and I've talked and I guess my fundamental problem with this Bill is that a seventeen-year-old, you can't tell me they don't know what they're doing. They cam you cannot tell me they don't know what they're doing and to simply walk away and do this, I just... I fundamentally, philosophically disagree. And... and, Art, I talked to you about this last week. I think there's

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

a way to accomplish what you want to do and it's called adult diversion. And I guess, the only reason I said will the speaker yield, rather than to the Bill, that you know, adult diversion will teach a lesson to that first-time offender, accomplish all the objectives you want to accomplish. But in the day teach a lesson. And I guess again, Art, I'd offer my assistance on doing that, but I just fundamentally disagree with this."

"Representative, I appreciate your comments and I did have a off the record discussion with you about also trying to look at some other ways in which we can improve the criminal justice system. The question, and I understand what you're saying regarding this cost factor and I tell you that there's another cost when you put these kids in the adult criminal... in the adult penitentiaries and that's a cost that we're not talking about. I'm telling you and having been around here a few years and to the former speaker also when we talk about policy. I've seen policy changes happen because if it makes the headlines in the Chicago Tribune or the Chicago Sun-Times or the local papers we tend to come in here and respond. We've had disasters. We don't have money, but if a tornado runs through town we'll find twenty-five (25)... we'll find ten, fifteen million dollars (\$10,000,000-\$15,000,000) to help in terms of relief. As far as I'm concerned, this is a This is an issue that we need to address. I tornado. believe and I'd be willing to work with you, I understand that there's going to be... I'm hearing you say that there's going to be an impact regarding counties. I'd be more than

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

supportive to cosponsor with you legislation or appropriation to help... help those counties with the unfunded mandate, as you call it, with this particular piece of legislation. But I think that the... the value... we now don't, you know, we tell our sixteen (16)... we tell our seventeen-year-olds that they can't vote. We tell them they can't drink. We passed legislation here telling sixteen-year-olds..."

Rose: "But Leader Turner, we tell them they can drive."

Turner: "...how they can drive and when they can drive."

Rose: "And if they get a DUI and kill somebody driving..."

Turner: "If a DUI is a misdemeanor, then that's different. We don't allow them to go to war. We're only talking misdemeanor cases here."

Rose: "Leader, again, I... I would extend the offer. Adult diversion accomplishes all the goals you're interested in. It... it's revenue... it's almost entirely revenue neutral to the colt... court system in our local counties 'cause it's all done outside of the court system. It accomplishes your goal and it also teaches the lesson that needs to be taught. And I, and I do mean this sincerely Leader, I respectfully disagree. I respectfully disagree. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in support of this legislation and it's rarely do I disagree with my two (2) friends who are... one from Champaign, the other one from DuPage County. I'm a former prosecutor from

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

the Cook County State's Attorneys Office and a prosecutor from the Illinois Attorney General Office and I do have some knowledge of how this system works. But if anybody's spent some time in the adult misdemeanor courtrooms, those are basically... those are cattle calls. People by the hundreds are in there all day long. They plea out 99 percent of their cases. You walk in front of the judge, you get a piece of paper, the judge makes some type of monotone admonishment and that's it. They're gone. Now, these youthful offenders, we have an opportunity to at least try to save them and put them in the right... move them in the right direction, if they're still under the auspices of the juvenile court which I know are going to place greater care in monitoring and oversight of these juveniles during that period of either probation or supervision. So, I think this is a good Bill, I support it. And also, I just think that the issue relating to the cost, I think, are a bit misstated. We're talking about misdemeanor... people charged with misdemeanors and rarely is the case where someone who's charged or has been sentenced, is either going to be held on bond inside a detention facility or is going to be sentenced to any type of term of incarceration. So, I understand the objections, but I think that this is a good Bill and I think, you know, we're not going down a slippery slope where we're going to start charging this... moving this on to felonies. But I think for these particular cases where minors are charged with misdemeanors, I think, this is the right direction in which

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- we should be going and I would recommend my colleagues to support this."
- Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill was on the Order of Short Debate. We'll extend it to Standard Debate. So, we've had three (3) speakers speak in favor of it, three (3) speakers speak against it. The next person to speak will be Representative Sullivan. Are you a proponent or opponent to the Bill, Representative?"
- Sullivan: "I was actually going to yield some time to Representative Reboletti, who is a opponent."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti, you've already spoken to the issue. We did give you 5 minutes and an opportunity for him to respond. Do you have one question or something that you had to do on this, Representative Reboletti, in all fairness to those people who have not spoken? One question. The Chair recognizes Representative Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Leader, I forgot to ask you one other question and you brought up the DUIs. And one of my concerns is that this Bill indicates that all misdemeanors, including DUIs, would be put into juvenile court. So, my understanding is if a seventeen-year-old or a sixteen-year-old were charged... a seventeen-year-old charged with a DUI that would go to juvenile court. That disposition then would not be indicated to the Secretary of State's Office and they'd be given a second bite at the apple when they turned eighteen (18). I... I was just wondering if that was the intent of your legislation?"
- Turner: "Representative, I'm not sure about that, I would think that... Representative, I don't have the answer to that

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

question. I would think if you're charged with a DUI, the Secretary of State maintains that... that... the driving record would speak for itself, but I... I... in farness I can't answer that question, Representative."

Reboletti: "Well, and I appreciate that and I would also join my colleague here, Representative Rose, in sitting down with you as far as an adult diversionary program, even assuming this did pass. I know there's always other avenues that we can explore to keep those out of the system that need to be out of the system."

Turner: "Representative, I appreciate your willingness and we will continue on this... on this path, because I do believe that diversions are necessary and that incarceration that... isn't... should be the very final solution to dealing with these problems."

Speaker Lyons: "We've had four (4) people speak in response, three (3) in support. Next person scheduled to speak would be State Representative Roger Eddy. Proponent or opponent? Proponent, Representative?"

Eddy: "Yes."

Speaker Lyons: "Proponent. Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Representative Turner, I stand in support of your legislation and I... it took me a long time to get to this point, because I have some of the same concerns that my colleagues do. But at the end of the day, a seventeen-year-old is a kid. Now, some of them commit acts that they should be responsible for as adults and my understanding is that this legislation simply takes misdemeanors from adult court to juvenile court. Plain and simple."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Turner: "That's correct, Representative."

Eddy: "No violent crimes. No... no battery. No assault. Those types of crimes will remain... if you're a seventeen-year-old, you commit those types of crimes, they remain in adult court."

Turner: "Violent offenses are not covered in this Bill,

Representative. Nothing in this Bill changes current law

regarding transfers to adult court."

Eddy: "Okay. And as to the idea that a seventeen-year-old might have a DUI and get in an accident, all I can say is what a tragedy and what that young person needs is help and maybe they... if they're in some type of a situation like that to begin with, we should be looking for how those young people could... to get some assistance because seventeen-year-old kids who are DUI have a lot of trouble. I... I just think we have to look at a seventeen-year-old and I've done twenty-eight (28) year's worth of being around seventeen-year-olds and you got some bad apples, but this Bill isn't for gangbangers, this Bill isn't for those that are committing violent crimes. This is for kids who would be better served and one quick question on the cost factor. If you take eight hundred (800) cases from adult to juvenile court, is there a cost reduction at adult court because you're not seeing eight hundred (800) cases?"

Turner: "That would be my assumption, Representative. Right."

Eddy: "So, how do we know that this is simply a cost increase only? You would think that if there's a reduction in the caseload equally that there would be a reduction in cost and it may be even closer to revenue neutral, rather than a

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

huge increase. I don't know that. Maybe one court cost more than the other."

Turner: "You're an educator and it's quite obvious and we appreciate your tutelage here today."

Eddy: "Well, I don't know if that is true, because I'm not sure of the cost differences. I just think that if you... if you reduce one court's docket, there certainly will be, maybe some minor... maybe it won't be the same, but I don't know that the increase overall would be as much as we're concerned about. Representative, I... as I stated, I think there's a lot of good that could come from this, I hope no bad comes from this and I... I'm going to have to trust the system here to sort out those... those young people that should go to the adult court based on the... the severity of the crime. But I think there is an opportunity for more good by placing them in the juvenile court than there is bad by taking them out of adult. And I support the legislation."

Turner: "Thank you, Representative, and you're absolutely right regarding the cost. As I said, it costs you more to incarcerate an individual. I think we're spending anywhere from twenty-seven to thirty-five thousand dollars (\$27,000 to \$35,000) a year to incarcerate them. Juvenile system does not spend that kind of money and so right away, you're absolutely right. It would be a cost savings on the other end."

Speaker Lyons: "We've had four (4) people speak in response and four (4) in favor. Representative Cultra, Shane Cultra, Iroquois County. Proponent or opponent, Representative?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Cultra: "Proponent."

Speaker Lyons: "Proponent?"

Cultra: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Cultra: "As a for... former county board chairman, I am cognizant of the cost of having to send kids out of the county to detention centers in Champaign and other places. But as far as most misdemeanors go, they normally wouldn't be incarcerated anyway, would they?"

Turner: "That's correct, Representative."

Cultra: "To the Bill. I realize in Iroquois County, where I'm from, we're always worried about the cost of... of sending juveniles out of county. But I think in this case, the age of majority in most places is eighteen (18). Now, I don't think that we should make an exception in this case and I rise in strong support of... of this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "We had a thorough discussion on this Bill. I call on Representative Art Turner to close."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you say, I think the discussion has been plentiful. I do understand and have heard what the Members are saying in terms of cost. I'm willing to work with them, as again I stated earlier this Bill does not get implemented until 2010. I would hope by that time that we would have a better handle on the numbers, but regardless of what that number is I think the cost... the savings for what we spend to save our children is worth every bit of it. And I would move for the passage of Senate Bill 2275."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 2275 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Turner."
- Turner: "Can I have Postponed Consideration, Representative...
 Mr. Speaker, please?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on the request of the Sponsor, we'll put that Bill on Postponed Consideration. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Attention Members, the Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk. Speaker Madigan in the Chair. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 21, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Amendment #1 to House Bill 6485."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, on page 34 of the Calendar, there appears House Bill 6485. What is the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6485, a Bill for an Act making appropriations has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Miller, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Miller moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6485, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 6485 is a ri… a revised version of the FY08, excuse me, FY09 higher education budget consisting of one billion, three hundred and sixty-six thousand dollars (\$1,000,366,000). I ask for a favorable vote."

Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Well, first, Mr. Speaker, if I could... We are still not able to get the analysis... the written analysis on this. Could we get a couple minutes here to have that updated or find out what's wrong with the system?"

Speaker Madigan: "We can do that, Mr. Eddy. The Sponsor's available for questions..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Speaker Madigan: "...if you wish to ask questions."

Eddy: "Appreciate that if we... we could actually get the text or at least some kind of analysis of what it is we're going to be voting on. Representative, in the mean time could you specifically... could you specifically state what the

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

differences are in this version of the budget... the higher education budget?"

Miller: "The... what's still in there is the 2.8 percent increase that we talked about at level three (3) funding. What's still in there is the five million dollars (\$5,000,000) for student success grant, four million dollars (\$4,000,000) for health services education grant... grant, eighteen million (18,000,000) going towards the MAP formula increase, 9.5 million (9,500,000) towards the federal matching fund. What has been taken out and what the difference is various initiatives."

Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, if we could have a little more order. I think... Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it's important that we pay attention to specifically Representative Miller's explanation of what... and you said there are initiatives. Could you be a little more specific as to exactly what and what dollar amounts were taken out of this version?"

Miller: "Well, listening to the debates earlier, it talked about how the earlier budget was inflated. So, we're trying to get more in tune to some of the... what are comments I've heard earlier in the day. That includes eight hundred and sixty-nine thousand (869,000) for SIU cancer center, one million, two hundred (1,000,200) for Western Illinois for a nursing program, two hundred and eighty-five thousand (285,000) Eastern Illinois for nursing, two hundred thousand (200,000) for a S.T.E.M. program at Northern Illinois, two hundred thousand

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

(200,000) for health care professional education program at Northern, to name a few."

Eddy: "To name a few. Since we don't have a specific list, could you continue naming the... the exact programs for the record?"

Miller: "Yeah, let me... That was it, Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Pardon me, Sir. That's all?"

Miller: "What I commented on..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Miller: "...that was it; that was removed."

Eddy: "Okay. So, I guess I misunderstood your comment, to name a few."

Miller: "Yeah, I'm sorry."

Eddy: "That is all of those."

Miller: "That's true. I believe... I believe that's it."

Eddy: "Okay. What about besides the… the hand-picked programs, the 2.8 percent that was in the earlier version that you mentioned does stay in?"

Miller: "That's correct. Plus the 3 percent going towards community colleges."

Eddy: "Okay. You didn't take out specific 2.8 percent increases to obviously do what the other intention was and that is to target programs for people who didn't support the budget. You didn't take that out of the 2.8, you just took those programs out because of your earlier comments regarding the reaction."

Miller: "The 2... no, the 2.8 percent increase at level three (3) funding recommended by the Board of Higher Education is still in existence is this language."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Eddy: "So, all colleges and... all colleges will get the 2.8 percent and community college will get their 3 percent, under this version."

Miller: "That's correct. Under 2.8 percent increase University of Illinois will re... will receive twenty million, one hundred and eighty-nine thousand, three hundred and sixty dollars (\$20,189,360). Western Illinois will receive one million, six hundred and two thousand, nine hundred dollars (\$1,602,900). Northern Illinois will receive two million, eight hundred and ninety-two thousand, one hundred dollars (\$2,892,100). Eastern Illinois will receive one million, three hundred and fifty-two thousand, seven hundred dollars (\$1,352,700)."

Eddy: "And those are exactly the same amounts that were in the other version."

Miller: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Let me... let me ask you what your motivation is specifically, Representative, for this version. What... what..."

Miller: "Those..."

Eddy: "...is your specific motivation?"

Miller: "Two (2) things. One is that... that hearing the comments earlier, they talked about what we were proposing was a lot of money for... for higher education. And so it seemed that there wasn't support for these initiatives on the local component, but nevertheless, the committee's mission was on certain global issues concerning MAP funding, concerning student phon... affordability, concerning matching federal grants, that is still in place. That is

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

what the charge of the committee has been, even though Members on this side of the aisle have supported it. Even though, Members in our committee have said that's what we would like to see in higher education and I believe them."

Eddy: "Representative, I have a great deal of respect for you and the work you do in education, but let me... let me just very quickly before individuals who are having those projects taken out, have a chance to discuss it with you. Here's the fallacy of that thought, in my opinion. There very well may be young people from your district that attend Eastern Illinois University that could be directly affected by the fact that that program's being eliminated. There could be young people from..."

Miller: "Let me cut you off."

Eddy: "...folks on your side of the aisle..."

Miller: "This is not... this is not..."

Eddy: "...that could be affected."

Miller: "First off... Let me cut you off. First off, the program's not being eliminated. Second point of, this is higher than the recommended level that Eastern Illinois came in and requested to our committee. It is higher than University of Illinois's requested amount. It's higher than the Governor's initial amount that he stated in his budget address. And so working with both sides of the aisle, this is what we came up with, with a 2.8 percent increase. University of Illinois, Eastern Illinois, Northern Illinois can still use discretion to fund those programs. What this is, by using this, is to try to help offset some of the tuition increases, meet the salary

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

demands, and provide the economic stimulus that the universities apply... give to our state."

Eddy: "Representative, did I mishear you state that there's specific money for a nursing program at Western Illinois University that was... that was in the original version that is not in this version?"

Miller: "No. There was... there was a request from the... from North... Western Illinois, just like any others. We asked them in addition to the 3 percent what else are your initiatives. So, this program is one of their initiatives and so to say that..."

Eddy: "And it was in the original... it was in the original."

Miller: "No. Yeah, it was in the original budget that we passed earlier. It was..."

Eddy: "And that was how much?"

Miller: "...one of their initiatives that we could have put in or we couldn't. But however..."

Eddy: "And how much was that?"

Miller: "...being more fiscally responsible..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Miller: "...it was removed."

Eddy: "But my point is by removing it, while I understand the...
the aim of this is to look at these folks and say, hey, you
didn't vote for this, so we're going to roll a Bill out
here and we're going to take what was in a budget out,
ready, aim, miss the target. You're... you have
constituents... everyone has constituents that could very
well go and need that program. That's my concern. This...
this type of... this type of reaction to a process that

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

people have a problem with, really doesn't... it hurts everyone. It hurts possibly students that graduate from your high schools that want to go to Western or Eastern or any of these universities. I think that's my concern. I don't want to see a reaction to a vote end up harming individuals who are innocent to the process. That's my point. I know there's others who what to ask questions of you specific now, I'll let them do that."

Miller: "And let me respond to that. It would be something if...
if we supported that when it was in the budget. If you
supported it when it was in the budget, I understand.
Okay. I can... I would agree with you. But it wasn't. And...
what are we to do?"

Eddy: "Representative, my point is and again, in an attempt to react to people who have a lot of problems with this process, a lot of problems with the total amount that all of these increases might... might end up being which cause a deficit and perhaps none of them to be funded. Folks voted based on that philosophy. They... they may not be against whatever happened to be in a budget. The problem is by casting that vote there's some type... there's some type of action taken against students that want to go to those schools that is obviously directly related to the votes of the Representatives on this side of the aisle who have those universities. This is so transparent. That... that's what this is and I'm afraid that in this feud there are folks from all over the state, including those from your district who will be harmed by the fact that this type of

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

reaction is being made. Thank you for hearing me out. Speaker, I'll... I'll let others ask questions. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Myers."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Myers: "Representative Miller, are there any other Amendments to any other Bills that remove projects that have already been voted on?"

Miller: "Not that I know of."

Myers: "So, this is the only one."

Miller: "Yes. Yes, it is."

Myers: "Why were these projects or why were these amounts of money put in this Bill in the first place?"

Miller: "As I approached the Higher Education Appropriations Committee, as you know, we work pretty well together and we want to achieve the same goal. Part of the discussion is saying, look, I believe in everybody being inclusive into a process, particularly if we're going to support it at the end of the day. If I'm hearing comments about earlier from other colleagues, not yourself, but other colleagues saying, 'We weren't at the table.' Well, we sat down and talked. That there was no input. Well, I would argue you just had... you had and Mem... other Members had as much input the 2.8 percent increase that Western and other universities get. We simply could have said, let's do a flat line budget, which was asked by the universities and responded to that. I think this is more responsible. But to direct your question, is the fact of the matter is I don't think it's penalizing anything. It's hearing the

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

comments of saying there's an inflated budget. Coming back and saying that... that if there's no support from Legislators who... who are from that district, then why keep it in?"

Myers: "If this is an inflated budget, then why is higher education the only one that has an Amendment now that retracts some of those funding?"

Miller: "Because I think the way we approached it was the fact that trying to get bipartisan for ... I can't speak on any other committee and how they handled their committee as chairman or chairperson. I know the fact of the matter is, is that I care about the ... the kids at Western Illinois just as much as you do. I understand that Western Illinois is... is an economic engine and needs the fine arts center as has been articulated. As you know, I entered... I was in band camp as a kid at Western Illinois where we all make jokes about, in committee. And so if we're trying to get to the same goals, we're trying to meet the same needs, then at least let's try to move in the same direction. And I think in our... in terms of higher education appropriation we've been able to at least try to move us down the field at the '02 level which is a high mark that's been historically mentioned over and over again. But yet, listening to some of the comments is saying that, you know, that... that there has been input from Members on both sides of the aisle on this and that at least we're tying to be a little more fiscally responsible."

Myers: "Well, to begin with, your comment about the performing arts center that isn't even in this Bill."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Miller: "No. That's a capital..."

Myers: "That's a capital project."

Miller: "...that's an example."

Myers: "Now... Okay."

Miller: "That's an example. That's an example."

Myers: "But that's not the proper example to use. You mentioned the goals of higher education. What are the goals of higher education?"

Miller: "Higher education as... as we articulate it, I think some of the Members talked about we need to try to maximize I think there's no disagreement in this federal dollars. chamber on that. We need to try to decrease... or increase the number of graduates from low-income and minority and disadvantaged areas. I think there's been no disagreement on that. We looked at universities as economic engines. I think there's no disagreement on that. I think we've looked at pipeline programs to try to make sure that those graduation rates increase and we also looked at trying to have affordability. And so, when we talked about the Student Success grant, we talk about MAP funding, I think those go into those goals. I think those goes in... goes into those universal principles. I think there would be no argument from either side of the aisle on."

Myers: "Let's take some of those projects that you mentioned were... were taken out. Let's use for example... example that I can use the closest and that's the nursing program at Western Illinois University. If the goal is higher education for students and affordability for students, you're taking funding directly out of a program that could

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

provide more nurses in a nurse shortage area in a profession that needs more of those kind of professionals. You're now suddenly limiting the ability of individuals to get a good quality education and... and when you go to talk about working together, Representative, we all on that same committee have the same goal. Did we not all agree to send those Bills out of committee on a... on an Attendance Roll Call. How other many committees, appropriation committees sent their Bills out on Attendance Roll Call?"

Miller: "Two (2) things is. You're right. We're probably the only committee that... that had a uniform support on most of the Bil... I think it was one dissension vote on all the Bills. However, that still doesn't speak to the votes on the floor. It's not that I'm against nurses at Western Illinois or nursing students at Western Illinois. There's still money in the Health Sciences grant that's listed at four million dollars (\$4,000,000). However, you know, at looking at the support that was given at least on the floor, I think this is at least responding to an action that was... that was presented earlier today."

Myers: "So, what you're saying is, we are being punished for our vote to try to bring together a responsible budget based on the revenue there. We are the only ones. Higher education is the only one that has an Amendment that retracts some of that funding request. All of the other budgets, all have the same votes, they don't have one of these Amendments. It's strictly higher education. Is that it?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Miller: "No. Higher education still receives thirty-seven million, six hundred and seven thousand, five hundred and seventy-two thousand (sic-hundred) dollars (\$37,607,572). The City Colleges, excuse me, the community college system receives a ten million (10,000,000), almost eleven million dollar (\$11,000,000) increase. To me that's a winner. Now if we want to look at specific districts, I mean, you're still Western Illinois, since you brought that up, still receives one million, six hundred and two thousand, nine hundred dollars (\$1,602,900) in this program. If they choose to do…"

Myers: "That's not the point, Representative."

Miller: "Well..."

Myers: "And you know that's not the point."

Miller: "...if they've asked for no increase... if they've asked in front of our committee, initially at no increase, then..."

Myers: "The univers... Western Illinois University submitted to your staff and to our staff the board of trustees' request. Not the Board of Higher Education request, not the Governor's request, but their trustees' request. Now that, Representative Miller, is a level that is substantially higher than what we were giving them to begin with at the 2.8 percent level and substantially higher than... than even the level that was in the budget to begin with."

Miller: "In defense of the universities, they all have signed on... and this is the environment that we're dealing with 'cause I don't really true... truly think we're debating, but trying to get to a better end. They all signed on to the initial Governor's statement. They all signed on to the

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Board of Higher Education's level, which is not true. We created this. The General Assembly... the Legislators in the House, the Members on our committee created this level funding. And so, yes, the board of trustees can make any recommendations they can. All of them do and they should, to... as far as what the state support should be. The state support should be more, but this is the environment we're in, we're trying to have a responsible budget."

Myers: "Well, Representative, I'm going to close by saying I'm very disappointed. We have a good working relationship on that committee and I'm very disappointed that we had an agreement in committee. I told you from the very beginning that we agreed with that, but we would have to look at the overall picture of the overall spending in all of these Bills before I could... any of us could commit to supporting any appropriation Bill. You obviously were disappointed in that and I can understand that, but I'm also disappointed that we're playing politics in an area that higher education has been the dog that's been kicked by this Governor for the last five (5) years. We were trying to make up some of that ground and I'm... I'm disappointed that this kind of action is being taken."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Stephens: "Representative, you alluded during your remarks that you took this action based on votes? Would you expand that so I can understand that?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Miller: "I heard earlier in debate a few things. One was that...
that this... that the budget was inflated, that we were
sending over basically large amounts of money over and this
is a reaction to it."

Stephens: "Okay. So, it's a reaction to it based on those comments. Did you agree then? Is that what you're saying, you agreed that your original budget that you said was good, was inflated?"

Miller: "No, what I'm saying..."

Stephens: "No, you didn't agree to that? Then why do you have this Amendment to trim the budget? Which votes, Representative?"

Miller: "Did you support the initial budget?"

Stephens: "I'll ask the questions."

Miller: "In higher education?"

Stephens: "Which votes did you object to?"

Miller: "Did you support the budget in higher education? If you did, then at least..."

Stephens: "You... you want..."

Miller: "...there's some argument... there's some argument that we can... are going in the right direction. That the 2.8 percent means something..."

Stephens: "Representative, don't tell me about the right direction."

Miller: "...that the ten million dollars (\$10,000,000) for community colleges means something."

Stephens: "I'm asking you a question, Representative."

Speaker Madigan: "Gentlemen."

Stephens: "Which votes?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Speaker Madigan: "Gentlemen... Gentlemen... Gentlemen, one person at a time, please."

Stephens: "Thank you..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens is recognized."

Stephens: "...I think I have the floor, Mr. Speaker. Look at that, the Speaker came to my defense and I appreciate it and I hope I have a chance to return the favor."

Miller: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you."

Stephens: "The question is, which votes over here did you single out?"

Miller: "Nobody."

Stephens: "Nobody... nobody, well, then, you know what, I don't know, but maybe a few hours ago I stood in objection, and I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, but it was a document that you signed to reconsider a vote by which a Bill had passed. And I said those three (3) or four (4) hours ago, I've been around here awhile I know something's up. Have the courage, Representative, to call it like it is. You're trying to punish particular Republican Legislators because you thought that they were too harsh in saying that you passed a budget that is now 3.1 billion dollars (\$3,100,000,000)... if you where ingenuous, Representative... Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. If you where genous (sic-3.1 billion dollars ingenuous) you would trim (\$3,100,000,000) from your bloated budget. If you... you must think the voters and the people who run the universities are stupid. You think they're stupid. think that you're going to be able to put a direct mail piece, you and your little political minions over there,

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

put a direct mail piece out and it's going to say, well, Republican X, he ruined this program at this university. If you think the voters are that stupid, Representative, it's going to come home to roost and it won't roost in these honorable Republican districts where we're trying not to overspend by 3.1 billion (3,100,000,000) and that's just so far today. We are going to be honored by... because people are not stupid. They're not stupid in Rich Myers' district, Representative. They're not stupid Pritchard's district or Rose's district. They are not going to stand by and let you blame those honored Representatives for something that you did. You, Miller, you, a man that I thought had a sense of honor and you let the Speaker and his political minions guide you down this misquided road. You should be ashamed of yourself and I'm sure that as your conscience grows, you will be ashamed of your actions today."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fritchey.. Fritchey. Mr. Joyce."

Joyce: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. The previous speakers have talked about politics, but the fact of the matter is, this is my sixth year in this House. All six (6) years I have served as the vice chairman of this committee, Higher Ed Appropriations. And I have served under different chair... as a... under a different chairman of this committee before Representative Miller took over and to accuse him of playing politics is plain wrong. And what the previous speakers are trying to do is flip the table because this chairman has worked and worked and worked to bring both sides of the aisle together to accomplish the

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

needs, the requests of the universities, of the community college and yes, of the Members of both Democrats and Republicans. And to personally attack him is wrong. Doesn't belong on the House Floor. This is not a political And he has tried to accommodate the needs of campaign. every Member of that committee. And you're trying to turn the table because, in fact, it was your Members that agreed and I stood with your Members under a different chairman. I stood with you and voted against other Bills that the Governor and the previous chairman wanted to pass and we defeated that. And he's extended... this chairman has extended every courtesy to your Members. And we had what we thought was an agreed Bill. It came out of committee that way. You can yell all you want. It came out of committee that way, but now because you've decided to take a caucus position that's fine. But you can't take a caucus position and then say that this chairman is playing politics, because that's not the case. This chairman made available to every single Member of that committee a chance to request initiatives, to request funding levels, and he put it in those Bills and you didn't want to support it. But the chair... to accuse this chairman of take... locking you out of the process, not including you, that's wrong because he has been the most inclusive chairman in the six (6) years I've been here and the many more years that I've been watching this process since I was about seven (7) or eight (8) years old. And the personal attacks are wrong and uncalled for on the floor of the Illinois House."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rose."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the... will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Rose: "Thank you. Representative, I... if I heard you correctly you decided to do this because some people were... stood and were critical over the overall state budget. Is that sort of correct?"

Miller: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear your question."

Rose: "You... you did this because people were critical over the overall state budget. That was one of the things... one of the reasons you listed as why this occurred."

Miller: "I thought this was the right thing to do."

Rose: "Okay. Well, I haven't spoken on a budget Bill yet today. Not one, Representative, not one. But I know you're a respected Member of the medical profession, you're a dentist. Is there a nursing shortage in Illinois?"

Miller: "Yes."

Rose: "Is there a nursing shortage in your area?"

Miller: "Most likely, yes."

Rose: "Well, I'll just make sure that the two hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars (\$285,000) for the nursing program at Eastern, they know what happened. So, thanks."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Cross: "Representative, I just want to make sure before I say anything. The eight hundred and sixty-nine thousand (869,000) for the SIU cancer center was taken out. Is that correct?"

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Miller: "Yes."

Cross: "Okay. To the Bill. I think everybody in this chamber knows what happened today. Let's not kid ourselves. Let's teach the Republicans a lesson, because they decided to be 'no' on the budget. We'll show them. Their... they wanted to be 'no'. They made some arguments that the budget was out of line, it wasn't balanced, and it's not. It's three billion dollars (\$3,000,000,000) in the hole, everybody in this place knows this. This is the, you know, we keep playing the games around here. We're going to pass a budget, we'll call it one thing, we'll... either... level 1 or level 2. We'll send it all over to the Senate and say we did a budget and that we've done our job. We can go home and it's all over. It's not over. It's the same thing we've been doing on everything around here this Session, whether it's recall, whether it's redistricting, whether we don't call Bills on capital and jobs. Whatever the case is, we haven't done a single thing of really any significance in a long time, 'cause no one around this place gets along. So along comes today and we decide and have the audacity to actually be 'no' on a budget. You didn't talk to us and I don't complain about that. We're in the Minority, that's fine. And David, with all due respect, I think you do have a good relationship with our guys on Higher Ed. I commend you for that, but overall on the budget, this was an approach of, this is how it's going to be, we are in the Majority. We have absolute power, take it or leave it. And so again, we come along and say we don't ap... we don't like that approach, we're not going

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

to be for it. So what do you do? The classic... classic approach of, well, we'll get you and we'll teach you a lesson because you're Republicans and you had the audacity to vote 'no'. We'll show you who's in power. We'll take out your projects in this Bill. Eight hundred and sixtynine thousand dollars (\$869,000) to open up a cancer center Eight hundred and sixty-nine thousand for SAI... SIU. dollars (\$869,000) to open up a cancer center that cost twenty-two million dollars (\$22,000,000) and you're going to show us by taking it out. This isn't about me or Raymond Poe or Rich Brauer. How about the people that want to go to the cancer center. How about the people that have cancer, that are close to dying and you now, to teach us a lesson... to teach us a lesson, we're going to show you, aren't we. You're not showing us anything. You're showing a complete disregard for the people of this state. isn't about me. This isn't about anybody on this side. This is about a nursing school at Eastern, a nursing school at Western, a cancer center, a safety town at UIS. This isn't about us. We... we can handle this. We happen to be rep... Representatives that represent Republicans Democrats who get cancer, who need nursing services, who need to make sure their kids are taught safety at SI... at UIS. So, you've really done an admirable thing today, and I'm not aiming it at one person, I'm aiming it to all of you, by taking these out. You've shown us all a great lesson. You've proven to everybody how much power you have and you're going to teach us a lesson. You wonder, and we've said this over and over in this place, why we can't

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

get a budget done. You know how simple it is to pick up the phone and say to me or to the President of the Senate, or the Minority of this... Leader of the Senate or maybe even the Governor, we got to get a budget done. We don't like each other. We don't even trust each other, but we have some responsibility to do our jobs. How many people don't get along with somebody at work? How many people don't get along with somebody at church or on a not-for-profit board, but they get their jobs done. Not us, we decide that we're going to concoct this goofy budget theory, send it over to the Senate and say it's real and oh my God, somebody questioned us, so we're going to teach them a lesson. should anybody trust anybody with that kind of attitude? Why would anybody say, God, that Illinois General Assembly's really doing a good job, they really care about me, they really care about the sick people in my district, they really care about the nursing shortage in Illinois or whatever the case might be, but they're not going to. There's no way they can because again whether it's a cruel hoax, whether it's the old two-step, whether it's the scam of a budget, the fantasy of a budget, or the retaliation, or the vindictiveness of your side, there's no reason for them to believe in government anymore. Not with this attitude. Not of take it or leave it or do you dare to question the king. You dare to question the king, you're going to be punished. Just keep in mind, you're not punishing us. I would suggest there are those of you around the state that have kids that want to go to U of I or SIU or Western or Northern or Eastern. Thev're

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Republicans, they're Democrats, they're Independents, that's who you're hurting today. Not anybody on this side of the aisle. So you got your way, you're the Majority. You've got 63 votes. Have at it. Be vindictive, retaliate, teach us a lesson, put the 63 votes on, show us who's boss, show who's power, and tell the people of the State of Illinois that you don't care and that the heck with them, because you have all the power and you're going to show us how important that power is and what you can do with it. That is very, very impressive. Mr. Speaker, we request a verification."

Speaker Madigan: "Democrats, you just heard the Gentleman's request for a verification, so if all Democrats could please be in their seats. All Democrats please be in their seats and I think Mr. Miller would like to get in the last lick. Mr. Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, I want to respond to a few comments. I would never call Representative Pritchard or Representative Rose, or Representative Myers stupid. To even say that is insulting. To say I would say that to them, clearly maybe you need to come in and listen to our committee. I think we do still work very well together. I think we will still work together very well, but to use that kind of language, I don't think is... is correct. Second thing is, I've heard a place at the table. It was me who went to Members on the other side of the aisle and said what is your interest, as they've asked me for my interest. And so, you know, so we're looking at a... a situation where someone had said that we didn't listen to

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

them. We did, we listened, we tried to incorporate the needs and concerns that has affected their particular interests and communities involved. Because the truth is, as Leader Cross had mentioned, these are our kids going to, regardless of whatever part of the state you represent, to some of the finest universities in the country. Even if they're in your community, even in the backyard of mine. And I think we all respect that. It was us, though, on this side of the aisle who voted for the cancer center. was us who voted for the nursing center at It was us who voted for Western Illinois nursing center. We voted for that. We voted positive for it, on the other side of the aisle did not. Now you may have a global issue with it. I can't argue that. I can't argue your global issue. The goal in higher education what I heard over and over again from the universities was that we've had level funding over the years, that the '02 mark was the highest state funding and that our kids are suffering because of high rise in tuition. It's been our charge and this budget represents those values. And so you can look at the cup half full... half empty for what wasn't included in. You always have that alternative, but I'd go back to what I like to look at is at half full because I'm an optimist. The university systems do win under this budget with 2.8 percent increase. The community colleges do win at a 3.3 percent increase. They do win. Now, if your university wants to augment those funds or shift those funds into what your program is on that side of the aisle, they can still do it, because we on the Democratic side are

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

providing the funding to do it for you. So if you want to do it, fine. That's up to them. But let's get in the game, because what higher education is really fighting... higher education is fighting with human services and fighting with the other budgets that passed and elementary and secondary education. So whatever passes over to the Senate we can at least get in the game so all of our kids are educated. So all our kids can compete in the global market. So all our kids can have an opportunity that they deserve based on the efforts of their heart. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
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 64 people voting 'yes', 32 people voting 'no'. There's a request for a verification. To those doing the verification, every Democrat except Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Osterman, and Mr. Will Davis are recorded as 'yes'. Are there questions? I just told you, they're all in their seats and the only people recorded 'no' are Hoffman, Osterman, and Davis are not recorded because they're excused. Will Davis. Are there questions? Turn on Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Flowers."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Flowers. Remove Representative Flowers from the Roll Call."

Cross: "Collins."

Speaker Madigan: "Collins. There's Collins in the back."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Cross: "Hamos."

Speaker Madigan: "Hamos. Hamos. Remove Hamos from the Roll Call."

Cross: "Dunkin."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunkin. Remove Mr. Dunkin from the Roll Call. Restore Representative Hamos to the Roll Call."

Cross: "Jakobsson."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Jakobsson is in her seat.

Restore Representative Flowers to the Roll Call."

Cross: "Yarbrough."

Speaker Madigan: "Yarbrough is in the rear of the chamber."

Cross: "That's all I have, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "There being 63 people voting 'aye' and 32 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Lyons in the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Speaker of the House Michael Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First, let me compliment all of you for such hard work that you did today, whether you supported these budget Bills or whether you opposed them. This has been a long, grueling day. All of you are to be complimented for being here and for staying the course until we had finished our work. To the Democrats, I want to congratulate you and compliment you, because through our action we have sent twenty-eight (28) appropriation Bills to the Senate. We have sent spending authority for the '09 budget to the Senate. The

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

(28) Bills to choose from among those Bills and determine a spending level that they can send to the Governor. If the Governor chooses to disagree with the combined action of the House and the Senate, as we learned summer, the Governor has authority under Constitution to reduce the level of spending and actually to remove lines from the appropriation Bills. Most of us who serve in the Legislature today have served here since 1991, which was the year when Governor Edgar and the Republican Leaders chose to go to a one-Bill budget process, and since '91 we've worked with a one-Bill budget process. It started because Governor Edgar wanted more control over budget making and it's continued because certain people wanted more control. Now, over the last few years we've heard complaint, complaint, complaint that the state budget is drafted by five (5) people: the Governor, Speaker, the Senate President, and the Minority the Leaders. And you all know there's been a high level of complaint about that budget making process. And what we've done here is to revert back to the way budget making was done before 1991. So, I can tell you, 1971 and coming forward there'd be sixty (60), seventy (70) appropriation Bills. Every agency would get an appropriation Bill. Bill would move through the House, the Senate, it would go The Governor would use his authority to the Governor. under the Amendator... under the reduction Veto or the line item Veto, make his changes, send the Bills back to the Legislature. The budget would not be finalized until the last week of the Veto Session in the fall. That was budget

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

making prior to 1991. Budget making subsequent to 1991 has brought on all of this complaint. Well, the complaint about closed-door budget making by the Governor and the four (4) Leaders has ended today. Our action today comes after we had scheduled regional hearings. All across the state there were regional hearings over a one-week period. There were over four thousand (4,000) witnesses that appeared at those hearings. Later there were hearings here in the Capitol building. So in terms of participation... participation by the Members of the House, by the people of Illinois, we've had it. Today is the culmination of all of that. There were some who said we don't like the idea that we only get one choice. Whether it's one choice in one Bill or one choice in fifteen (15) or twenty (20) Bills and so our action today gave everybody in this House multiple choices, multiple choices. If you wanted a flat budget it was there for you, vote 'yes'. If you wanted a growth budget it was there for you, vote 'yes'. If you didn't like the flat budget, vote 'no'. If you don't like the growth budget, vote 'no'. Okay. You had your opportunity. You had your choice. What's the complaint? There's never been since 1991 so much participation in budget making as there has been over the last several weeks and now the They'll have the same matter is in the Senate. opportunity. They'll do as they please and then go on to the Governor where he can take his action. Again, we want to compliment everybody for their hard work and for those of you that are still a little angry and for those of you who are very happy with what we've done, the plan is that

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

we're going to cancel Session on Friday and we will... You Republicans can clap, that's okay. You won't get taken to the woodshed. Cancel Session on Friday, return late on Tuesday... late on Tuesday. Monday is Memorial Day. Everybody should be advised when we return next week be prepared to be here through the end of the month. That means Saturday. Saturday is the last day of the month. So... again, thank you for your hard work. Enjoy the Memorial Day weekend. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand adjourned until, I believe, 10 a.m. tomorrow morning."

Speaker Lyons: "11, Speaker."

Madigan: "11 a.m. tomorrow morning."

Speaker Lyons: "Speaker, before we adjourn, Members, the Clerk will read the committee assignments and times. So, stay tuned for a few minutes before we adjourn. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Meeting immediately after Session is the Personnel & Pensions Committee in Room 115. Personnel & Pensions in Room 115. Consumer Protection in Room 122B.

Consumer Protection in Room 122B. Mass Transit in Room 118. Drivers' Education & Safety in Room C-1. Health Care Availability & Access in Room 114. Transportation & Motor Vehicles in Room D-1. A half hour following Session Elementary & Secondary Education will meet in Room 114. Human Services in Room D-1. Local Government in Room C-1 and Judiciary-Criminal Law will meet in Room 118. Tomorrow morning on Thursday at 9:30 a.m. Railroad Safety will meet in Room 122B. Tomorrow on Thursday, Railroad Safety will meet at 9:30 a.m. in Room 122B."

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative David Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to move the posting requirements so that Senate Bill 2077, Senate Bill 2071, and Senate Bill 2033 can be heard in Local Government Committee this afternoon. And Senate Bill 2676, if it's not already posted. That's Representative Smith's Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman asks for the waiving of the postings. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the posting has been waived on the Bills... Representative Leitch had recommended. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Mike Tryon."
- Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to request that the Speaker record my vote on House Bill 6485 as a 'no'. I had voted... thought I had voted 'no' and when I looked up, when we were going through the verification, my light was not lit so I'm requesting that it be recorded a 'no'."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tryon, the Journal will so reflect. The Chair recognizes Representative Randy Ramey."
- Ramey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With the cancellation of Friday, are the deadlines been extended on Third Reading?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ramey, we'll let you know that by tomorrow morning."
- Ramey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lyons: "And now allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Speaker Madigan Motions to adjourn the House 'til the hour of 11 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, May, 22. All those in favor of adjournment signify by saying 'aye'; those

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Everyone have a restful, peaceful, enjoyable evening. We'll see you tomorrow at 11:00."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on May 21, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved floor consideration', referred to Consideration Postponed is Senate Bill 526. Representative Molaro, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II-Criminal Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 21, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' is Senate Bill 1887, Senate Bill 1975, Senate Bill 2053, Senate Bill 2340, Senate Bill 2355, and Senate Bill 2855; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' is Senate Bill 2718. Representative Smith, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 21, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' is Senate Bill 2487, Senate Bill 2512; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' is House Bill 4707, Senate Bill 2682, and Senate Bill 2864. Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 21, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

amended Short Debate' is House Bill 3472, Senate Bill 2012, Senate Bill 2199, Senate Bill 2256, Senate Bill 2492, Senate Bill 2552, and Senate Bill 2656; 'recommends be adopted' is House Resolution 1185. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation & Motor Vehicles, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 21, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Senate Joint Resolution 77. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Local Government, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 21, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' is Senate Bill 2162, Senate Bill 2353, Senate Bill 2674, Senate Bill 2676, Senate Bill 2744; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' is Senate Bill 2033, Senate Bill 2071, and Senate Bill 2077. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Drivers' Education & Safety, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 21, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' is Senate Bill 1930. Representative Hamos, Chairperson from the Committee on Mass Transit, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 21, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' is Senate Bill 2824. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 21, 2008, reported the same

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2047; 'do as amended Short Debate' is Senate Bill 2595. Representative Flowers, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Availability & Access, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 21, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recomen... do pass as amended Short Debate' is Senate Bill 1415; 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2380. Referred to the House Committee on Rules is Senate Joint Resolution 78, offered by Representative Watson. Senate Bills-First Reading. Senate Bill 886, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation and Senate Bill 1908, offered by Representative Miller, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bills on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 3472, offered by Representative Coulson, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 4707, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Senate Bills-Second Reading. Senate Bill 1415, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading of this House Bill (sic-Senate Bill). Senate Bill 1887, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading. Senate Bill 1930, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading. House Bill (sic-Senate Bill) 1975, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2012, offered by Representative Delgado, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Second Reading of this Senate

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Bill. Senate Bill 1930, a Bill for and Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1887, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 2012, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 2033, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2053, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 2071, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 2077, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 2162, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2199, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2256, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Reading. Senate Bill 2340, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading. Senate Bill 22... or Senate Bill 2353, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2355, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2487, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill... Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 2492, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2512, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2552, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2595, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2656, a Bill for an Act concerning State

271st Legislative Day

5/21/2008

Government. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2674, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2676, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2682, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2718, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2744, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2824, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2855, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading. Senate Bill 2858, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading. And Senate Bill 2864, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."