281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We ask the Members and our guests in the gallery to turn off laptop computers, cell phones, and pagers and we ask the guests in the gallery to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Bishop G. E. Livingston of the Life Changers Church in Decatur, Illinois. Bishop Livingston is a guest of Representative Flider."
- Bishop Livingston: "Would you bow your heads, please. Father, we come before You today facing great challenges, energy prices, gas, the cost of food, and people struggling to get ahead. The people, the men and women in this House, will make decisions that will affect people around this state, in cities, and even around the country. Because of that, Father, I pray two (2) thing for them. One is wisdom to make the right choices, and secondly, is courage to do the right thing. We pray for them and bless them in Your Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Flider."
- Flider et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Rich Bradley, Collins, Will Davis,

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Golar, Hamos, Howard, Jefferies, Lang, Nekritz, Reitz, and Ryg are excused today."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representatives Bassi, Black, Mathias, Meyer, Dunn, Dunkin, Pihos, Hassert, Myers, Sommer, Watson, Mulligan, and Schock are excused today."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 90 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Sa... Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Rules..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Report. 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 July 16, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' is Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 450. Representative Washington, Chairperson from the Committee on Prison Reform, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on July 16, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2746."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sacia."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Stat... state your point."

Sacia: "Mr. Speaker, this morning, I, along with other Members of the Prison Reform Committee, gathered to meet to listen

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

to a very important Bill. During the discussion of that Bill, the worst display of racial hatred I have ever heard in my six (6) years in this General Assembly was displayed. I respectfully request, Sir, that you and members of your staff review the transcripts of that committee meeting and deal with the appropriate ad... admonishments and I may... myself may be included in that, but I have great respect for the presenter and the Sponsor of the Bill and the tremendous job that he did of presenting it. I have profound respect for Chairman Washington and the great job he did of maintaining order, but that type of racial hatred that was displayed in that committee meeting this morning went out with the seventies. And I respectfully request that you review the transcript or a member of your staff."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, on a similar point of personal privilege, was in that committee this morning and I... when I first heard the remarks they were... they were so ridiculous that I burst out laughing because I thought it was a joke. But as the Lady pursued her line of diatribe it was clear, clear that she was taking shots racial... openly racial shots at those of us who represent areas that happen to have a corrections facility within our district and said that she can predict our vote because we were pro crime, we wanted more crime. You wanted more people from the... the City of Chicago to commit crimes so that they could come down to your district and provide jobs. How ironic when it is... There are a lot of us on this side of the aisle that feel like, you know what, we would like to

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

make the commission of a crime such that it was... that you had every incentive to not commit a crime. We agree with those who... who say it's the best course of action is to stay in school, don't have children before you're married, and don't get married until you have a job. And if you'll follow those... those simple tenets, 90 percent of you will be successful, regardless of race, regardless of status, regardless of which neighborhood you came from, but to say to me and to others who represent prisons, we want more crime so that we can watch those criminals in jail is the heighth of racial politics, ugliness and unnecessary comments in this chamber."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the… of the General Assembly, I also, too, was in that committee the Prison Reform, and was flabbergasted by the comments that one of my colleagues made on the other side of the aisle. I spent eight (8) years as a prosecutor seeking justice for the people of the State of Illinois not… not trying to pu… to prosecute anybody based on race, color, creed, background of any sort, but the comments that were made there should not be tolerated in this Body. To… to make the assumption that all in law enforcement are evil people, to continue an industry only to provide jobs for… for any part of the state is completely absurd. And I believe that what I did and what others have done in the criminal justice system,

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

have made this state a better place and made it a safer place for law-abiding citizens of the State of Illinois. I never prosecuted somebody to put them in jail to provide a job for somebody else. That's ridiculous. But of course, walking out of the committee was the Representative said to me, 'well, do you have a prison in your district, is that why you're going to vote 'no'?' I voted 'no' on the Bill because I didn't believe in the merits of the Bill and I appreciate the Sponsor of the Bill and what he's trying to do and his point of view and I've always worked with your side of the aisle on these types of issues that maybe we may not have agreed upon but maybe could come to some common ground. But when those types of comments are spewed out in a committee, it's hard to fathom how I could support any type of that legislation when... if that's all it's going to come down to is race beating, I'm not going to participate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Represe... Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I'm really sorry if my comments were misconstrued. Race was never mentioned in that debate in that committee. Race was never talked about. It is rare that we talk about a Bill before the Sponsor puts it on the House Floor. The Bill was Representative Ford's initiative to allow former inmates, who are qualified, to pay into a fund of fifteen dollars (\$15) per month that would allow them to get a loan at 2 percent interest to open a business. Mr. Ford's... Representative Ford's comments were that this was needed because too many former inmates cannot get jobs. The

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

question was asked, can they get jobs at McDonald's? The response was, when people ask have you been convicted of a crime and you respond 'yes' you're more than likely not to get the job. What I did say and what I do adhere to is, too often in this Body... too often in this Body, it appears to me and I have a right to my opinion, that some people who have prisons in their district choose to do whatever's in their power to make sure re... recidivism occurs. When I notice these individuals they... they hardly ever... You can... you can act like that if you like, but this is a Body of decorum."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, please, we don't need jeering. Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "The debate continued that if we don't provide some opportunity for people who have made mistakes, they go back to a life of crime. The recidivism in the State of Illinois is extremely high and we should ask ourselves why. Is fifteen dollars (\$15) per month too much for a former inmate to pay to be given an opportunity to get a loan to open a business? No money comes from the taxpayer at all. There's no taxpayer money. So, then the question becomes, what is your objection if a violent criminal cannot participate, a sex offender cannot participate, those who have committed nonviolent crimes that would allow them to get their life back on check... track. They can't get educational loans. They can't get federal loans for... for educational purposes. So, my objective, Mr. Speaker and Members of this illustrious Body, was to wake up the people who have an opportunity to change the... the record in

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Illinois of... if rehabilitation is supposed to occur in prison then people should have an opportunity to work after that and that was the entire intent. Anybody... I also stated and this is a fact also, Mr. Speaker, that there are some individuals who commit crime and when they get out they go right back to the job they had prior to when they went to prison. That's documented. I didn't call anyone a name. I didn't mention any race and if anyone decided that race was a factor then sobeit, it's in their mind. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Just to clarify our request. We're simply asking that the Speaker's staff review the transcript of the meeting. If the Lady is right and nothing said was offensive to any Member, then we... we retract our request. However, if we are right and we have the right to be offended, then we would hope that the Speaker would take appropriate sanctions towards the Lady from the county of Cook."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I just want to say that this morning was a heated debate and I actually appreciate everyone wanting to debate the issue. But one thing that we can't lose sight of is the fact that we must do something to help Illinois move forward and move forward to be all that it could be. So, I ask that when this Bill does come to the floor, that we work together and before it makes it to the floor that we work together now to make the Bill the best Bill that it could be and not

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

close the door on the opportunity that we want to provide. So, I ask the people on the other side to join me and the other people that's going to be working to try to bring this Bill to the floor so that everyone could vote on it. We have a lot of bridges to be built. We have a possible Olympics that's coming to Chicago and we could provide a lot of opportunities for a lot of people and we could generate a lot of revenue for the State of Illinois through taxes. So, I ask that you not lose sight of what we're really trying to do and not let anything deter us from our ultimate goal and that's putting people to work. Thanks."

- Speaker Madigan: "On page 3 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 2526. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2526, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment 3 was adopted to the Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2526, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Froehlich."
- Froehlich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 2526 addresses collective bargaining in the public sector and there are several changes that would be made. One thing that we're trying to expedite decisions when complaints are lodged with the Labor Relations Boards

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

and we want to make sure that the staffs are sufficient so that they can, on a timely basis, render decisions. We also... there's several other items. I'm not aware at the moment of opposition to the... this Bill as... as it is amended at this time. Be happy to answer questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, first, let's make sure we know what Amendment... Is Amendment 3... does that become the Bill and is that what... what we're discussing here?"

Froehlich: "Just a minute. You're talking about Amendment...

House Amendment 3."

Eddy: "Okay."

Froehlich: "Deletes everything after the enacting clause."

Eddy: "So, Amendment 3 becomes the Bill in essence, the… the entire Amendment now constitutes the Bill."

Froehlich: "Correct."

Eddy: "And as amended... Well, I do know that initially there was opposition from the Municipal League and the IEA and those are kind of... on many issues, you know, to see them together as opponents was interesting because oftentimes they're on opposite sides of issues. What... what is the opposition and how was that removed by this Amendment?"

Froehlich: "The... the IEA originally had an issue with organizing expenses being included in fair share fees.

That was one of their concerns and that was addressed I believe because fair share payers still may opt out of this. So... and the other issue... they wanted to make sure

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

that the... the different Labor Relations Boards would remain separate and I'm happy to state for the record, there's nothing in here nor anything in my intent that would merge the two (2) boards. The intent is to keep them separate but to make them more efficient in dealing with issues that come before them."

Eddy: "So, it's traditionally fair share was specifically expenses related to the bargaining process and in its original version this Bill extended to fair share costs those costs in organizing the union and there was an opposition to that, but that's been removed. The only continued costs are those expressly for purposes of bargaining. If there's any fair share, it's only for bargaining expenses."

Froehlich: "That's correct."

Eddy: "And the autonomy of the boards is now complete with that Amendment and you're telling us all the opposition is removed."

Froehlich: "To the best of my know... I know it is from the IEA and the Municipal League. I have not heard a word from on this Bill and I'm... they... they didn't slip it... they didn't slip against it. So if they're opposed, they're... it's kind of a secret right now."

Eddy: "Okay. Representative, thank you and I know I araised the initial opposition on the… on the way the Bill was introduced and I appreciate the fact that you were willing to work with all sides and at least remove most of the opposition and especially that dealing with fair share and I thank you for that. And I agree that at this point this

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Bill has been to the point where most... most folks who had any opposition had the chance to state it and it's ready to go. Thank you."

Froehlich: "You're welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reis. Reis."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, according to our analysis or our status report, nothing's been done with this Bill since May. Why is it important that this Bill runs right now? I mean... Let me start with that question."

Froehlich: "Well, this is a Bill that's been negotiated for awhile. As you heard, Representative Eddy and I did work out an issue that he had had with the Bill and really this is kind of the first opportunity we've had since the last day in May to a..."

Reis: "No. You didn't answer my question. Why is this Bill so important? I mean..."

Froehlich: "Well, they... I..."

Reis: "We're trying to get staff up here. Amendment 3 didn't even go through the proper committee process. It was... come straight from the Rules Committee to the House Floor. Why is this so important when we have Vetoes to discuss on budgets. We have a capital Bill to discuss. We don't even know what our schedule is from one week to the next. Why is this Bill so important to run today?"

Froehlich: "Well, the… the substance of the Bill has been through committee. The third Amendment twice, it had been through regular committee and the third Amendment made

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

minor changes. It did not overhaul the whole Bill and as far as the order of the day, I think you'd have to address that question elsewhere. I don't... I don't set the agenda for the House."

Reis: "Will you do us a favor, Representative, and take this Bill out of the record at least until the end of the day? We're trying to get through to the proponents of the Bill, there aren't even any lobbyists here today. They don't care what we're doing. So, will you please take it out of the record until the end of the day so we can find out if all the opposition's been removed?"

Froehlich: "Representative, your colleague, Representative Eddy, indicates that he knows of no opposition now. That because we..."

Reis: "He said because you said that. We just want to make sure that that's in fact the case."

Froehlich: "Well, his opposition's removed because I addressed his problem with the Bill. The IEA's is removed for the same reason. I'm not aware of any opposition to the Bill. I don't see why we should further delay it not... and again, not knowing what the schedule's going to be like today, I'd like to address it right now."

Reis: "We haven't gotten through to the Municipal League.
What's their stance on it?"

Froehlich: "They did not slip in opposition to the Bill. So, and they're pretty good..."

Reis: "Which... which..."

Froehlich: "...in my experience..."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Reis: "...which... It didn't go through committee, so how were they able to slip on the third Amendment?"

Froehlich: "This... this is... It's been through committee on both a House and a Senate Bill. The base... the crux of this Bill has been through committee. They had opportunity if they wanted to express opposition to do so and in my experience the Municipal League doesn't miss many. If they see there's a problem, their lobbyists are there to express their point of view."

Reis: "They slipped the original Bill, but have... our indications are that they're opposed to Amendment 3 and that's what we're trying to find out. We're going to be here quite awhile today. Hopefully, we can get through to them to find out if in fact their opposition is still there and if so, what it is. If not, we'll run your Bill at the end of the day. I'm sure that Speaker would be more than obliged to do this before he adjourns for the day."

Froehlich: "Representative, the Municipal League has not reached out to us to ask for any changes or to tell..."

Reis: "Representative, we've been adjourned..."

Froehlich: "...me there's a problem."

Reis: "...since Memorial Day. We are completely out of sync here. We just want a simple comment from them as where they stand on this. I don't know why that's so difficult."

Froehlich: "Even at the end of May when... when this Bill was called the Municipal League never contacted us, never asked for changes, never expressed a problem with it. So, I... I'm not convinced that further delay here is going to be productive."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Reis: "To the Bill, real quick, Mr. Speaker. I... I don't know why if you can't give him your commitment that we'll call this at the end of the day. I mean, we are so out of sync in this place. We just want a simple checkup on opposition to a Bill we haven't seen since Memorial Day. We've all been home doing our own things. We're out of sync here. You do as you wish, Representative, it's your Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens. Bellock."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Well, my concern also was not only the Illinois

Municipal League on our background saying they were
opposed, but also the DuPage Mayors and Managers
Conference. So, are they still opposed to this
legislation?"

Froehlich: "It... it... I'm not sure if it's new opposition or... or opposition to the original Bill, but they didn't... they haven't contacted me either and I... as you know I represent..."

Bellock: "Right."

Froehlich: "...part of DuPage..."

Bellock: "Right."

Froehlich: "...and I do stay in touch with DuPage mayors and managers. So, I'm not aware of it. Again, they didn't slip it if they were opposed."

Bellock: "Well, I would ask that you hold this Bill until we can find out if those two (2) major groups are still opposed to it."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Froehlich: "Well, again, my experience has been good with those groups and I haven't found them needing our help for them to express opposition when they have it and this Bill has been around now for... for some months, in one version or another. And if... if... certainly, Representative, if they had a serious problem with this Bill, we would not be wondering where their position is right now. I'm sure you'd agree with that. If this were..."

Bellock: "I'd agree with that, but I'm not sure that they know that this Bill was being called."

Froehlich: "Well, I mean, it's been on Second since the last day in May."

Bellock: "Yeah, but we thought we where coming down to discuss the Vetoes and capital. I don't... I don't know... I'm not aware if they knew this Bill was being called. I haven't heard from them and maybe you're right, but I'm just concerned."

Froehlich: "Right. Well, I mean, we are in regular Session.

So, we... you know, this... I think Bills are in order in regular Session. This is not a Special Session called by the Governor."

Bellock: "Thank you."

Froehlich: "You're welcome."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens. "Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A Parliamentary inquiry, first of all. Does this... based on which Session we're in, does this require 60 or 71?"

Speaker Madigan: "71."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- Stephens: "Thank you. Representative... Representative Froehlich

  I wonder if you'll take this Bill out of the record?"
- Froehlich: "I... I'd like to give it a try today, Representative.

  And I'm not... I'm not sure if given some of the other things
  we may be dealing with today, we'd get back to it later in
  the day."
- Stephens: "Well... well, the reason I ask is that we... we're not sure about what some of the opposition of this might be.

  Based on that and based on your response and refusal to take it out of the record, Mr. Speaker, I would request a verification should this vote get the 71 required and... and that's all I have. You got my verification request? Thank you, Sir."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Froehlich."
- Froehlich: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill has been debated on on the floor before. It's been through regular committee twice. The... the major opposition has been removed. If there is... Okay. What we're going to do, though... to give you an opportunity to check, we'll take it out of the record for an hour or so and if... if you can contact, you know, the groups that you think could be a problem, that'd be fine. So, we can address... address the issue fully. So, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask that we take it out of the record temporarily."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, take this matter out of the record. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Joint Resolution 101?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Joint Resolution 101's on the Order of Resolutions."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Holbrook."

- Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Joint Resolution 101 is an initiative for us to look at our nuclear power issues here in the State of Illinois. It passed out unanimously out of the Senate 58 to 0 and unanimously out of committee. I know of no opposition to the Bill. It's a critical issue I think we need to look at here in the State of Illinois and I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Resolution. The Chair recognizes Representative Osmond."
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution came out of the Senate with Senator Bond's sponsorship. We... Senator Bond and I share a district that has a nuclear plant that is being decommissioned and we felt very strongly that this task force would be necessary to deal with some of the questions around decommissioning, so I would ask for the support of the Members."
- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt this Resolution?' Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. They 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. On page 2 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 392. And the Chair recognizes Mr. Hannig. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 392's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3 has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig on the Amendment."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just ask that we adopt the Amendment and then debate the Bill on Third."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; those opposed say '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 the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 392, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Representative Lang was excused today, but he had asked me yesterday if I would handle this Bill on his behalf. it deals with the situation or the position of the liquor control person in a municipality. Under the normal circumstances we elect a mayor or a village president and then they act as the liquor control officer for that municipality. Under some circumstances, though, a mayor may have an interest, may own a restaurant that has a liquor license. And so Representative Lang has suggested that in those circumstances we would say that the mayor would not serve as the liquor control person. That's already the current law, but we would also say that we want to make sure that the individual who is appointed to serve in this important position is picked by people who are not in a situation where they have a conflict of interest and so he would suggest that the city council by a majority vote, would pick the liquor control person for that

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

municipality. So, that's what the Bill does. I think it makes sense that we want to have a group of individuals who don't have any perceived conflict of interest making this decision. And so, this Bill makes eminent sense to me. I hope you would agree. I'd certainly answer any questions and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Representative, when... who... is it a separate... on the liquor control commission who would then appoint them? How would that board be set up? Because right now your mayor can appoint someone to be the liquor control person. Now, what this says is they can't do that, if they have a controlling share in a..."

Hannig: "And so, as far as the liquor control officer, is that what you're saying?"

Bost: "Right."

Hannig: "So, right now, under most cases in our communities the mayor either does this himself or he appoints someone else."

Bost: "Or he appoints somebody. Right."

Hannig: "What we're saying is in those rare instances where a mayor may have an interest in a liquor license, that we'd have the city council make that appointment instead."

Bost: "Okay. It is the city conscil that's going to be..."

Hannig: "Right."

Bost: "That's... that's what I couldn't read..."

Hannig: "Yes."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Bost: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Riley."

Riley: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Just a point of clarification. So, since the mayor or village president is usually the liquor control commissioner, in the case that they, you know, had a business or something like that, would this liquor control commissioner appointed by the council be the liquor control commissioner in perpetuity or only for those cases that involve the business of the village president or maybe..."

Hannig: "Just for that term of office, Representative. So each mayor..."

Riley: "I'm sorry."

Hannig: "For the... for the... that term of office."

Riley: "Oh, I see."

Hannig: "So, in other words, the mayor... when a new mayor comes in if that mayor wishes to remain the liquor commissioner he or she would... would then do that."

Riley: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rose."

Rose: "A quick question for the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Rose: "Perhaps you covered this, but what do you define as a direct interest? I mean, would a share of... would stock ownership qualify?"

Hannig: "And so, Representative, it's... it's not really defined in the legislation and I guess it's really more of a guideline. The local communities are going to have to make

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

that decision. I would think that there would be some discussion. They'd probably ask for some recommendations from the legal staff that... that advises the mayor and the city council. But we just wanted to make sure that we, in the Legislature, try to spell out a situation so that even the perception of a conflict would be removed."

Rose: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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 81 people voting 'yes', 9 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Supermajority Constitutional Vote, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 2 of the Calendar, there appears Senate Bill 450. What is the status of that Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 450 has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 3 and 4 have been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jefferson, on Amendment #4 and Mr. Jefferson, you may wish to adopt the Amendment on Second Reading and then put the Bill on Third Reading for consideration."

Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the..."

Speaker Madigan: "All right. Let the… let the record show...
...let the record show that Amendment #3 will not be considered."

Jefferson: "No."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Speaker Madigan: "And then on Amendment #4 the Gentleman moves that the Amendment be adopted. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say '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 the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 450, a Bill for an Act concerning law enforcement. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jefferson on the Bill."

"Than... thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislature. Amendment #4 becomes the Bill. This is a gut and replacement Amendment and it adds a one dollar (\$1) surcharge to vehicle registrations fees beginning in 2010 to provide funding for the State Police Vehicle Funds. And it also sets requirements down the line that we will be doing in (sic-in-car) video cameras starting in June 1 of 2009, and also in... in June 1, 2011, we will set guidelines that of all police assigned to patrol with in (sic-in-car video) camera vehicle recording equipment capable of recording ten (10) hours or more and the cameras must be activated while the vehicle's on patrol. We have no opposition to this Bill at this point. I've talked to the other side of the aisle and they're in agreement with this. The State Police are in agreement with this and there's no known opposition. So I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in strong support of the Gentleman's legislation. This is a Bill that he and I

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

and several other Members of both sides of the aisle have worked very hard on. It's a good Bill. It does provide a funding mechanism for the Illinois State Police Squad Car Fund and I strongly encourage all of us to support Representative Jefferson with this outstanding legislation and I applaud him for his work. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunkin. "Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also, too, rise in support of this legislation. It is of great essence and great timing because when we need to enforce the great and the positive standards of our State Police this piece of legislation simply adds a great deal of value to an impressive police force here at the state level and I am very proud to support Amendment #4 on Senate Bill 450. This is something that we should have been a part of, quite frankly, a long time ago, but in due time it's here. I'm very proud of this legislation. Representative Jefferson, congratulations to you and our State Police. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, we just want to make sure we have everything straight and that everyone knows what this is.

Amendment 4 becomes the Bill."

Jefferson: "Yes."

Reis: "And there is a one dollar (\$1) fee increase to the registration each year on your plates. Is that correct?"

Jefferson: "That's correct."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Reis: "So, what's the fee now, is it seventy-eight dollars (\$78) and it'll go to seventy-nine (79)?"

Jefferson: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear that."

Reis: "So, the… your registration for your car each year will go from seventy-eight dollars (\$78) to seventy-nine dollars (\$79)."

Jefferson: "It would go up one dollar (\$1) whatever that would be. Yes."

Reis: "And that would be for every year hereafter..."

Jefferson: "Yes."

Reis: "...beginning after 2010."

Jefferson: "Absolutely."

Reis: "So, there is a one dollar (\$1) fee increase."

Jefferson: "Yes. That would go toward purchasing police vehicles."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you."

Jefferson: "Thank you."

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? Munson? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 75 people voting 'yes', 15 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Supermajority vote, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 2 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 1290. What is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1290's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1,

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

offered by Representatives Leitch, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leitch on the Amendment."

Leitch: "I would move its adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say '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 the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1290, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The substance of this Bill has already been approved by this chamber. The purpose of this Bill is to permit Peoria County to have, if they choose to do so, a front door referendum that would enable the county to expand its sales tax for facilities. Presently, counties have the power to do that transportation and for public safety. The reason that our county is so very strongly in favor of this is because one of the contemplated uses is a completion of a.m. about a hundred and thirty million dollar (\$130,000,000) riverfront project that would be featured with a fifty-one million dollar (\$51,000,000) Caterpillar training center. This is an extraordinarily important community initiative and I would like to thank the Speaker and others who were helpful in bringing this back before us and ask for your approval."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no discussion, 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? This Bill requires 71 votes. Again, the Bill requires 71 votes to pass. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 71 people voting 'yes', 18 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Supermajority vote, is hereby declared passed. On page 2 of the... For what purpose does Representative Munson seek recognition?"
- Munson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to table House Bill 5585."
- Speaker Madigan: "Are you the principal Sponsor? You've all heard the Lady's Motion. Is there leave? Leave is granted. The Bill is tabled. On page 2 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 1460. Mr. Hannig. And Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill? 1460."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1460 has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #2 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, who is the sponsor of the Amendment?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #2 is sponsored by Representative Turner."
- Speaker Madigan: "And Mr. Hannig... Mr. Hannig, did you plan to handle this Amendment for Mr. Turner?"

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members... Members of the House. I'd ask that we adopt the Amendment and then... and then debate the Bill on Third."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig, we're going to take this Bill out of the record. House Bill 5701. Mr. Schmitz."
- Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. The cau... Republicans request a caucus immediately in Room 118."

Speaker Madigan: "How long do you think you'll be?"

Schmitz: "At least an hour."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay. All right. So, the Republicans shall go to caucus. We expect a return of about 11."

Schmitz: "11."

Speaker Madigan: "Yep. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, put in the record House Bill 5701.

And Mr... Mr. Clerk, is there a Motion 3? Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Motion #3, an override line item Veto."

- Speaker Madigan: "All right. And the Sponsor of this Motion is Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

  I would ask that there be leave so we could suspend the applicable House Rules and consider the relevant line items in this budget, this override line, in one Roll Call vote."
- Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Gentleman's Motion. The Chair recognizes Mr. Cross."
- Cross: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, but we're a little unsure on this side of the aisle what you're... what he's actually trying to do."
- Speaker Madigan: "Right. And if you go to page 22 of the Calendar, and it's somewhat at the top of the page, it

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

reads House Bill 5701, Motion #3 then there would be five (5) items on pages 79, 122, 200, 200, 213 that would be contained in this Motion 3. And so, Mr. Hannig, I believe that your request would be for leave to consider on your Motion those five (5) items at one time."

Hannig: "That's correct, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "That's..."

Hannig: "And, so..."

Speaker Madigan: "...that's..."

Hannig: "That's... that's exactly what the request is."

Speaker Madigan: "That's the Gentleman's request."

Hannig: "So, we would ask that we could combine those five (5) as shown on page 22 into one Roll Call vote."

Cross: "But the other thirty-three (33) Motion... everything else would continue or move forward in the same way."

Hannig: "Well, I think, Representative, if you started on page 21 of the Calendar, the Clerk has outlined how the Motions that we filed line up with the actual pages and lines. So, for example, on the first Motion, you have... you have six (6) different pages and number of lines."

Cross: "No. Gary, I think we're okay on this one."

Hannig: "Okay."

Cross: "I just wanted to make sure the rest of them are going to move in order."

Hannig: "Yeah. Okay. And this is #3."

Cross: "What are you doing about... as long as we're here, what are you doing about 1 and 2?"

Hannig: "Well, I think we'll come back to those..."

Cross: "Is there..."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Hannig: "...and we'll make the same Motions."

Cross: "Is there going to be an order to this today, Gary, or maybe we can note… establish that now of how you intend to move forward."

Hannig: "We... I ... "

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross, maybe I can answer your question.

My plan is to go on a request basis. So, if there's a request, as Mr. Hannig is making a request now for a Motion, that's how we'll proceed."

Cross: "So, of the thirty-three (33) filed it's possible, I'm not holding you to it, that we may not get to all thirty-three (33) of them."

Speaker Madigan: "That's correct."

Cross: "Can I a... One other inquiry of the Chair. Is there a Bill out there that we haven't seen or that anyone intends to file with respect to revenue such as a funds sweep Bill today?"

Speaker Madigan: "The answer is no."

Cross: "Okay. All right. So, with respect to this Motion we're o... or with his request, we're okay with that on this particular issue."

Speaker Madigan: "Again. Back to the request of Mr. Hannig for leave to consider these five (5) items as part of Motion 3.

Leave is granted. Mr. Hannig. Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. On... Let me just first say that when we adopted the budget plan in May, I think that many of us were comfortable with the spending level that we passed and was adopted by the Senate, as well. And clearly, the fact is

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

that it was a relatively close vote in the House of Representatives and I think that demonstrated that probably had done our best to try to reduce the spending levels as far as we thought we could and still pass a Bill. And so that balancing act, which is oftentimes very difficult in this chamber and particularly when you work with the Senate, was... was one that we had to fine-tune to a large degree in order to pass a budget and... and get to the Now, we were comfortable with those spending levels, but we always understood that if the Governor was not that the framers of the Constitution had given him a Veto pen to allow him to make some reductions. We also know that he had other options. He simply could have reserved a certain amount of money or he could have worked within the lapse period spending to ensure that moneys were not spent in areas that he thought were not essential. could have made across the board kind of reductions with his Veto pen as well, but he made some choices that I think many of us would say simply were too far... went too far and were too deep. And so today for example, in this Motion #3, he reduced three hundred and fif... two hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000) from the Department Corrections for the chaplain services lump sum line item or he reduced two million dollars (\$2,000,000) from the Oak Park Hospital of Cook County. He reduced a twenty-seven million, five hundred thousand (27,500,000) for a fifty cent (\$.50) an hour wage increase for the DD and mental health direct care workers. He didn't cut it to thirty cents (\$.30) an hour or twenty-five cents (\$.25) an hour or

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

even a dime (\$.10), he simply said it's all gone. reduced front-line spending by eight and a half million dollars (\$8,500,000). Again, we know for example, for those of us who represent areas where we have facilities, whether it's the Department of Corrections or... or anywhere else we know that these staffs are short staffed. that in the Department of Corrections that people are being told that they have to participate in overtime, mandatory. They understand that, but they also understand that if we would hire some additional staff, not only would it save money, but it would make the facilities a safer place to work and it would give the administration of the facility the flexibility to work with the employees in a way that made more sense. So, it seems to me, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that in these cases... that in this case on Amendment #3 in particular, that the Governor simply went too far. That the Governor had other options available that could of made him comfortable with this spending level, but he simply decided to balance the budget in his mind by taking it out on the workers of the State of Illinois. And I think that's not what we, in this House, have ever stood for and so I would ask for your 'yes' vote to override the Governor's Veto."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative Hannig, I think you reviewed the fact that some of the line items that were reduced were reduced

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

below the funding level that they... they were funded at in '08. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "I'm advised that... that's correct."

Eddy: "So, in the... in the Corrections line item for chaplain services, the two hundred and fifty thousand dollar (\$250,000) amount was funded in the FY08 budget at two hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000)?"

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "And the Governor chose to eliminate that line completely. He reduced that servi... that... that entire line over '08."

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "But some of the reductions were reductions to new items, new spending. An example of that would be the... the fifty cent (\$.50) per hour wage increase for private DD and MH providers. That is new... that is new spending."

Hannig: "It's..."

Eddy: "Above FY08."

Hannig: "That's correct, Representative, for people who are there, but it's new spending... it's raises."

Eddy: "It's an increase in the line item from '08 and the... the other, the grant to Oak Forest Hospital, is that a new item?"

Hannig: "I'm advised it was in last year's budget at two
million dollars (\$2,000,000), as well."

Eddy: "Okay. So, that's a flat... that's a flat budget number that was... you're reinstating?"

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Hannig: "It was two million (2,000,000) last year in 08. In the '09 budget, we put it in at two million (2,000,000) and the Governor would say take it out."

Eddy: "Was it paid last year?"

Hannig: "I had not heard that it was, Representative. Now we're still in I think in the lapsed period. So..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Hannig: "...if there were services or there was an effort to do so I think..."

Eddy: "So, what I'm trying to determine is whether or not it's...
it's part of the deficit that can be attributed to the FY08
budget that was funded or wasn't funded and the money was
actually paid or not."

Hannig: "So..."

Eddy: "Was this an add-on last year?"

Hannig: "I know that last year it was appropriated and it was part of the final budget and it... and it survived the Governor's Vetoes last year. Apparently, so..."

Eddy: "Okay. But you're not... you don't know if it was actually paid. Juvenile Justice... the line item for Juvenile Justice, does that represent a flat line item for front-line staff at last year's amount?"

Hannig: "I'm advised that it was in last year's budget."

Eddy: "So, that's a flat amount. The only... the only other one that is of... the front-line staff at Department of Corrections is an increase of about 8.5 million dollars (\$8,500,000). That would be over the FY08 budget amount, but was specifically designed to increase front-line staff and added to this year's budget."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Hannig: "It was clearly included to try to increase front-line staff, Representative."

Eddy: "New spending over FY08, though."

Hannig: "It would be for new employees. That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Cross: "Representative, I want to just kind of establish some or ask some questions kind of for the purpose of the whole day and try to avoid them further. There are thirty-three (33) Motions that have been filed to override the budget cuts."

Hannig: "That's correct."

Cross: "If my numbers are correct, the Governor vetoed about a billion four (1,400,000,000) and yet... not and yet and these overrides total a billion three two three (1,323,000,000). Is that... do you disagree with those numbers?"

Hannig: "I don't know that we have a rack up, Representative, of... of what the proposed numbers are. I do know that some of the Vetoes were in the Senate Bills."

Cross: "No it will...

Hannig: "And I do know that we did not file for every last item that the Governor vetoed."

Cross: "I guess in general terms, I think your staff has agreed with ours that, generally speaking, the Governor's in an area of a billion four (1,400,000,000) and generally speaking, you guys are in the area of one two five

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

(1,250,000,000) to one three (1,300,000,000). Would you agree with that?"

Hannig: "Our staff's going to try to look for rack up."

Cross: "Let's, you know, it's kind of important, I mean..."

Hannig: "I'm... I'm not disputing what you're saying,

Representative..."

Cross: "Yeah."

Hannig: "I don't know. We're looking."

Cross: "I guess I'm... Let's assume for the sake of this discussion, until you tell me otherwise, that's accurate. There aren't, as I understand, any additional revenues either in this exercise of Motions to override, which there wouldn't be, nor will there be any more later today. How do we... I guess you're not talk... You're agreeing with that number?"

I think that what I'm Hannig: "No. advised now, Representative, we were trying to answer your question, is that all of the GRF that was... that is proposed to be restored would be about 1.2 billion dollars (\$1,200,000,000) and I think what I tried to say in my opening was that we think that the Governor has cut unevenly and unfairly in many cases and we would feel more comfortable, as we have said, if we would work for reserves across the board. Now, that would be an approach that I think would be more fair to work with as opposed to the way the Governor did it. Now he has his right to do that and that's why we're here debating the Bills today."

Cross: "I... I guess I'm struggling with... and, you know, I...

Let's make it... some things very clear. Everybody on this

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

side of the aisle is struggling with and has an appreciation for a lot of the areas we're going to talk about today: substance abuse, DD, autism, state workers, people that work at prisons. And... and people in this caucus have been champions in so many of those areas of taking care of the people that need us the most, but what I'm struggling with, Gary, is that you passed a budget that you guys created that was out of balance. You readily admitted it was two billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000) out of balance and challenged the Governor to cut. The Governor cut and now we are basically restoring all of those cuts. Why? Without any new revenue."

Hannig: "Representative, we... we passed a budget and we felt comfortable with it. It was... as I said, it was a close call in passing a budget in this chamber."

Cross: "But was out of balance."

Hannig: "We felt that it could be managed through the lapse period spending, that it could be managed through reserves that were across the board that were done fairly. We thought it was a manageable budget. Now, the Governor has the right to veto, if he so chooses and he has so chosen. Now, we also have the right to debate whether or not we think those specific Vetoes make sense or not and whether they should be restored. And I'm simply arguing that we think the Governor acted unfairly, that he cut too deep in certain places, that certain things were left in the budget for reasons we don't understand, but in any case..."

Cross: "Yeah. He... And... and there may be people here that... providers that are potentially being hurt and we agree that

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

there's some cuts that were too deep and we don't want people in the state to get hurt. But wouldn't we have avoided all of this if you had passed a balanced budget and not sent an unbalanced budget to the Governor? I mean, I... I don't think there's any dispute, you guys have all agreed it was unbalanced..."

Hannig: "I don't think that we've agreed that it's..."

Cross: "...by up to two billion (2,000,000,000) and we would say higher."

Hannig: "I don't think that we've agreed that it's unbalanced. We simply think that the Governor needs to manage it. Now, if we had an opportunity to work with the Governor on the budget perhaps it'd have come out different, but it was what we put together with the Senate. It was a compromise in this House and in that House. And we know that when Governors are at the table that they have a number of items that they typically will give up in a negotiation. Things that they've put in the budget that perhaps aren't their highest priority, but we didn't have that opportunity for the Governor to give up any items. He simply wasn't there and so we had to assume that everything he put in the budget was something that he wished, but we know that there's an opportunity for him to work through his lapse period spending to make his budget work. So we increased the lapse period to make it work."

Cross: "Again, if there had been either a balanced budget passed or communication between the Governor's Office, the Speaker's Office, and the President's Office and passed a balanced budget, in all likelihood we wouldn't be here

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

today. And in all likelihood, those that rely most on state services wouldn't be confused, wouldn't potentially be hurt, wouldn't be saying, am I going to get my money because I'm told the Senate's not going to come back in. And the reality is your... your inability to work together is causing harm to the people of the State of Illinois and we see it today. And you can't... we haven't gotten an answer on what we can do to say to people in the State of Illinois these cuts are going to be restored and we can assure you that life will be okay for the people that you serve."

Hannig: "My only response, Representative, is that we're elected to pass a budget. The Governor has an opportunity to use his Veto pen, which he did. We now have an obligation to act whether we think that these items should be restored. Not everyone will agree that they should be or shouldn't be, but that's why we'll have a debate and that's why we'll vote on the Bills."

Cross: "Well, let's... let's just put aside the people that are going to get hurt, because of what you've done. How do you intellectually, just for the sake of this discussion, argue that we sent an unbalanced budget to the Governor we dared him to cut it, he cut it. Now, we're restoring all those cuts. And how do you say to a taxpayer, we are now putting that unbalanced budget back in the position it was before the cuts?"

Hannig: "We say that we sent to the Governor a budget that he could manage, that made sense, that was in balance. He had an opportunity to sign it. He had an opportunity to create reserves. He had an opportunity to make across the board

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

cuts. He chose to do what he chose to do. Now, we have the obligation to take up debate on those reductions. And so I would argue, Representative, that we have an obligation to vote on these Bills and Members are free to vote accordingly. But in my view, we tried to pick those items that we thought that relatively... that respected Members of this chamber though were unfair."

Cross: "Have you done anything today in any of your actions at all today to repeal the 3.8 percent pay raise that was in your unbalanced budget?"

Hannig: "Representative, I think that was a statutory change that occurred..."

Cross: "Funded in this..."

Hannig: "...that was a cost-of-living... that was a cost-of-living adjustment."

Cross: "Funded in your budget. Correct?"

Hannig: "I think the law would require us to fund this just as we would be funding the AFSCME contract once it's finalized."

Cross: "Okay. Not everything that people wanted was funded, but yet the pay raise was refun... funded. My question is..."

Hannig: "I think we funded what was statutorily required."

Cross: "Well, that's not been the case in the past. We haven't always funded that. Isn't that correct?"

Hannig: "That may be correct, Representative."

Cross: "Okay. I guess my question was, there are agencies out there that need money, do you in your moves today and Motions or did you contemplate taking that pay raise money and use it to help perhaps that DASA or anybody in the

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

autism world? Did you say maybe this year we won't fund the COLAs or the pay increases and we'll take care of those people that need it more than we do."

Hannig: "Well, first of all, it's my understanding, Representative, that... that the... that first of all that the pay raise is still an open question."

Cross: "I'm talking about..."

Hannig: "And certainly was not..."

Cross: "...the 3.8 percent pay raise. It's in the budget. Funded in this budget."

Hannig: "It's a cost-of-living adjustment. The same thing that like our state employees get and that's in a Bill that was... that's in the Senate. So..."

Cross: "Well, no, let's stay on the 3.8. That's a... call it what you want. You can call it a COLA, you can call it a pay raise."

Hannig: "It's a cost-of-living adjustment."

Cross: "Okay. Bottom line is Members of the General Assembly will see their paychecks increase by 3.8 percent.

Correct?"

Hannig: "And I think most state employees will. So, in that case, we're the same as all state employees. Most every state employee sees a cost-of-living adjustment."

Cross: "You would not argue with me or disagree that if we hadn't funded that we wouldn't have been breaking the law and we could have used that money to fund some agency that needed it more than us."

Hannig: "Well, Representative, we felt that it's important to simply follow the law and we did not fund the pay increase

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

that was recommended by the Compensation Review Board because that wasn't final and that's not the law."

Cross: "You were you're..."

Hannig: "And so we made it... we made that a distinction."

Cross: "We're talking about two (2) different issues, Gary, and you know that."

Hannig: "That's correct. Two (2) different issues."

Cross: "And who knows what's going to happen over in the Senate."

Hannig: "One of them is pending and one of them's the law."

Cross: "I... who..."

Hannig: "One of them's pending and one of them is already statute."

Cross: "But did not need to be funded and my... And so, the bottom line is you've done nothing today to repeal that million and a half dollars (\$1,500,000) used for legislative pay raises. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "The... the legislative pay raise is in a Bill that was in the Senate."

Cross: "Okay. Well..."

Hannig: "That's in the Senate."

Cross: "All right."

Hannig: "So it's not part of this discussion..."

Cross: "You've..."

Hannig: "...on this Bill."

Cross: "...you've done nothing to repeal the 3.8 percent cost-of-living increase that every Legislator's going to get. Is that correct?"

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Hannig: "Representative, there's... there's not a mechanism in this Veto that we... that we can do that with. Now, you could file a Bill or I could file a Bill to do that. That would be the mechanism I think and I suspect..."

Cross: "I don't have any other questions."

Hannig: "...that someone has filed them."

Cross: "Well, my only point and... my only point, Gary, is we all talk about drastic cuts and we're talking about how the Governor acted irresponsibly and you know what, heaven forbid, was that a shock to anybody? I mean, you guys say let's send a budget to this guy who we don't like, who we don't trust, who does things that we don't like and he makes these dramatic cuts. Were you really expecting anything different?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative..."

Cross: "And so... and so my only point is, you have an opportunity to take a million and a half dollars (\$1,500,000) and help somebody somewhere in this state and you chose to take care of yourselves first and that's I think that's a mistake. I have no other question."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't intend to speak on every one of the Motions. I know that we're going to be here for a long time and people want to go home. I'd just like to make a couple real brief statements to follow up on the previous speaker and some of the comments of Representative Hannig. First of all, I guess the concern here is the reinstatement of about, by my calculations, there are about 1.25 billion

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

dollars (\$1,250,000,000) that were vetoed from House Bills... from these House Bills and they were... that was done not because the Governor wanted to do it, but the Governor was required under the Constitution to have a balanced budget. We could have helped and avoided these cuts. How could we We could have provided a capital Bill that would hundred provided over six million dollars have (\$600,000,000) to close this budget gap. We could have... we could have passed the Bill that came from the Senate over five hundred and twenty-five million dollars (\$525,000,000) in funds sweeps that would have closed this budget gap. We could have passed a pension obligation bond that came from All those Bills have passed overwhelmingly the Senate. from the Senate are sitting here. These cuts, these reductions could have been avoided if we would have acted. And we could have acted and provided over seven hundred thousand (700,000) jobs throughout the State of Illinois. So, why are we here dealing with this today? We're dealing with it today because we're not willing to make the tough decision on the revenues. We're not willing to create jobs and economic development because of some political games, because of finger pointing, because we sit in meetings and when the Majority Leader says it is the Governor's prerogative and responsibility to take his red pen and make these cuts, he did it. Now, what is all... what are all these Motions adding up to? Of the 1.25 billion dollars (\$1,250,000,000) in reductions on the House Bills started in the House, we have Motions to override 1.22 billion dollars (\$1,220,000,000) and how are we going to

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

pay for it? How are we going to pay for it? We won't pass a capital Bill. We won't provide jobs to close this budget gap. We won't provide fund sweeps. There's not going to be any revenues called. We're just going to continue the charade and continue the charade of saying this is a balanced budget. It isn't. These actions, we don't want to take. We don't want to make these cuts, but we're being forced to do it because of the inaction on this side of the aisle to provide jobs, economic development, and a fund sweeps Bill that will provide some of the revenues to balance this budget. So I'm going to be voting 'no' on all of these simply because we can do it a better way. We can provide jobs. We can provide other revenues. provide a fund sweep. We can come back then, pass supplementals and put this back in the budget. So, having said that, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak and I'll be voting 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mulligan. Mulligan, you're up."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, it's my understanding that we're passing no revenue today."

Hannig: "I'm sorry, what was..."

Mulligan: "It's my understanding that you've stated that we're pa... or the Speaker that we're not passing any revenue today."

Hannig: "Representative, I think we're... we're dealing with just on this Motion, we're just dealing with the Vetoes. So, I'm..."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Mulligan: "Well, I certainly understand that but if you overspend and it doesn't take much to figure out that, you know, at some point come November or December, it's going to collapse into itself if you overspend and the agencies that I deal with are not foolish. I mean, they come to me and say gee, if I get a contract this year what's going to happen by the middle of the year when the state doesn't have the money? Even though they want these things, they're not so foolish as to know that it's not doable under the certain climate. And so when we were discussing this last week the discussion was that we were going to do fund sweeps and designate it to say Human Services. Tribune and The Daily Herald both asked me if I believed the Speaker was going to try and pass an income tax increase after the election and I basically said you'll have to ask the Speaker, I don't know. But I know there's not enough money. So, you're asking us to but money back in to a budget that was bloated to begin with without a discussion of any additional revenue. You know, normally, and when you did the budget to begin with at the end of May, I asked you that. And normally, the Leaders get together and the Leaders which it... I'm sure it hasn't been normal and Lord knows, I've certainly criticized the Governor a lot. Normally, the Leaders get together and figure out we have 'x' amount of money to spend for the coming year and then we'll spend some of it this way and then they throw it back to some of the Members that work on the budget and say okay, figure out how you're going to fit that all in and that has not happened. It didn't happen

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

last year and it didn't happen this year. So, this year particularly, where we weren't even asked, you know, if we had an opportunity how would we divide it up. We have no real template this year of 'x' number of dollars, let's divide it up and now you're out there saying let's do overrides on not enough money to begin with. And in some of these instances we certainly agree. A lot of us have worked on some of these issues for a long time and that we're very sympathetic to the people that you everybody and their brother money to, but the bottom line is what happens, and it's certainly time for after the election, what happens come the beginning of the year when we've run out of money? Do you just suddenly tell agencies their contracts are canceled or we're not going to pay you? Or you have no way of saying... say you give the ... the fifty cent (\$.50) raise, is it going to start in January? have no way of doing that, the Governor might but you Say hey, the agency will start it in January or they'll start it on March which may reduce the amount of money but that isn't the way it's presented. So, what you're doing is you're giving us... information that is flawed on a system that has gotten more and more dysfunctional and flawed as we go along with no hope of having any additional money. I mean... So, you're saying to me, I don't know, just vote for it. Well, that's not a good way of doing it and Representative, I know you better. I know you know it's not a good way of doing it. worked with you for a number of years and it's very disappointing to ask you that question and to get back an

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

answer that bases decisions that everybody here is being made to ask on really bad information. So, if you're not going to tell us if there's any additional revenue, it's like a shot in the dark."

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think we've made it clear that we would be willing to negotiate with your side of the aisle and with the other caucuses and the Governor on some fund sweeps. Now, the Governor sent us a Bill that basically said well, he would take five hundred and thirty million (530,000,000), wherever he wanted, whenever he wanted from whatever fund, even if it was under Jesse White or under someone else and we didn't think that was the way to go, but we've voted for fund sweeps. I've stood here and sponsored them and been criticized for fund sweeps. So, we're certainly willing to work with that. I sponsored the pension obligation Bill. I took it to committee. It got one vote. My vote. So, it didn't do so good."

Mulligan: "So, you threw yourself on the sword, I mean you know, that's your problem not mine."

Hannig: "Well, I'm just saying that..."

Mulligan: "Quite frankly, you know, the fund sweep when it was..."

Hannig: "The funds sweeps only something we're..."

Mulligan: "...brought up to me all I said was I am not going to sit there and make that decision. Give us a list. We asked for a list last week. I asked for a list at the beginning of the week. We never got a list. There was no discussion because there was no discussion out there. It was kind of an abstract discussion. Okay, you go make

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

these bad decisions so we can blame the bad budget decisions that we made in May on you, too. And I don't fell like having that happen."

Hannig: "Well, Representative..."

Mulligan: "I feel like wanting to know what am I going to tell the Human Service agencies? What am I going to tell AFSCME? What am I going to tell the people when the money runs out? I certainly... Tell me when you have had... you've introduced a substantive supplemental that will pick up the amount of money that there's a shortfall on in the last number of years. Certainly we didn't get one for the FY08 and we were off somewhere between five hundred million (500,000,000) and seven fifty (750,000,000) but we never saw a supplemental to pick that up, nor probably was there any money to cover it if we'd had the supplemental."

Hannig: "Well, but I think you raise a good question. It was alleged that there was a seven hundred and fifty million dollar (\$750,000,000) deficit in '08 in the Governor's budget book and the Senate said well we can fix that with a five hundred and thirty million dollar (\$530,000,000) fund sweep. Oh, and we'll do some health care and we'll do some projects and people said that'll work, but I think the point is that we've come to the end of the fiscal year, we didn't do a supplemental appropriation and so maybe a lot of that rhetoric that we heard about how much we were out of balance last year was simply that, rhetoric. And I think a lot of the rhetoric that we're hearing this year about two billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000) or some amount of money is rhetoric and we're certainly prepared to sit

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

down with the Governor and the caucuses and do fund sweeps. We're certainly prepared to listen to the Governor or anybody else who has ideas on revenue that we think make sense, but we've had debates on the capital Bill. We've had debates on pension obligations and I think we know what the result was."

Mulligan: "All right. So, you have no revenue. The Senate has not scheduled themselves to come back."

Hannig: "Representative, we would do fund sweeps. Okay. Let...

let me just say, we would do fund sweeps. So, if you want
to..."

Mulligan: "So, have you..."

Hannig: "...if you want to..."

Mulligan: "...given our staff a list of the funds that you think you would sweep?"

Hannig: "Yeah. So, Representative, we're only... we're only talking about this whole Veto, you know, you talk in terms of a billion (1,000,000,000). But it's, you know, less than 5 percent of the budget. So, it's a small amount that we can work with the Governor on and work with you on if there's a willingness of all parties to do that. Part of the reason we're here is there's simply not a willingness."

Mulligan: "I'm laughing because your staff is telling me how insignificant this is but I've worked with him before and I know that that's not necessarily the case. The problem is you haven't presented that. You've given us a big bunch of Bills and I'm not going to ask you these questions again because I don't want to spend the day. I'm going to ask them this one time. You've given us all this whole

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

composite of things that you'd like us to override so people can pick and choose what's your favorite agency. How are we going to do this? Then what you've done is you've thrown all the money in here, what you... what your idea of negotiating a budget this year was to ask everybody what they wanted and throw it all in and now what we have is we have to make decisions and have no money to begin with. The Senate's not coming back. What's the object of this? Campaign mail pieces? Get your people..."

Hannig: "Well, Representative..."

Mulligan: "...to like you the best..."

Hannig: "...we're... we're simply..."

Mulligan: "...or what's the deal?"

Hannig: "...trying to fulfill the obligation... the obligation that we have as Legislators. The Governor cast Vetoes. He started the clock and so this is the time that we have to decide whether we accept or we don't accept the Governor's Vetoes. We normally do this in November, but the Governor chose to have it done now, so we're here."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan, could you bring your remarks to a close?"

Mulligan: "Most certainly."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you."

Mulligan: "I think this is an exercise in futility just as the way you passed the budget was. It's really a shame, because we used to work fairly well together and we used to come together on some issues. This has been a fiasco for the last six (6) years and I don't think you're helping it any. It used to be that we'd get at least some cooperation

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

from you, but I think now you've joined the melee of dysfunctional and I really feel bad about that because it's the people we represent and these agencies that have a problem and the fact of the matter is what happens after some of this stuff passes and we hit November and December? It's going to be a real problem."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, just one question. Back in May, just to refresh everyone's memories, we voted on about twenty-eight (28) Bills one afternoon. One set of Bills was a flat 2009 budget that was the same as 2008. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "That's correct. There was one that was basically a flat budget."

Reis: "So, that didn't include any moneys for chaplain services, grants to Oak Park Forest, additional front-line staff, a fifty per... fifty cent (\$.50) increase, it didn't include any of that in those flat lines."

Hannig: "It included some of those, Representative. I'm advised that the chaplain services and I believe that the Oak Forest hospital were... were in that, because they were in the '08 budget."

Reis: "Okay. But the fifty cent (\$.50) an hour increase for the DD and MH workers... providers was not in that..."

Hannig: "It was not in..."

Reis: "...that budget."

Hannig: "That's correct. It was... it was not in the flat budget that was passed in the House and remains in the Senate."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- Reis: "So, if I remember right, everyone on your side of the aisle voted for a budget that did not increase that level.

  That could have been taken up in the Senate and the Governor could have signed that Bill. Correct?"
- Hannig: "It certainly could've been possible, Representative, yes."
- Reis: "So, you would've been on record not supporting that fifty cent (\$.50) an hour increase."
- Hannig: "We... we tried to send the Senate some options."
- Reis: "But you voted that... To answer my question, you would've been in support of a budget that did not increase that hourly wage by fifty... fifty cents (\$.50) an hour. Right?"
- Hannig: "We were in... we were in a position where we were willing to tell the Senate that we would go with a high budget or we would go with a low budget and give them some options so that we could conclude our business, Representative. In the end, we did a compromise with the Senate and it did include this and I think most Members were happy that it did."
- Reis: "Well, to the Bill. I think everyone knows what's going on here. We can wrap this all up and package it up any way you want to. We can come back and say you voted for a budget that did not increase these hourly wages by fifty cents (\$.50). You can come back and say, we're not voting to override the Governor's Veto which isn't going to get taken up in the Senate anywhere. Just wanted to get that on record that... that that side of the aisle did vote for a flat line 2008 budget and that line of theory is going to go through many of today's override Votes. You're on

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

record for supporting a budget that didn't increase any of these amounts anyway. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If we could, we'd like to have Representative Rich Brauer added to the excused list, please."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. Mr. Franks."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Motion. listening to the debate and it prompted me to speak on this. We have to remember that the Senate was given twenty-nine (29) appropriation Bills, but they chose to send us a much larger budget, some would call it the Christmas tree budget. With a shaky funding mechanism where if one part failed the whole thing would fail. really caused... was designed to fail, if you look at it objectively. Now, the Senate won't come back Springfield for a simple reason. They want their pay raises and which is more important to them than doing the peoples' work. There's... there's talk about a fund sweep which I don't support but I think there's support, here on the House Floor that could bring three hundred million dollars (\$300,000,000) to the state which would pretty much fill up all the cuts to the Human Service agencies and bring them up to last years level. So, for the Senate not come back I think they're really shirking their responsibility. I agreed with the Governor and voted against the Senate version of the budget because like many of you, you thought it was unbalanced and it was. However, I disagree with the Governor's cuts and that's why I'm

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

going to vote to override them, because I believe the Governor failed to make the tough decisions on these Bills. For an example, he cut his office less than 3 percent. we all know, he moves a lot of his expenses over to other agencies. However, he cut the Attorney General's budget by about 25 percent and the Attorney General... that office provides significant revenue to the state. These cuts aren't fair. They aren't based on anything other than politics. It's the politics of fear and it's the politics of division and if you look at ways where we could've cut the budget instead of taking out fifty cents (\$.50) an hour wage increase for those people who need it the most. if you break down a fifty (50) hour wage increase... if people work fifty (50) hours... I mean fifty (50) weeks a year at forty (40) hours a week that's a thousand dollars (\$1,000) a worker, which is less than the increase that the Members of the General Assembly are going to get by three (3) times. To put it in proper perspective, I think it's mean spirited. I think it's done only to cause problems to cut something like this out of the budget instead of honoring the people on the front lines it's a slap in their face. You know, did the Governor take a cut in his private jet? Did he cut in the budget the... the money for the new leather for the chairs on his private jet? Did he say hold off on the pension increase for his cronies he brings over and gives them a thirty-eight thousand dollar (\$38,000) a year pension increase? Did he cut out the eighty thousand dollar (\$80,000) a year drivers that his agency directors are receiving? Did he cut from the budget the forty-one

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

million dollar (\$41,000,000) slush fund that he uses like his own private piggy bank? Did he try to combine the seventeen (1700) hundred state programs that we have so we can understand what all of them do? We don't even know who runs them and how much they spend. Did he think that possibly the state agencies shouldn't be buying their own computers and all having their own computer software and hardware and perhaps they should be able to speak to each other and buy one for the entire state and save millions of dollars that way. He didn't make any of those choices. He didn't do any of those cuts. He went after the people who needed it most. We have a duty to override these Vetoes and have them go back and veto what ought a be vetoed and not the people who are on the front lines providing the services that our citizens so desperately need. though I voted against the Senate Christmas tree Bill, I'm voting for the overrides as should you. Tell the Governor to do his job. Take the politics out of it and let's get back to work."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig to close."

Hannig: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. We made some tough choices when we put the budget together in May. We met with the Senate Democrats who had some views that were different than ours from time to time and we reached some compromise and not everybody liked it. Not even everybody in the Democratic Caucus here in the House liked what we had done and there were a lot of people who thought that the spending level we had passed was too low. But in the end we felt that the compromise we had reached

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

with the Senate and the opportunity that it allowed us to conclude our work on time was worth the effort to send a Bill to the Governor... to send a budget to the Governor. A budget that we felt made sense, that had appropriate spending levels and that he could manage and we also recommended him... to him afterwords when he discussed that he had some discomfort with some of the spending levels that we'd be willing to work with him in trying to establish some of these reserves. That we would be willing to work with him for some fund sweeps. If we were willing to identify this funds... if we were willing to identify the amount. We've done that in the past and we certainly could have in the future, but I think what the Governor did particularly here where he takes items like the chaplain services lump sum, something that's been in the budget for a number of years, something that tries to help people who are incarcerated and who are on the wrong track, who perhaps want to turn their life around. Maybe they've found God and they need someone to help them. Why would we... why would we veto, in its entirety, that small amount of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000)? How significant can that be in the overall budget? But how significant might it be to one or two (2) individuals if they can turn their life around? And what about the fifty cents (\$.50) an hour wage increase for DD and MH providers? Does anybody in this House think that they're not worth it? That they shouldn't receive that money. That the work that they do doesn't make any... doesn't have any value and isn't worth a raise? Front-line staff, is there anybody in this

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

House who hasn't heard from people who work in state facilities that hasn't told us about the overcrowding, the understaffing, and the difficulties that they face, the mandatory overtime, the unsafe conditions? These are things that I think we owe our state employees and we owe the people of the State of Illinois. We're willing to work with the Governor. We're willing to work with the other side of the aisle, but it has to be a two-way street. But at this time the only choices that we have is that we either vote to override or we vote to sustain the Governor. And I think that in these cases we've made the case that it's important enough that we should override the Governor on this Bill and on this Motion. And I would ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Stephens rec... seek recognition?"

Stephens: "Well, first of all, Mr. Mapes has a screw loose.

It's in my desk and I..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens, Mr. Hannig closed on this Motion. And so my question to you was, for what purpose do you arise?"

Stephens: "Just to report the loose screw."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay. Thank you. So, Mr... Mr. Hannig has filed his Motion and the question is, 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion pass, notwithstanding the item Vetoes of the Governor?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Cultra. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

64 'ayes' and 26 'noes' and the Motion fails. Mr. Hannig, on Motion #4."

Hannig: "Could I ask the Chair, do I need to suspend the rules on each..."

Speaker Madigan: "Yes."

Hannig: "...of these?"

Speaker Madigan: "Yes."

Hannig: "Okay. So, then again, if you would turn to page 22 of the Calendar, you'll see where the Clerk has lined out the pages and the lines that I would ask that we consider together on this Motion."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Gentleman's request. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Motion deals primarily with personal services. It's personal services at the de... at the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity. It's personal service reductions at the state prisons and our Department of Corrections. It's personal services reductions at the State Board of Education, Healthcare and Family Services, the Department of Human Services, and the Department of Juvenile Justice. And again, I think it's clear that... for those employees who work in these facilities, they reported to us many times that the State of Illinois could save money by simply hiring more staff and reducing overtime. And it seems to me that this is one of those Motions that actually would make sense to hire more people, because in the end we would save on the overtime and we probably would save in some of the difficulties the cost will incur with workers'

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

compensation injuries and even disability. So, I think that this is something that's long overdue. We need to begin to move forward in this area. And I would ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy. Eddy. Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative Hannig, my questions are pretty much the same as with the last version. Is it fair to say that of the total number of items, some of the items represent reductions from the FY08 budgeted line and some of them are new spending that was reduced out?"

Hannig: "Yeah. That's correct."

Eddy: "So, can you make the statement that the reduction in personal services, those line items that are reductions to personal services were... were reduced back to the FY08 line item? Is there... is that a consistent statement or is this all over the board?"

Hannig: "I'm advised that some of these now, if the Governor's Veto stands, would... would go below '08."

Eddy: "I'm sorry, would go to..."

Hannig: "I was advised that... that some of these reductions, if the Governor's Veto stands, would take the personal service lines below '08."

Eddy: "And is the reinstatement amount meant to sustain the FY08 level or would it provide an increase in these line items? You know, are we increasing those total line items over the FY08 budget?"

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Hannig: "I'm advised that it's a combination, Representative.

That some would restore to '08, but others would actually go higher."

Eddy: "All right. So, specifically..."

Hannig: "But you know... that we don't have a choice to just say we want to go back to the '08 level and stop there. I mean our choice on this Motion is either vote to override or you vote to sustain."

Eddy: "I understand."

Hannig: "We can't file a Motion to restore some of the money."

Eddy: "Okay. So, I'm going to be specific to one facility because it's in my district. When... when I go to the Lawrenceville... personal service for Lawrenceville Correctional Facility, the original amount in the budget was twenty-four million, six hundred thousand dollars (\$24,600,000). The Governor vetoed five hundred and five thousand dollars (\$505,000) out of that. Does this amount... does the override return it to the amount in the FY08 budget line or does it reflect an increase over FY08 for those additional personal services?"

Hannig: "I'm advised that it gets it back to the Governor's introduced."

Eddy: "And is that the same as last year's? I mean, we can't go, obviously..."

Hannig: "I believe that it is, Representative."

Eddy: "Okay. So..."

Hannig: "Yeah. So, it's at '08. That's correct. Our staff had verified that... that if we restore this. we simply restore it to the '08 level."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Eddy: "Okay. So, that's the intent here is just to restore to the FY08 flat level the amount for personal services in DCEO or, excuse me, Corrections. Can you say that about the state board budget as well? I think some of those are new positions."

Hannig: "In the state board..."

Eddy: "Those represent new positions?"

Hannig: "Yeah. I think... I think you were correct. There were some... some that were new and some that were reinstatements."

Eddy: "And do you know if those new positions are federally funded so that the… the line item or the increase simply allows the State Board of Education to use federal funds in a manner that supports those positions and without this…"

Hannig: "Yeah. I think that's what we had done in the budget.

We had agreed at the end that we would... we would allow those positions to be added to the state board's budget where there were federal money that was driving it."

Eddy: "Okay. So, if this reinstatement isn't made to that level, would we then be basically not using federal funds to support positions at the State Board of Education because we're not authoriding... authorizing a line item that would allow for the use of those federal funds?"

Hannig: "That's correct, Representative."

Eddy: "Okay. So, really, in effect, whether the intent was there or wasn't in there when those lines where reduced by the Governor's Office they basically turn away federal funding to provide personnel for the State Board of Education."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. What about the DCEO line? Do you know if those are... those personal services are juvenile justice?"

Hannig: "I believe that that... that this would take it back to the '08 level."

Eddy: "Okay. Representative, thank you and I think that's the point I want to make here is in each one of these in some cases all we're doing by reinstating the amount is taking the line item back to the support level it had in '08. However, in some cases, it's new spending. But even in the case of new spending, some of it is simply using federal funds that otherwise would not be available if that line item were not reinstated. So, this is much..."

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "I mean, it's a very, very difficult Bill to read in that there are... there are several different intentions here. And if we're wanting not to do any harm to line items from '08 and not turn back any federal money, some of... it's important that these get enough votes so that that money can be accessed."

Hannig: "I agree, Representative."

Eddy: "Representative, how many votes does this Motion take?"

Hannig: "60 votes."

Eddy: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Stephens: "Representative, you... I think I heard you correctly that you said you would like to work with us on the budget... budget matters."

Hannig: "We did in '07, Representative, and the Governor vetoed the budget anyway, but it was still a fun experience."

Stephens: "Did you work with us this year? This budget that you..."

Hannig: "Well, Representative..."

Stephens: "...crafted this year that was two and a half billion dollars (\$2,500,000,000) over expected revenues?"

Hannig: "We... we had budget hearings throughout the state..."

Stephens: "Did you..."

Hannig: "early on and..."

Stephens: "...did you... did you call any of our staff? Did you call Mark Beaubien and say, Mark, I want to meet with you and bring... bring the... all the Leaders and... of the various committees that deal with appropriations, Rosemary Mulligan, others? Did you call us and say let's meet, let's work this thing out, let's... let's govern together on this budget this year?"

Hannig: "Repre... Representative, we had hearings throughout the year..."

Stephens: "The answer's no, Representative."

Hannig: "...on all the agencies."

Stephens: "The answer is no. We had hearings."

Hannig: "Rep... Representative, that's ... "

Stephens: "We're... we're right here in Springfield."

Hannig: "...isn't that what we're supposed to do? We had budget hearings..."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Stephens: "You didn't even have the courtesy to dial a number to say Mark Beaubien, you're the spokesman for appropriation matters on the House Republican side."

Hannig: "Representative..."

Stephens: "Mark tells me you didn't call him."

Hannig: "We have committees. The committees heard the testimony and the committees voted on the Bills. Now, Members of committees routinely offer Amendments. They offer substitute Bills. I didn't see any Amendments or substitute Bills on your side of the aisle. We certainly would have taken them under consideration and perhaps even adopted them, Representative. I mean, we..."

Stephens: "Well, let me... let me ask it this way. Have you ever called in your history have you... did you used to call us or did you just have these hearings? Was there anything different about this year in your mind? You've been doing this for twenty (20) years, Gary. In twenty (20)... in those twenty (20) years, where on occasion did you call your counterpart on this side of the aisle and did you try to line up meetings between counterparts at various levels of the appropriation process or did you just have these hearings around the state, schedule some hearings here and say that's all the input you're going to get?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, we had... we had hearings around the state and..."

Stephens: "In the past have you made phone calls to us, to your appropriate counterpart? Yes or no."

Hannig: "I... I try to work with Representative Beaubien all the time."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Stephens: "So you've called him in the past, but you wouldn't call him this year?"

Hannig: "We... we had an open process, Representative, I mean, we had..."

Stephens: "You've called him..."

Hannig: "...twenty-eight (28) budget Bills and..."

Stephens: "Mr. Sp..."

Hannig: "...they were just like every other..."

Stephens: "Let me... let me get to another part of the Bill."

Hannig: "...opportunity, you can file Amendments. So..."

Stephens: "This has... Okay."

Hannig: "We... all the hearings around the state. I mean..."

Stephens: "Okay. Did this..."

Hannig: "...I didn't see a Republican budget that we had... that we voted on, I mean, none came forward, Representative. But we certainly would have been willing to work with you on one."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "I wonder..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "...if the people that listen to this..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "...if they're paying attention, if they understand how ridiculous this sounds."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Because..."

Speaker Madigan: "Could you address the Bill? Would you address the Bill?"

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Stephens: "Oh, don't dare address the process that got us into this mess. Is that right, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "Well, I'm simply asking if you could end the discussion with Mr. Hannig and proceed with the discussion of the Bill. I'm not telling you what to say."

Stephens: "I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for addressing a process that stinks so much. So, I will... Mr. Speaker... Mr. Hannig, a portion of this has to do with Corrections. Is that right?"

Hannig: "That's correct."

Stephens: "Do you have a Corrections facility in your district?"

Hannig: "Yes."

Stephens: "And Representative Hannig, when we deal with issues having to do with criminal justice, I've always known that you've been pretty tough on crime."

Hannig: "Thank you, Representative."

Stephens: "I'm told that you do that because the tougher you are on crime... a matter of fact, even if you can be unfairly tough on crime, that'll put more people in the prisons in your district. Is that the reason that you're tough on crime, for economic development for your district?"

Hannig: "Representative, I think I have a philosophy that some would say is tough on crime, but we don't... I don't at least, vote to try to put people in prison for economic development purposes or to fill the prison. The prison's already full. In fact..."

Stephens: "Have you ever..."

Hannig: "...the argument is we need..."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Stephens: "...have you ever known anyone who did?"

Hannig: "...the argument is we need more guards."

Stephens: "Have you ever known anyone who did in your twenty some years here? Have you ever heard that concept before? You guys are tough on crime, so that it'll be economic development for your district. I've never heard it. I just wondered since you've been here only slightly longer than me if you ever had."

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think that those of us who have prisons in our district see the economic benefits of having jobs, but I don't think that any of us believe that we vote to put people in jail to do that."

Stephens: "I... I don't know this for sure, but all the prosecutors and the police officers that I talk to say that the reason we put people in jail is because they've been bad."

Hannig: "Well, yeah, Representative, I mean you're entitled to a trial by jury..."

Stephens: "Sure."

Hannig: "...and there's a process. I'm not an attorney so I can't speak to it."

Stephens: "Innocent until proven guilty. I couldn't agree more. Well, to the Bill. It occurs to me that and it's been admitted here on the House Floor, Republicans in this chamber didn't have much input into this process. We're not supposed to talk much about that process, but since we didn't have much to do with that process I remember when the budget passed we sent a two and a... 2.5 billion dollar (\$2,500,000,000) over budget Bill to the Governor and

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Speaker Madigan himself said well, that's okay because if... if... we don't want it to... we want it to be balanced and we think the Governor will balance it for us. Now he's made a lackluster attempt to balance it. He's made some cuts. But even those cuts, Representative, if we restored every cut, would the budget be balanced?"

- Hannig: "Representative, I think that if we restored every cut that the Governor would have a budget that he could manage and through the lapse period spending..."
- Stephens: "We have a constitutional mandate that doesn't say manage your budget. It says balance it."
- Hannig: "So, within the parameter of how you balance a budget, you have revenues and you have expenditures and within that item you have lapse period spending and typically that's the area that you have to manage and that's a number that you have to manage and every Governor has a comfort level on what he's willing to manage."
- Stephens: "Well, you know, the people in my district are having a tough time understanding when I tell them that just up the road from me there's a Representative who's in charge of the Democratic budget process and he says that this budget is well managed and they say, well, you know what I've read in very respectable documents and newspapers around the state that it's not only not well managed, it is over budget and it continues to put us in a deeper hole every year. I don't know what I should tell them. I'll just tell the that, hey, according to Democrat math it's okay... according to Democrat math okay... it's okay. And I... I just want to remind the Body and the people of Illinois why

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

we're here and why things are in such a mess. Here we are This is what you get when you put Democrats in control of everything. You're a great guy, Representative. I love you. Served with you for more than twenty (20) years, but the fact of the matter is you're part of the problem. You're part of the problem because there is no adult leadership in Illinois and that's not my fault. is not the fault of commonsense Republicans because we're not at the table. You admitted that in the past we were. You suggested that it was different this year, but I don't remember getting any phone calls. Mark didn't get any. Rosemary didn't get any. I don't know if that's the way you manage government or not, but to the people of Illinois remember, the Democrats control every bit of the process here. Every bit. Everything that's wrong with the finances of the State of Illinois this year can be laid at the feet of all Democrats, all of you are guilty."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "I just wanted to ask, I agree with a lot of the comments that Representative Franks made regarding what cuts we had hoped the Governor would make, not the cuts that have been made on the most vulnerable populations in Illinois who can't really speak for themselves. And so, in this Motion 4, I wanted to find out, I wasn't clear, on the 2 percent reduction for the community-based services for DD. What exact services is he cutting out? Since we've

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

just been ranked fifty-first (51) worst state in funding DD people to cut out even this 2 percent, I'd like to know what it is. I mean, we're known throughout the rest of the United States as being the worst state to live in if you're developmentally disabled or mentally ill."

Hannig: "I think, Representative, that probably the analysis that we're looking at is wrong because it's our understanding that... that the DD 2 percent reduction is in Motion #33, I'm advised."

Bellock: "Oh, well, I'm glad you made that clear, 'cause that makes a big impact on whether we're going to vote for that or not. So what was the other... 30... 33."

Hannig: "Motion 33 will..."

Bellock: "Oh, I... I saw that in 33, so I wondered why it was in two (2) of them."

Hannig: "Yeah."

Bellock: "And... oh, okay, so then that doesn't..."

Hannig: "It was separated out... it was separated out,

Representative. I think when the staff put together the

analysis they failed to strike it from this one."

Bellock: "Fine. Thank you very much. I appreciate that explanation."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Winters. Winters. Mr. Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minute I get on the cell phone. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Winters: "Gary, are you aware of any revenue enhancements that we'll be voting on today? I mean, that... that partially

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- would determine how people vote on this if they know that there might actually be some revenue to pay for it."
- Hannig: "This is... this is actually a budget Veto negoti... or debate."
- Winters: "I understand that. We are authorizing... a 'yes' vote on this would authorize additional spending over where we are if we do not vote for this. Is that correct? This would authorize additional spending."
- Hannig: "This would authorize the Governor to do additional spending. That's correct."
- Winters: "Right. You're one of the Deputy Leaders on your side. Are you aware of whether we will in fact be voting on any revenue enhancements over and above when we left May 31?"
- Hannig: "If you have some in mind maybe we could put them on the Calendar, Representative."
- Winters: "I'm asking you. You control the agenda. I, you know, I can't... I have lots of ideas, but I can't seem to get them on the floor."
- Hannig: "I'll... I'll call you. Representative Stephens says if I'll call you, you might have an idea."
- Winters: "Could I accept, that since you won't answer the question, that there are no revenue enhancements today?"
- Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think I said earlier that our side would negotiate with your side and the rest of the caucuses if we wanted to do fund sweeps and that seemed to be one that had at least some appeal because in the past we've all participated in funds sweeps from time to time."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Winters: "Do you have any indication that that's going to be called for a vote today?"

Hannig: "I don't think that there's an agreement,

Representative, so..."

Winters: "I'm sorry, I missed what you..."

Hannig: "I do not believe that there's an agreement..."

Winters: "Okay."

Hannig: "...on that subject and so it doesn't make any sense."

Winters: "So, after... after a minute of debate we have established that, in fact, there is no additional revenue over what was passed on May 31. You were quoted or I believe you said on the floor at that time that we had a badly out of balance budget, but we were going to let the Governor choose where to cut. If we are adding millions of dollars of spending back into the budget, do you have alternatives that you would suggest to the Governor that he shouldn't spend? I mean, he's already done his reduction Veto. He can't do any more of those, but how are you going to... what are you going to tell the Governor when the pay comes..."

Hannig: "Right. So..."

Winters: "...the vouchers come in to be paid and there's no money in the state treasury..."

Hannig: "So, we would..."

Winters: "...and all we're doing is piling more vouchers on to the system today. We're offering to all these agencies the hope and the prayer that, in fact, they will be able to continue the programs that they'd planned on and yet

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

there's no money to pay for it. How do you answer those agencies?"

Hannig: "Representative, we would say that you can do reserves. We would say that the Legislature will work with you if there's an agreement on both sides of the aisle to try to do some sweeps, but I think that what we really have to say is that the Governor has to be willing to try to manage these items. And we've seen where the Governor has made some decisions to keep items in the budget that some of us would say probably could have gone and we wouldn't have objected but he also made some cuts, like these, that we simply think should not have been made."

Winters: "Well, I would simply point out to every agency in the state that thinks that a vote today is going to restore dollars to the budget that they can draw down, that that is in fact a false hope. That the Majority Party in this chamber is trying to mislead the public that they're actually doing something. They're not doing a thing except holding out false hope. If we inpact... fact pass these, it doesn't make any more money available to all the agencies. All it does is spread the butter a little bit thinner on every slice of bread that we're trying to give out. And Mr. Speaker, in case this receives a Majority I ask for a verification."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig to close."

Hannig: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

It seems to me that if there is a level that the Governor feels that needs to be reduced we should try to do so in a thoughtful way that minimizes the pain and suffering and it

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

tries to spread around any kind of difficulty that there may be out there. But it seems to me that what we've seen, for example in this Veto, is that the Governor is unwilling in some cases to even fund personal services at the '08 levels. We've seen where the Governor is unwilling to even accept federal money so that they can have additional positions at the State Board of Education. None of that makes any sense to me and it seems to me that the appropriate thing for us to do is to override the Governor's Veto. And so I would ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Gentleman's Motion. The question is, 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion be restored, notwithstanding the item reductions of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cultra. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, shall take the record. On this question, there are 57 'ayes' and 33 'noes'. And the Motion fails. Mr. Hannig on Motion #20."

Hannig: "And again, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we suspend the appropriate rules so that we could... oh, excuse me, we don't need to do that on this one. I would yield to Representative Feigenholtz."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Feigenholtz, Motion 20."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion #20 appropriates three hundred and fifty million dollars (\$350,000,000) to hospitals. This cut increased cycle from ninety (90) days to one hundred and thirty-one days (131) and in an effort

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- to keep cycle to the minimum, we are asking for an 'aye' vote from Members to restore this cut."
- Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Lady's Motion. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this line item be restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor?' The Chair recognizes Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."
- Mulligan: "Representative, you said the cycle goes from ninety (90) to what... a hundred and twenty (120)? I thought it was going from seventy (70) to ninety-six (96)."
- Feigenholtz: "I have ninety (90) to one hundred and thirty-one (131) days. This is for hospitals, Representative."
- Mulligan: "Well, obviously, the budget you passed originally must have been pretty bad if it was going from ninety (90) to a hundred and thirty (130). I mean, you know..."
- Feigenholtz: "This is just hospital payment cycle, not overall cycle."
- Mulligan: "I don't care. It's Medicaid, period. It's money and there's other things. My... my feeling is I just wanted to make sure you spoke right. That's a really long cycle and if that's not true then that's a pretty big statement to be making since that's not what I had heard originally. But you're saying that its going to a hundred and thirty some days and that isn't a hundred and thirty some days because it's more because it's after the bills are okayed. Correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Was that a question, Representative?" Mulligan: "Yes."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Feigenholtz: "Seventy (70) days is an average of all providers' cycle right now, Representative. This particular Motion just addresses hospitals."

Mulligan: "All right. So, if we don't restore, it goes to one thirty-one (131)."

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Mulligan: "And that's because the doctors..."

Feigenholtz: "Just for hospitals."

Mulligan: "...are still getting preferential treatment because of All Kids."

Feigenholtz: "Just for hospitals."

Mulligan: "I get it. I just wanted to make sure it's correct, because the ninety (90) part of it was not so hot to begin with."

Feigenholtz: "So, clearly, you understand that a hundred and thirty-one (131) days would be worse, right?"

Mulligan: "I understand the state screwed up and that this government's dysfunctional. I understand that extremely well. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, you indicate that the delayed payments will go from ninety (90) to one thirty-one (131), I assume that's an average. Is... my assumption is that's an average. Is that correct? So, there are some that are worse than that."

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Pritchard: "And in my area, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we are considerably worse than that. And just as Mr. Newton established a rule that every action has an equal and opposite reaction, the cuts that we make here and the delayed payments to hospitals have a very significant reaction and that reaction is a cost shifting to those people that do have insurance or are paying cash when they go to the emergency room and it deals with not only the cost of health care but access to health care. I think all of us are concerned about people getting care when they need it and clearly the hospitals have become the last resort for getting that health care and for us to put them at financial risk by extending that payment cycle even more than the six (6) months that my hospitals already have, is unconscionable. I would encourage you to think strongly about the unintended consequences of this kind of reduction and vote to override."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Lady's Motion. question is, 'Shall this line item be notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. 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 people voting 'yes', 25 people voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, this line item is declared restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Governor. I'm sorry. Mr. Winters. Winters. Did you request a verification? Okay. Motion 21. Mr. Hannig, 21."

Hannig: "Yeah. I'd... I yield to Representative Feigenholtz who did so well on the last one."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Feigenholtz on Motion 21."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion #21 is a budget override from general revenue for nursing homes. Again, this would... this cut would increase the cycle from ninety-seven (97) days, which the nursing homes alone are at, not any other providers, to a hundred and nine (109) days. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Lady's Motion. Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Thank you. Representative, a quick question. Basically, I think what you're saying is without this reinstatement of the original amount for downstate nursing homes, for example, in my district the cycle would increase from ninety-seven (97) to about a hundred and nine (109) days."

Feigenholtz: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. And... and that's based on an average cycle. I mean, some..."

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Eddy: "So... I mean, for those nursing homes that call me and they talk about not receiving any payment for five (5), six (6), seven (7) months, they're put into the average. Where

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

are the nursing homes receiving payments at a rate that makes that average come down from six (6) months in some places to, I think... what about ninety (90) days would be about three (3) months? Where... where... are there places getting them the same day or in ten (10) days?"

Feigenholtz: "The... there's a conversations that go on between individual providers and the department. That's how those variations are determined based on the department's decisions."

Eddy: "Is there a criteria for those decisions, not like a zip code or something? It's... it's... I mean, what... what other criteria is it? The wealth of the area. Is it... Is there something that's concrete?"

Feigenholtz: "You'd have to ask HFS..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Feigenholtz: "...and the director that question."

Eddy: "Yeah, that'd be interesting to know why some cycles are twenty (20) days or whatever and some are six (6) months and how we get to a ninety-day average, but basically, the bottom line here, your intent with this reinstatement is to shorten the average cycle from a hundred and nine (109) to ninety-seven (97) days."

Feigenholtz: "That is correct."

Eddy: "Okay. Thanks for the clarification."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Lady's Motion. The question is, 'Shall this line item be restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Fortner. Clerk, shall take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 26 voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, this line item is declared restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor. Motions 1 and... Motion 1. Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask leave to suspend the appropriate rules for Motion #1. It's delineated on the Calendar."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Gentleman's request. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of he House. This deals with the office of the Secretary of State. And... and I have to tell you that from past experiences we have typically worked with our constitutional officers in a way that respects the office that they've been elected to. Whether they're Democrats or Republicans, I think that we all understand the independent nature of the Secretary of State or the Attorney General or the Comptroller or the Treasurer. And certainly, it seems to me that these elected officials have an opportunity and we have an obligation to ensure that they have a budget that allows them to run their budget in a way that makes sense. And so when I look at this budget veto for the Secretary of State, I see four hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars (\$425,000) for maintenance of the buildings under the Secretary of State that's being removed and it suggests to me that if the Secretary of State feels strong enough that he's asked us to override, that indeed it's important for us to hear what Secretary White has to say. And I think

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

that we should agree with him to override. And it strikes me a bit odd or unusual that the next three (3) items I see the list the two millions (2,000,000) for cost associated with administering monitored device permits and a monitored device driving permits and even... and even the Association of Junior Golf Fund, these are all non-GRF items. These are items where moneys are paid into funds or through some mechanism other than general taxes moneys come into these funds for the spif... for the specific purpose for which the fund was created. And the Secretary is simply asking us for the authority to spend these funds that were created for that purpose. It seems... it just seems to me that if we don't fund the two million dollars (\$2,000,000) for the cost associated with administering the monitored device permits, we tie the Secretary of State's hands but don't create any additional money that's available for any other purpose. It seems to me that this is something that the Secretary of State feels strong enough about that he would come to us and ask us to override the Governor and I'd simply ask that we respect the opinion and view of Secretary White and that you join me in voting to override the Governor's Veto on this Motion."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative Hannig, does the original amount in the FY09 budget exceed the FY08 introduced for the line item

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

related to operations, alterations, nonrecurring repairs and maintenance? Is that an increase?"

Hannig: "I'm advised that it's the same as '08."

Eddy: "So, this would simply restore the FY08 amount."

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Is that the same for the monitoring device driving and administrative fee? Those are both FY08 amounts being restored by this action?"

Hannig: "So, Representative, I'm advised that the... that the monitoring devices that that's a new program for '09 and that the moneys will be raised to fund that program. This is not a GRF fund its another state fund. So..."

Eddy: "So, we passed legislation that establishes a fee or was that done by some type of administrative action of the Secretary State's Office? There's obviously a fee. You say a fund's being established and just uses that fund and it's a new program."

Hannig: "Yes. Essentially, there's money that comes not from General Revenue for the purposes of..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Hannig: "...you know, funding this... this program and we've created it, Representative."

Eddy: "So, without this would the fund... or the fee be collected and not used for the purpose that it was intended?"

Hannig: "That's exactly what would happen."

Eddy: "So... Okay. Well, I appreciate that explanation, 'cause many of us in here like to see dedicated funds go for their specific use and that seems to be what this does. I... I have a question, though, on one of the items. It has to do

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

for a grant to the Illinois Professional Golfers Association Foundation."

Hannig: "So, I'm advised that you can buy a license plate if you want to put money into that fund. Just like you can buy a license plate for a university. So, these are... you know these are a golf plate. Now, somebody obviously puts money in it. It doesn't look like it raises a huge amount, but it raises twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000). So, you maybe bought this plate because you thought it was a good idea to donate a little extra of your money to some fund. Okay? So, I think it's only fair enough that if you're willing to do that we should make sure that that money goes to the purpose that it was designed for."

Eddy: "Okay. So, this... this fund reimplementation or by reestablishing this, you're... you're using then another fee designed for as a designated purpose for the purpose that it was designed to pay for rather than allowing it just to be in General Revenue for other use. You're establishing the spending to go with that."

Hannig: "Right. So, if someone put money into the fund because they're willing to pay some premium for this plate..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Hannig: "...thinking that it's going to go to this golf association, shouldn't we make sure that it does?"

Eddy: "But is there anything in the fund that requires that the money be only used for those expenses associated with it?

I mean, what stops the Governor from going ahead and using that money for General Revenue rather than to spend it on

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

the line item that we're establishing here with this reinstatement?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, generally it's a fund that's established and run by the Secretary of State."

Eddy: "Okay."

Hannig: "So, the Secretary would... would be in charge of the fund."

Eddy: "So, in this particular case the Secretary of State's Office makes that decision..."

Hannig: "Right."

Eddy: "...not the Governor's Office."

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Unfortunately, Representative Feigenholtz was talking to me so if this was asked, excuse me. Did you say when you presented this that all of the reductions in here were appropriations for funds that are established in there and the only appropriation... the only reason there's an appropriation for that is because there's funds that pay for these?"

Hannig: "Rep... No, Representative, I said of the four (4) items the one is GRF and that's four hundred and twenty-five thousand (425,000) and that's for maintenance of buildings under the Secretary of State and that this actually reduces it below '08. The other three (3) items are from dedicated funds. And so I'm suggesting that when people pay into a

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Monitoring Device Fund that... that the money be used for that."

Mulligan: "Right. I would think that the monitoring device should be self-sustaining for the simple reason that those are the drunk drivers and they pay for the device themselves. They have to pay fines."

Hannig: "Right and so we're..."

Mulligan: "And it should be a fund that... that is not out of GRF. They pay for it."

Hannig: "No. That's my point. It's not a GRF fund. It's a other state fund that the Governor has reduced funding... has reduced the spending level for the Secretary of State from a non-GRF fund. And I'm suggesting that if the Secretary believes that he needs the money that the moneys in the fund and the moneys raised in a way that specifically was set up to fund it that... that the Governor was wrong. That he just simply made an error."

Mulligan: "Well, were those three (3) funds part of the original funds sweep Bill that came over from the Senate?"

Hannig: "Well, I... I don't know, because... remember that the Senate proposal said that the Governor could sweep five hundred and thirty million (530,000,000) from any fund, even funds under the Secretary of State, at any time. So, perhaps that's what the Governor's thinking, that he wants to sweep this fund. But I think that in this case we've set up this fund and people are paying into it and if the Secretary says he needs the money to monit... to run the fund we should ensure that he has the money."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Mulligan: "Well, if it was set up to be self-sustaining, I understand why the appropriation was there. The fact is though you mixed one in that isn't, although it's a small one it's part of the game. So, my guess is that, I mean, I see... I see no problem in appropriating money that's there that doesn't come from General Revenue but comes from a fund that is established in order to make a program self-sustaining."

Hannig: "Right."

Mulligan: "So, I'd like to go along with this that's why I'm just trying to check on it, but the four hundred and twenty-five (425) I guess is a little bit of a problem and then the grants for the Professional Golfers Association for the foundation that's for young people. Correct?"

Hannig: "Right. So, people buy license plates, again, they pay a premium on their plates..."

Mulligan: "Right."

Hannig: "...the money goes into a dedicated fund. It's believed by the people who buy the plates that the money will be used for this purpose that's why they donated it in effect and if we don't appropriate it, it simply sits in that fund. And so we would... I would say and I hope you would agree with me that we should honor what people have given us and we should... we should allow the Secretary of State to spend the money."

Mulligan: "Well, not always, but sometimes we are fairly smart in how we set things up because we would like a program to function but we don't want the people of Illinois to pay for it. We want the people that are interested in it to

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

pay for it and I agree with you on that and the four hundred and twenty-five thousand (425,000) is the only thing I was worried about..."

Hannig: "Yeah, that's..."

Mulligan: "...but the other two (2) seem to me to be logical."

Hannig: "...that's for the maintenance and if we don't override,
 it actually takes the Secretary down below last year's
 level."

Mulligan: "All right. So, in a world that's not too logical, some of this is logical, I guess."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunkin."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Okay. I just wanted some clarification on the last question. She mentioned that if the Governor... in the Bill there was about five hundred-plus million dollars (\$500,000,000+) that the Governor has proposed to sweep?"

Hannig: "The Governor has... would ask for powers... the Senate Bill would authorize the Governor to sweep five hundred and thirty million dollars (\$530,000,000)."

Dunkin: "Okay."

Hannig: "Up to."

Dunkin: "Up to. And so over the ye... what's the total fund sweep amount, in all the funds would you say? Jus... just sort of a strong estimate."

Hannig: "Well, I guess that's a matter of debate how much is... how much is..."

Dunkin: "How much is projected..."

Hannig: "...excess."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Dunkin: "...how much is sitting in there right now?"

Hannig: "I don't know the answer, Representative."

Dunkin: "Of which one? That's projected?"

Hannig: "I mean, it's obviously a significant amount, but some of the money, you know, goes… is… is used. It comes in and it goes out. It's for a specific purpose."

Dunkin: "But is there any idea of what's sitting in sort of all of our state special funds today?"

Hannig: "Probably the Treasurer could give us a number if we...

if we consulted with him, but I don't know it off the top

of my head."

Dunkin: "Okay. And the... and the bill of the five hundred and thirty-plus million dollars (\$530,000,000+). Do we know how much was coming out of the Secretary of State's special funds?"

Hannig: "No, we don't, Representative. And that's..."

Dunkin: "And these... these funds here."

Hannig: "And that's one of the objections that I think we have is that we're willing to work with the Governor and others to find excess money in dedicated funds, but I think we're not willing to just give the Governor blanket authority to take from wherever he wants and whenever he wants. So, for example, before we would take any money from any fund that the Secretary of State has jurisdiction with we would... we would have consultation with him and ask him for his input. And if he thought we couldn't do that or shouldn't do that, we wouldn't."

Dunkin: "Over the last five (5) years we've swept funds in this General Assembly."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Hannig: "We have."

Dunkin: "In the General Assembly, both the House..."

Hannig: "We have. Yes."

Dunkin: "...have voted to sweep funds. What has been the criteria prior today... prior to... to today with us going through that funds sweep process?"

Hannig: "We would work with the Members in our caucus and we would have a list of funds that each caucus would work with and so then... First of all, the Governor would give us a list. He would say this is what we think you can sweep. Then we would visit with our Members, I would and others, and we would take... we would take some off and the Republican would take some off and the Senate would take some off and at the end there would be some remaining that we would all agree that we could sweep some money from that fund and for some purpose that we're agreed to. That's typically how we did it in the past."

Dunkin: "Okay. So, that has not occurred at all this year."

Hannig: "That has not."

Dunkin: "In our House chamber and the second floor."

Hannig: "That's correct."

Dunkin: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Winters."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Winters: "Representative, there are rumors that you'd gotten a call from the Secretary of State that if this Bill does not pass or the override is not... if the Governor's not overridden, that he has worked out an agreement with the

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

State Police that anybody with a legislative plate, on their way home will be stopped. Is that rumor true?"

Hannig: "I certainly hope not, Representative."

Winters: "Well, one other question then. This I believe is the fifth Motion that we've taken up this morning. You have had two (2) of those Motions. Representative Feigenholtz has had two (2). What's the… what's the batting average so far for you and for Representative Feigenholtz?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, she's done pretty well."

Winters: "I believe she's two (2) for two (2). How are you doing, Gary? And does this take..."

Hannig: "It's one of those 0-for days so far."

Winters: "This takes 71 votes as these are item redu..."

Hannig: "Yes. That's correct."

Winters: "...or line items. 71 votes."

Hannig: "70... 71."

Winters: "I'd ask for a verification."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative."

Hannig: "Yes."

Reis: "Normally, it's the practice in this chamber if you don't receive the required number of votes that you ask for Postponed to Consideration. Are you going to start doing that this afternoon?"

Hannig: "Well, these are actually Motions that are renewable.

So, we could come back tomorrow and we'd vote on them

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

again, but I don't think anyone believes that if they fail today that... that they'll be better tomorrow."

Reis: "Okay."

Hannig: "So, it's a little bit like... it's a Motion to override.

It's not the Bill."

Reis: "I do have one serious question. You said most of these line items were taken back to 2008 levels. Just simply there was no increase. The Governor was removing the increase for FY09."

Hannig: "So, this... this is a Total Veto of four (4) items. So what that means is the Governor's zeroing it out. So, inother words these Total Vetoes the Governor's gone from four hundred and twenty-five thousand (425,000) to zero (0), from two million (2,000,000) to zero (0), from twelve hundred... one million, two hundred fifty thousand (1,250,000) to zero (0) for that particular line. So, these are reductions by any stretch of the imagination."

Reis: "So, the et... Motion #2 then will take up specific line items."

Hannig: "That will take... Yeah. That will be items that he reduced to some lower number but... but still greater than zero (0)."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig to close."

Hannig: "Well, again, I just ask for a 'yes' vote. I think it's important that we allow the Secretary of State to have the flexibility to ensure that these items are funded. It's his constitutional duty to do that and we need to give

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

him the spending authority so that he can meet that authority. And I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion pass, notwithstanding the item Vetoes of the Governor?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mulligan. Mulligan. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 58 people voting 'yes', 31 people voting 'no'. The Motion fails. Mr. Hannig on Motion 2."

Hannig: "Well, again, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the This deals with the office of the Secretary of The most significant part of the reductions that State. the Governor made in that budget include, for personal services, ten and a half million dollars (\$10,500,000); at the motor vehicle group, 3.2 million dollars (\$3,200,000); at the general administrative group, for security at the Capitol the Secretary of State had asked for a million dollars (\$1,000,000). So, these are, again, important items that the Secretary of State, a duly elected constitutional officer, someone who serves all the people of the State of Illinois who's asked to provide the driver's license stations that serve us in our district. He's asked to maintain those. He's asked to do any number of things as Secretary of State and I think the Governor has unfairly reduced his budget by an amount of money that will make it almost imposable for the Secretary of State to run the operations of his budget. So, I'm perfectly

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

willing to tell the Secretary of State that he should tighten his belt and that he should have reserves, but I don't think we're really serving anyone in the State of Illinois by putting the Secretary of State in this untenable position where he has a hard time even meeting the payrolls of that agency. So, it's important that we vote to override the Governor's Veto on this item and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, one of the reductions has to do with regular positions. The reduction or excuse me, the original amount was twenty-three million dollars (\$23,000,000) and it was reduced by a little over ten million (10,000,000)."

Hannig: "Yes. That's correct."

Eddy: "What... That makes the final amount twelve million (12,000,000). What services... what regular positions does that line item fund?"

Hannig: "It's for the employees of the motor vehicle group."

Eddy: "So, for example, the local motor vehicle department, the people who work there, those... those personnel would be reduced by..."

Hannig: "Well, Rep... yeah, it would put tremendous pressure on the Secretary to reduce head counts out in these... these stations that people go to to get their driver's license, to get their license plates. Those... those are facilities that are in our districts."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Eddy: "So, the original..."

Hannig: "There set..."

Eddy: "The original amount, was that the FY08 amount? The twenty-three million (23,000,000), was that the FY08 flat amount that was sent to the Governor? Do you know if there was an increase in that?"

Hannig: "I... I don't have the answer, Representative, but I think you can see that this is such a significant cut that it drives it significantly below the '08 amount and it probably puts the Secretary of State in the position where he's going to make some drastic head count reductions and some of that could be in your district and mine."

Eddy: "Has the Secretary of State indicated that to your staff that if these aren't reinstated that there could be significant reductions maybe to the point where if some of these facilities weren't... there weren't personnel for these facilities that there'd be trouble issuing licenses or renewing registrations?"

Hannig: "The Secretary wants to maintain his office and the level of service at where he's at today, but if we force these decisions on him he will have to live with such a reduced budget that his choices are going to be very drastic and I don't... I don't know that we really want to force the Secretary to have to close facilities or do significant layoffs."

Eddy: "Do you know what the percent decrease in the Secretary of State's budget line item after the reductions was compared to FY08? Just the total amount."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Hannig: "I'm advised it was about a 16 percent cut,

Representative... reduction."

Eddy: "FY08 to FY09, 16 percent."

Hannig: "The Veto was 16 percent from '09... from the proposed budget."

Eddy: "Did the Secretary of State have any direct input as to those reductions? Any..."

Hannig: "I'm not aware, Representative."

Eddy: "Okay."

Hannig: "I don't know the answer."

Eddy: "All right. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, I kind of had my last question on the wrong Motion, so I'll refocus my question here to this Motion. Which one of these line items if... if you and your staff could tell us are a reduction below the FY08 levels? I understand probably the..."

Hannig: "I think... I think all of them probably are,
Representative. Certainly most of them are. These are...
these are real cuts and probably real layoffs."

Reis: "Versus what we had in 2008."

Hannig: "Yes."

Reis: "Okay. 'Cause when... when you responded to Representative Eddy's question your... your answer was that it was a 16 percent cut from the FY09 budgeted amounts, but we don't know what the increases were so if we could get a true amount of what this cut is over the FY08."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- Hannig: "Well so, for example, in the first one the personal services for the motor vehicle group, we had it at twenty-three (23) and know it's at twelve (12). So, I mean, that's a pretty significant reduction in personal..."
- Reis: "Yeah, but what was FY08?"
- Hannig: "I mean, this is... this is a reduction from even '08, Representative."
- Reis: "But we don't know exactly which... what the amount is."
- Hannig: "I don't know the exact amount, but it's very significant. I don't think we gave the Secretary..."
- Reis: "Probably not but there's some of the other ones... We're just trying to sort this out, I mean, the Secretary of State's Office is... is good. I'm sure we can find good in every one of these Veto amounts... or Veto Bills that we're taking up today, but it would help us to know how much the low FY08 each of these line items are. You know, take... take #4. You have... you went from fifty-one million (51,000,000) down to forty-eight million (48,000,000). A Veto of..."
- Hannig: "I'm advised that... that the total cut is like twentytwo and a half billion (22,500,000,000), almost 22.6
  million dollars (\$22,600,000) in GRF."
- Reis: "Okay. Representative, I know this is a tough situation.

  These are all gotten to Hour... in our hands late. We're trying to bring some clarity as to whether these are cuts from '08 or just cuts from an increase that was budgeted into '09. So, thank you for your answers."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Monique Davis."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the restoration in this legislation. I think we should all realize that the Secretary of State's Office provides service to all of our districts. This cut, this reduction will mean a 16 percent reduction in the personnel that serves us, that serves our children as we go in to the second... Secretary of State for our licenses and for other services. This is a political reduction to punish someone who's done absolutely nothing to be punished. I think most of us know that Jesse White does a fair job, no matter whose district these offices are in. His objective is to serve you as quickly and expeditiously as possible. now the Governor's attempt is to remove the Secretary of State's ability to serve the public in a fair and in a way that senior citizens don't have to wait in long lines, in a way that you don't have to get rid of all of these employees because you can't afford to pay them. This was mean spirited and without justification. You should override this. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. When you look at the operations of the Secretary of State very little of that money goes out in the way of grants. Almost all the money that the Secretary of State has is for personal services for people who are at driver's license stations in our district that need to be there so when one of our constituents shows up and wants a driver's license or wants to get a license plate or needs to have something transferred that something... so that that process can take

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

These are people who work here in the capital in Springfield or up in Chicago to make sure that information gets done. That people can get the information that they need for the title of their car or that things get sent out. Make no mistake, this is a vital part of the Secretary of State's Office and the Governor has reduced it significantly below the '08 spending level. If we do not override this Veto, the Secretary of State will have very limited options on what he can do to try to manage this budget. He's going to have to close some facilities. He's going to have to lay off some people. I don't think that's something that any of us want to be a part of. I think it's important that we recognize that the Secretary of State has done a good job in this state and he does need to be supported by this Body and we do need to provide him with the adequate funding so that he can continue to run the office that he was elected to run. So, I would ask that you override the Governor's Veto on this Bill and that you please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig requests leave that all of the items be considered on a single Roll Call vote. Is there leave? Leave is granted. The question is, 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion be restored, notwithstanding the item reductions of the Veto?' Those in favor sig... vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 64 'ayes', 26 'noes'. The Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, the relevant line items are hereby declared

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

restored, notwithstanding the item reductions of the Governor. The next Motion will be by Representative Feigenholtz and it will be on Motion 9... 9."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Budget override #9 Feigenholtz: restores the PUNS waiting list for agent care givers. Many who have spent time in the Human Appropriation Committee knows that PUNS is a list that people, children especially, who are... who have ... are living with developmental disabilities are... who have caregivers that are over the age of seventy (70) are in desperate need of alternative living arrangements. That was a five million dollar (\$5,000,000) cut... Veto from the Governor. The other is a 4.6 million dollar (\$4,600,000) restoration to increase community integrative living arrangements for more CILA slots in... for the nursing rate, I'm sorry. million (2,000,000) to transition young adults with DD as they leave the school system and half a million dollars (\$500,000) for the money follows the client federal grant."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would simply ask that we suspend the appropriate rules."

Speaker Madigan: "Yep."

Hannig: "For..."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Gentleman's request. Is there leave? Leave is granted to consider all of these items on one Roll Call. Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion pass, notwithstanding the item Vetoes of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 28 voting 'no'. The Motion fails. The next Motion will be Motion 10... 10. Representative... Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion #10 is a reduction Veto of 5.3 million dollars (\$5,300,000) for the autism program, two million (2,000,000) for the centers for independent living, and two hundred and seventy thousand dollars (\$270,000) for the ARC's Life Span Project. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig requests that these items be considered on a single Roll Call. Is there leave? is granted. Representative Feigenholtz moves that the... 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion be restored, notwithstanding the item reductions of the Governor?' 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 63 voting 'yes', 26 voting 'no'. Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, line items are hereby declared notwithstanding the item reductions of the Governor. The next Motion will be #11. Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Budget override Motion 11 increases capacity grants for non-Medicaid reimbursable

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

services for people with mental illness through the mental health community providers that are in all of our legislative districts for 3.9 million dollars (\$3,900,000) and the two million dollar (\$2,000,000) restoration is a statewide mental health service program."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig requests leave that the items be contained on one Roll Call. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Representative Feigenholtz moves that the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion pass, notwithstanding the line items of the Governor. Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. 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 57 'ayes', 32 'noes'. The Motion fails. The next Motion will be #12. Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Budget override Motion #12 restores 4.2 million dollars (\$4,200,000) for supportive housing for the mentally ill and three million (3,000,000) for the children's mental health partnership."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig requests leave that the items be considered on one Roll Call. Is there leave? Leave is granted. The Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, can you compare the reinstated amount to the FY08 amount on these line items? I think the original budget was six million dollars (\$6,000,000) for the children's mental health partnership. The Veto amount was three million, zero six zero (3,060,000) making the final

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

two million, nine four zero (2,940,000). Can you tell me what the '08 budget line item was compared to that two million (2,000,000)?"

Feigenholtz: "This is... this is three million (3,000,000) above '08, Representative."

Eddy: "So, the two million, nine forty (2,940,000) that the Governor cut this to was the FY08 amount. He cut the increase out?"

Feigenholtz: "No. There's still a small increase that he left in the budget."

Eddy: "Okay. So, this... the reinstatement goes above the FY08 by how much? A small... I think what we're trying to establish here is what we're supporting. If we're supporting an FY08 level, if we vote for reinstating the amount or if we're actually voting for an increase over FY08, if we support this."

Feigenholtz: "Representative, staff has just informed me that if we take the cut that the Governor instated we are below the '08 level."

Eddy: "If we vote in favor of your Motion will we be above the FY08 amount?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Eddy: "Okay. Is that the case..."

Feigenholtz: "By roughly three million dollars (\$3,000,000)."

Eddy: "We'll be above it by roughly three million (3,000,000).

How about the support of MI housing line item? The
Governor vetoed 4... around 4.3 million (4,300,000) making
the final amount 13.9 (13,900,000) is that an increase over
FY08?"

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Feigenholtz: "It would be under FY08 by 2 percent."

Eddy: "So, even by restoring this to the amount of your Motion, we're 2 percent less than FY08? Is that what..."

Feigenholtz: "No. We're higher than '08."

Eddy: "Okay. So, this represents a 2 percent increase... the restored amount does. So, in this case both of these... both of these amounts will be more than FY08. If you vote for this Motion, you're voting for an increase of 2 percent on one and a small percent increase in other."

Feigenholtz: "No. If you vote against this Motion, Representative Eddy..."

Eddy: "Yes."

Feigenholtz: "...the programs will still have a 2 percent cut from FY08."

Eddy: "I understand that, but I guess..."

Feigenholtz: "But if you vote for the Motion..."

Eddy: "...they'll have an increase."

Feigenholtz: "They'll receive an increase of what you're looking at..."

Eddy: "Well, let me ask you this question."

Feigenholtz: "...in your analysis."

Eddy: "And I'm just interested in the answer. Why didn't you stop at the FY08 level? Why have an increase from that?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, we don't have a lot of latitude on how we respond to the Governor's Vetoes. We either restore or we don't. We restore all or nothing. We can't tinker with the numbers."

Eddy: "So the..."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Feigenholtz: "I will assure you, however, that both of these lines are very, very cost-effective and they address growth and legitimate need for people looking for suppor... housing that is less expensive than traditional institutions in this state."

Eddy: "And I'm not going to argue that point. I'm just trying to get the idea... 'Cause you did make a statement that's interesting. You... your statement was that when you reinstate a line item you don't have the flexibility of changing the amount of the original. You have to either do that. You can't go up to a certain amount of that."

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Eddy: "Those are the only options you have on a Motion like this."

Feigenholtz: "That's it."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion be restored, notwithstanding the item reductions of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Winters, Fortner. Winters, Fortner. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 27 voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, the relevant line items are hereby declared restored, notwithstanding the item reductions of the Governor. The next Motion will be #7. Representative Feigenholtz."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know that many of us have gotten calls from our Department of Alcohol and Substance Abuse (sic-Division of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse) community providers to talk about the devastating Draconian cuts that the... that were... were given to the... that particular budget. The concession of fifty-five million dollars (\$55,000,000) of federal money is unconscionable and what this Motion and hopefully, the next Motion will do cuts. is restore those The nine million (\$9,000,000) for addiction treatment services for special populations, three million (3,000,000) for treatment services statewide, and  $2.7 \quad (2,700,000) \quad \text{in}$ General Revenue for alcohol and substance abuse for a welfare reform project are in this Motion and I'd be glad to answer any questions about it."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig requests leave that the items be considered on one Roll Call. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Representative Mulligan. Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."
- Mulligan: "Representative, how much in federal funds are we losing if we don't pass this?"
- Feigenholtz: "I think the number is fifty-five million (55,000,000), Representative. It's a.m. it's a dollar for dollar match."
- Mulligan: "I know Catholic Charities called me. The… in… included in this as a program that they have for veterans, that's a pilot program that will probably fall if we don't restore this."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Mulligan: "Was this money to restore cuts in the FY08, also?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes it was. Good point."

Mulligan: "And have they not had an increase as far as a COLA or anything for quite some time?"

Feigenholtz: "I believe last year when we worked on the budget together, Representative Mulligan, we originally had included a cost-of-living adjustment for the Department of Alcohol and Substance Abuse (sic-Division of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse) along with DD and MH. I think that there was some reparations for DD and MH that were provided on some level and some relief, but DASA got nothing."

DASA was cut. So, we had this little Mulligan: "Right. discussion before. Who do you think the Governor was most unhappy with because we both supported DASA, you or me? Because why would you go after one agency when they've had increase. Theirs... obviously, it impacts all the different districts. You know, in my high school there's a waiting list. We don't have enough people to provide the support. Of all the restorations, this one to me would be one that we would want to support for the simple reason as we get back more federal funding than we're losing and these people have not had any kind of a raise and there's programs that are being cut here that include men that are getting out of prison, veterans, teenagers, everything that has to do with a problem that causes multiple other problems in this state, that's drug abuse. So, I would think this would be an 'aye' vote to try and restore this if you're going to restore one item of all of these. Even

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

though the Senate seems not to want to come back and do this, I think that someone, whether it's on the second floor or across the corridor ought to take note. This is one of those things I do not understand why you cut things that destroy federal funding, which we're always looking for, so I don't... I don't get the object of this. I don't get the object of a lot of stuff that's going on here now, but of all the ones that I would support if I had to choose this is one that I think should be restored."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Harris."

Will the Sponsor yield? I... I want to "Thank you. agree with the previous speaker. Of all the items that we should address today substance abuse and addiction is one of the greatest that we can. Everything else we talk about here, the cost of our prosecutorial system, the cost of the police system, the cost to our hospitals and our emergency rooms, a lot of these costs are driven by substance abuse. So not only do we lose the fifty-five million dollars (\$55,000,000) in federal funding, we're driving up our costs in almost every other department of government in the state, the city, the municipalities. Drugs are tearing apart our neighborhoods. They're the cause of most of the violence and shootings that we all talk about. destroy families. They increase domestic violence. we're taking away here the only opportunity that people have to get off drugs, to get off alcohol, to stop the abuse and stop the cycle. And I would urge everyone to vote on both 7 and 8 to restore the funding and override the Governor's Vetoes."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Sara, I'm looking at the analysis and it shows that we're trying to restore under fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000) and if we restore the fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000), would we get... are you saying fifty-five million dollars (\$55,000,000) in federal matching funds?"

Feigenholtz: "No. Tha... It would be a combination... that fifty-five million (55,000,000) would be a match based on passage of a combination of Motions 7 and 8."

Franks: "Okay. So, those together... If we didn't pass this we'd be leaving at least fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000) on the table of federal funds just on Motion..."

Feigenholtz: "Fifty..."

Franks: "...just on Motion 7."

Feigenholtz: "Fifty-five million (55,000,000)."

Franks: "Okay. But on Motion... on this one it's fifteen (15) the other one it's forty-some. So, together it'd be fifty-five million (55,000,000)."

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Franks: "Okay. Well, and to the Motion. On a strictly cost benefit analysis it's criminal not to vote for the override here because we'd be leaving fifty-five million dollars (\$55,000,000) on the table. And when we started today's Session there was some question about prisoners and what we're doing with our prison system. What a perfect way to help keep people out of prison by treating them for their

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

addictions. The statistics indicate that over 70 percent of the people that are incarcerated in this state are there due to drugs or some type of an addiction. So, not only would we be saving fifty-five million (55,000,000) that we'd be losing from the feds, we'd also be alleviating some of the problems in our other areas of the budget. So, I would ask for all to vote for an override. This will help downstate as well as upstate. This is a Bill that we need to override and after we override this, and let's hope that we do, we need to call upon the Senate to come back and do their job, because once we've... we've already overridden many of these Vetoes so far, but it's going to meaningless unless the Senate comes back and overrides the same ones because we only have a small time frame under the... under our statutes. So, they have to be here within a week to pass these. So, I'd encourage our Representatives to call upon our Senators to come back to Springfield to finish the work that we're doing here today, otherwise all this hard work is for naught."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, M.: "Representative Feigenholtz, are these... are these programs that have councilors and substance addiction professionals who are helping people to stop drug abuse?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Davis, M.: "That's what these programs are."

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- Davis, M.: "And your Governor wants to... your Governor wants to reduce or end this very needed opportunity for people across the State of Illinois."
- Feigenholtz: "That is accurate, Representative Davis. Shocking."
- Davis, M.: "Now, Representative, is it... I don't know if this is true, but is there a prison that deals with just substance abusers? Did he open that prison?"
- Feigenholtz: "I think there's a division of a prison."
- Davis, M.: "There is a division. But if people in different communities don't get this kind of opportunity it will make a very large impact on the number of people perhaps who continue to use methamphetamine, crack cocaine, cocaine, marijuana. So, as Legislators, I know the kind of state that we want is a state that will help and protect citizens. People who are addicted to substances commit crimes. Is that right, Representative?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Davis, M.: "To the Bill. I urge an override of this reduction. You know, I think after this Session today people are going to know a lot more about the Governor of the State of Illinois. They're going to know a lot more about him than we've learned in the past. When you say one thing but your actions are totally different, that affects people's lives in such a negative way, it affects all of our lives. I urge an override. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the previous speakers, let me just say that

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

nobody... nobody that I know of in this House wants to be voting on these type of issues. We could have done our We could have passed revenues to pay for these issues. Every editorial board throughout the whole state says there's a two billion dollar (\$2,000,000,000) deficit, two billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000). All we had to do is pass a jobs Bill, some fund sweeps, pension obligation bonds, and we wouldn't have to be voting on this. You can bring the Senate back... you can bring the Senate back, but there's no money to pay for it. You want to talk about false hope, tell a person who is going to be on a waiting list for six (6) months to get substance abuse treatment because we don't have money to pay for it. False hope? We don't have the money. Pass the revenues and we can restore all of this. It isn't hard. We shouldn't be here. Put the politics aside, do our job. The Senate did theirs. voted for this budget. I voted for this budget, but we should have passed the revenues to fund the budget. So far guess what we've done. We've overridden four hundred and thirty-seven million dollars (\$437,000,000) in cuts. Four hundred and thirty-seven million dollars (\$437,000,000) in cuts. I want to vote to override them all, but I want to put the revenue in place to pay for them. Four hundred and thirty-seven million dollars (\$437,000,000) of money we just don't have. Where are we going to get it? The people in the hospitals, we restored their money. You know what, their payment cycle is still going to be as long because there's no money to pay for it. The nursing homes, restored their money. Their payment cycle is going to be

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

as long because we don't have any money for pay... to pay for it. You want to talk about a cruel hoax, a cruel hoax on someone who needs substance abuse and we're going to say we're doing something to help you, but we're not going to pay for it. We don't have the money. Vote for the revenues. Vote for the jobs Bill. Vote for the fund sweeps. Quit lying to the people of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And the Representative Stephens: from... from Madison couldn't be more correct. that... that this Body sent a budget that was two and a half billion dollars (2,500,000,000) over... overspent and now you're saying, well, you're going to be judged, you're going to judge us politically because very popular programs, like the one before us, the Governor had to make some cuts somewhere. You didn't have to send him that budget. You could have made cuts in other places or you could of cooperated with us and had a capital program except for petty jealousies about who's going to win the next gubernatorial race. That's what this is about. fact of the matter is you wouldn't cooperate with any of the other parties involved in this process. You wouldn't cooperate with House Republicans. You wouldn't cooperate Senate Republicans or Senate Democrats Governor's Office to create a much needed development Bill that would provide jobs for Illinoisans and the money for the much needed services in this Bill. Speaker Madigan, you're the one that wouldn't cooperate.

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Why? Why, politics get in the way again. Don't you ever wonder that maybe good government should be your major motivation. This isn't good government. You know what, I... I myself have been a benefactor of programs provided by this agency and it hurts me to turn to my veteran friends and have them say to me, Ron, why... why did you vote to cut those funds for us? At the end of the day when I'd been able to make my argument about what a silly process you're putting us through, even my veteran friends will say to me, you know what, go back there and fight the good fight again and keep their feet to the fire and make them govern no matter how stubborn they are. And I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunkin. Dunkin."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, how much did you say the State of Illinois would lose if we don't get the federal match money, roughly?"

Feigenholtz: "This is a dollar for dollar match,

Representative, so if you..."

Dunkin: "This being the three (3)... the four (4) items here: addiction treatment services for special population..."

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Dunkin: "All four (4) of those items in Motions 7 and 8."

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Dunkin: "I just got off the phone with the Governor's Office to this specific issue. They say that's grossly exaggerated. The federal match moneys. The fifty-five million dollars (\$55,000,000) is grossly exaggerated. That's not true.

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

So, I'm not sure if... if the wires with the Speaker's Office here and the Governor's Office got crossed, but I'm trying to get to some level of truth here because they're saying they wouldn't sacrifice that amount of federal dollars being lost. And it's not dollar for dollar. No offense or disrespect, I'm trying to get some clarification."

Feigenholtz: "We were told that the Governor's Office didn't even realize that we had a maintenance of effort on this line item, Representative Dunkin, and I don't know who you talked to in the Governor's Office this is one..."

Dunkin: "One of his deputy governors."

Feigenholtz: "Uh huh. All right then. So, anyway, I believe, you know, the advocacy community probably has their finger on the pulse and know what they're talking about."

Dunkin: "Okay. So, well, again, it's important because that's a lot of money at the federal level for us to sacrifice or lose as is with the transportation dollars that's also coming about... upon us in September, October, I believe. So, it's important that we're real clear. So you're saying the advocacy community versus the Governor's Office... Which numbers are we looking at roughly, Representative? Is it fifty-five million (55,000,000), is it ten million (10,000,000), is it two million (2,000,000)?"

Feigenholtz: "It's a dollar for dollar match, Representative..."

Dunkin: "They're saying that that's not true, Representative.

So... Representative."

Feigenholtz: "MOE, Dunkin."

Dunkin: "MOE?"

Feigenholtz: "MOE, maintenance of effort."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Dunkin: "Maintenance of effort. Okay. All right. Well, I'm still confused because we suppose to have very reliable sources here in this chamber, maybe the second floor and maybe even the Senate. And what's interesting about this is we had two (2) opportunities... two (2) opportunities, one last week and on the 31 to generate the revenue potentially so we wouldn't even have this type of conversation. debate shouldn't even be on the table, quite frankly. Actually, all of these issues here, not just for substance abuse, not just for children, but for the capitalization of some of these schools and these roads and bridges and some of the mass transit, but yet here we are going through an extensive two (2) days of debate with enumerable Motions and we could have concluded this Session May 31 like we all expected or had planned and so we're backtracking again. Many of the Members here in this chamber voted against revenue sources, two (2) times, last week and May 31. Now, I know the Senate sent over a Bill that didn't have our great input in it and it wasn't pretty, but it was a revenue source at least that we could have worked or dealt with to some degree where we wouldn't have to deal with 1.4 billion dollars (\$1,400,000,000) in cuts. And it was to my understanding that it's the Governor's job as well as our job to balance the budget. In other words, have a responsible budget that impacts all of the citizens here in the State of Illinois. And so we're going back and forth and I'm not... I'm not sure if it's... if it's political, if It's certainly not professional and a it's personal. number of those individuals who can't afford to hire

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

lobbyists or take the three-hour trip down here and give their voice on a particular issue, they could care less whether the Speaker is getting along with the Governor, whether the Governor's getting along with the President or the Speaker or whomever. They could care When you walk the streets of Chicago in some of these tough neighborhoods they will just look down upon us here in this chamber and over in the Senate and try to figure out what the world that we're doing down here. lot of the young people were just asking me just this weekend, where are our summer jobs? I'm sure if you go in the southern part of our state where there is a great deal of poverty, as well, it's not just the cit... the City of Chicago or Cook County, they'll ask that question as well. So, again here we are backtracking trying to overdo or redo something that we should have taken care of at least twice to correct and we're still about to lose or miss an opportunity to receive federal matching dollars. It's real sad that we're in this state today and I'm just looking for an end to it all, quite frankly, from our Leadership, from us as rank and file Members and coming up with some way to do the right thing for the people of the state. You know, we override the... a lot of these Motions, the Senate may not even call this Bill. We still may not even have the money needed to pay for the basic programs, let alone get a federal match. So, that's the state of affairs that we're in apparently and guess who's going to suffer. The average citizen here in this state."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Jakobsson."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Jakobsson: "Representative, would this... treatment services, do they cover methamphetamine addiction?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I'm glad you mentioned the issue of methamphetamine which you know is ravaging downstate Illinois. It's a problem in my district. I believe that these programs in Motion 7 and 8 are comprehensive addiction treatment services and that those providers who have meth problems in their district are certainly focused on that problem in their areas and in their communities."

Jakobsson: "Thank you. I have a provider in my district and I have attended some of its graduations. I've attended drug court graduations, and I've seen people who have been addicted to many different kinds of drugs, including meth, graduate from these programs they've and become contributing citizens once again. Their lives have been made whole. And also the provider that I'm speaking of tries to work with the families while they're victims, because if they're in a household where there's been meth use the children have often suffered because of being around those kinds of conditions and they've provided programs for the children, also. And I believe when we can help people overcome their addictions we're making sure that the state saves dollars in other areas in... incarceration and other ways that benefit. There's probably a decrease rate in domestic violence, lower on-

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- the-job accidents and fatalities when people have been treated. So, I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McCarthy."
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is put. Representative Feigenholtz to close."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I encourage everyone to support this and remind the Body that this will require 71 votes to override."
- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion pass, notwithstanding the item Vetoes of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. 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 66 voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no'. And the Motion fails. On page 3 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 1987. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1987 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "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 July 16, 2008, reported the

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' Amendments 4 and 5 to Senate Bill 1987."
- Speaker Madigan: "So, Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendments 4 and 5, offered by Representative Hannig, have both been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig on Amendment #4."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment represents a negotiated agreement between Commonwealth Edison and Tenaska and I'd ask that it be adopted."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment 5, offered by Representative Hannig."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "This actually is just a technical Amendment. I'd ask that it be adopted."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. However, a state debt note has been filed on House Amendment #3 and not yet filed."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Speaker Madigan: "So, since the... Amendment #3 was not adopted, put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1987, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."

"Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Hannia: Back at the end of May I came to you with a proposal that would allow a company in my district to do a study which would allow them at least the possibility of building a clean coal gasification power plant in my district. that time, Commonwealth Edison opposed the Bill for a number of reasons. However, in the interim we were able to have some negotiations take place between Tenaska and theCommonwealth Edison company and they've adopted in the Amendments that we've just put on some safeguards so that Commonwealth Edison now is comfortable in a position where they can say that they actually support the Bill. now come to you today with a Bill that Commonwealth Edison supports that would allow us to build a cle... at least study the possibility of building a clean coal electric plant in my district. I think it makes eminent sense for us today to not only look at our options with natural gas, but to look at the options of what we can do here in Illinois to burn coal in a clean way. So, I'd be happy to answer any questions, but this is a very important Bill for downstate Illinois and for the coal fields of Illinois and I'd certainly ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Winters."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Winters: "Gary, I believe this is pretty much the same Bill that we faced in May at the last minute. There have been some changes made to it, but it still... it's primarily trying to use Illinois coal and then requiring the sequestration of at least 90 percent of the carbon. If they don't meet that 90 percent they can then go out and buy carbon credits. Is that a fair summation?"

Hannig: "That's correct."

Winters: "Now, it also, I believe, has some provisions that Commonwealth Edison, while there are no transmission lines that are capable of carrying the power from the Ameren territory up to ComEd, they have some kind of an agreement that would allow them to buy in the PJM market, but the Taylorville facility would cover the costs by them selling the power into the ISO. Is that... aquire from the..."

Hannig: "That's... You're correct, Representative."

Winters: "Do you have any further detail on that?"

Hannig: "I think you've actually explained it."

Winters: "Well, the... the problem that I have with the Bill, again, I wish that we weren't faced with these without hearings on the Bill. We did have one hearing in the House on the underlying Bill in May two (2) days before the end of Session. We have not had the opportunity to hear this one. At least it didn't come to E & E or to the Utility Oversight Committee. My concern is whether or not we're simply giving a competitive advantage to Commonwealth Edison and Ameren against their market competitors, the

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

alternative retail energy suppliers known as ARES. I believe the objective or an underlying objective to this Bill is to reregulate the Illinois market to some extent, to not allow the free and open competition. And my understanding again from some of the lobbyists, is that the ARES would not have the same exact cap on their price as the major utilities do."

Hannig: "Well, Representative, the purpose of this Bill from the start has been to find a way that we can burn Illinois coal in this state, a resource that we have in great abundance, where we can do it in a way that's clean for the environment and a way that creates jobs here for our Illinois citizens. Now, Commonwealth Edison was... was willing to sit down with us and to negotiate in good faith and they had some concerns and we put things into the Bill that provide for more oversight by the Illinois Commerce Commission."

Winters: "Yes. You have an agreement with Commonwealth Edison. You do not have an agreement with all parties that are in the energy market in Illinois and my concern is that the utility customers are going to be paying for unproven technology. Now, I believe, and correct me if I'm wrong, not having been to any hearings on this I may well be wrong, but we are asking for a study to be done of this Taylorville facility. Finding out what the cost of delivered energy are... as well as the consultants can tell ahead of time. At the same time that we're starting that process, the study of the economics of this, we are asking the utility buyers to sign contracts to buy the power in

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

the future. Is that a.m. is that still in the Bill as it was in May?"

Hannig: "So, nothing would so... The answer is yes, but make sure that you under..."

Winters: "So, it was bad in May, it's still bad."

Hannig: "Pardon?"

Winters: "If you're... you're holding a gun to the head of a utility buyer... of an electricity buyer and saying here's a contract, sign it, we'll tell you later what it's going to cost you."

Hannig: "Representative..."

Winters: "When the study comes back, we'll tell you."

Hannig: "So... so we... we have to come back and you and I will have an opportunity to examine the study. The Illinois Commerce Commission will have an opportunity to examine the study. Any number of experts can look at the study, but the point is we worked with Commonwealth Edison and I might add that Ameren is neutral on the Bill. And I think that in the past when they objected that they had concerns that what you said was true."

Winters: "Commonwealth Edison is not the only one that we have to be concerned about in setting public policy in this state. We have to be concerned about the consumers and my fear is..."

Hannig: "Absolutely."

Winters: "...that an unproven technology may well drive up utility prices, particularly for the businesses in Illinois who are buying on the open market in competition. There are companies competing with Commonwealth Edison who are

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

supplying power to companies based on their demand needs, their load needs, at a... at a more competitive rate. Now, if we cap the price paid by the consumer... by the residential consumer and these companies that are selling, the ARES, can only raise prices so much on the residential and yet their prices are rising higher, what's going to happen is that business is going to be bearing the burden. They're going to become un... uncompetitive. They won't have price... the same price as they do in other states and we're going to drive jobs out of Illinois."

just Hannig: "Yeah. I... Ι would simply disagree, Representative. I think that this is good. It would create jobs in the State of Illinois, in the coal fields of Illinois. It's going to open coal mines where we can have hundreds of good-paying jobs. It's going to help... if this is successful, this study, it's going to help us set a pattern where we can burn Illinois coal and do it in a clean way that then can be replicated throughout the State of Illinois and we can see power plants again that create good jobs... good-paying jobs and are competitive and clean. And so, we've got to take that first step and I think that this is a place where we, in the State of Illinois, can weigh-in and say that we're willing to work with people in the industry who want to do this and we can move forward with this project, Representative, still reserving the right to say no if we believe that in the end that the study doesn't justify it."

Winters: "I agree that we need to support the Illinois coal industry and coal miners. We need to continue producing

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

the power here in this state. I just object to the idea that we are not in... investigating this well enough before we set up the scheme. The last line of questioning I'd like to ask is what do we do at the end of the... it's almost a lease-to-own. After the... the contracts run out does the ownership of that plant revert to the State of Illinois... to the Illinois Power Authority?"

Hannig: "I think that option is still there, Representative."

Winters: "Well, I... I didn't say that the option was out there. What happens at the end of the lease? Does the Illinois Power Authority then take over the ownership or would they have to pay a fair market value for any... any value that's left. What... what is at the end of the lease? I guess maybe I can read on page 29 of this Bill, 'permit the Illinois Power Agency to assume ownership of the coal facility without monetary consideration.' Now, doesn't that say that the state will receive this plant at the end of... I don't know what the term of this is."

- Hannig: "Yeah. So... so, it says that they may, Representative. It doesn't compel them, if for some reason they don't wish to. But if there's a valuable asset there, then you are correct, I'm sure that they would take it."
- Winters: "So, this... this is a method in this Bill of the state becoming a power producer."
- Hannig: "Well, I would anticipate if the state took that plant some years down the road, they would either sell it or they would hire some management company to run it."
- Winters: "So... so, that's almost like if you pass this Bill, thirty (30) years from now we're going to give you a

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

valuable asset. Isn't that kind of pay-to-play? Is this company in fact asking us to pass this legislation and offering the state as an incentive to pass this, hey, thirty (30) years in the future we're going to give you a live coal plant that's sequestering carbon and we'll give it to you for nothing."

Hannig: "Well, Representative, it could be that by thirty (30) years this technology will be out of date. I mean this... there's no... there's no question..."

Winters: "Well, why shouldn't we let the market decide how to invest the market's money."

Hannig: "Why would we walk away from someone wanting to give us the plant after thirty (30) years if they so choose, Representative? It would be..."

Winters: "I'm not... I'm not saying that that would be an intelligent move to make at that point."

Hannig: "I think..."

Winters: "You know, if it's a free asset, yeah, give it the state."

Hannig: "Okay."

Winters: "But the point of it is, why are we trying to intervene in the market and telling the market where to put the money? It should be the investors in Tenaska and in Wall Street and with Goldman Sachs that's going to be selling these bonds that should be taking the risk."

Hannig: "And so, Rep..."

Winters: "Not the consumers of Illinois."

Hannig: "But Representative, I think anytime that you begin the new... to do new technology it's always the difficulty of

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

building that first plant and the risk that is... that is there with building that first plant. Once you get a plant up and running and you show that it works, just like we were trying to do with FutureGen, then it can become the model for everything that come after and there can be improvements built on it. But we have to get that first plant up and running and that's what we tried to do with FutureGen and that's what we're trying to do here with It's the best opportunity we have for Illinois coal today and I'd suggest that if we don't pass this Bill today we really send a message to the rest of the... to the rest of the country that Illinois's really not serious about developing their coal assets. They're really not serious about clean energy and clean coal. It's just simply a lot of rhetoric. So, I'd say we need to put our money where our mouth is. We still reserve the right to say no if we believe that the ... that the study indicates that this doesn't make economic sense, but I think we need to... to allow this process to move forward and that's all we're asking."

Winters: "Mr. Speaker, I appreciat… appreciate your indulgence with the time for the questioning. I think this is… this Bill is a case of the state trying to intervene in the open markets and pick the winner. They're trying to pick ARES as the losers. I think it's the wrong statement for this state to make. Let the market decide where the best investment for our dollars are and I would ask for a verification."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, I did not support the Bill in May. I thought that it needed some clarification. I am actually on the Clean Coal Board and... and I thought there needed to be some work done to this Bill. I think at this point this is a Bill that needs to move, because of a couple of things you said. First of all, the industry in Illinois... the coal industry in Illinois as a result of a successful prototype plant could provide this state with thousands of good-paying jobs and an alternative source of energy that everyone in here would agree. And basically at this point there are safeguards in this Bill that would require any additional contracting, purchasing, or any of the concerns, they'd have to come back here. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "Yes. And also the Commonwealth Edison negotiations provided that there would be oversight by the Illinois Commerce Commission, that purchases would be reviewed, that there would be a three-year review. I mean all the safeguards that I think that you probably were correct in saying were lacking in May are in the Bill now."

Eddy: "And... and at this point, I think through some very hard work, negotiations, all but a few folks are not supporting this, but I don't know of very many Bills, since I've been here, that, well, especially complicated Bill like this that are going to have 100 percent of the people involved on-board, supporting something. I think you've done a good job with this. I would urge my colleagues to vote for this. Southern Illinois and the coal industry and the jobs that could be supported by this type of legislation and

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

more importantly... more importantly what this technology could do for the United States and the use of coal as an alternative energy if we can... if we can through this study provide that, this is a terrific investment. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Granberg."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Granberg: Obviously, I rise in support of the Bill. House. are two (2) projects in this legislation, one is Tenaska and one is Power Holdings. We did the legislation three (3) years ago to allow Power Holdings to enter into longterm contracts for the sale of synthetic natural created by the use of Illinois coal in an environmentally friendly manner. We did that and it passed I think near unanimously. We are back today to extend it because when Power Holdings filed their application for an EPA permit it was initially rejected. They've had to file an amended permit. So, it is now going through the permitting process. We needed the additional time so we can conclude that process and it will be... it will be approved. There is no downside to that project. It substantially... it provides for the sale of synthetic natural gas at substantially less than current market rates, almost 30 percent. synthetic natural gas will be created in downstate Illinois. We piped... the contracts are being entered into with Peoples Gas and others in the Chicago... in northern Illinois. So, that's going to be providing consumer relief and given these market prices you can understand that. So, this will happen for a period of ten (10) years.

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

have less than market rates for natural gas in northern Illinois. So, that's why this... I... it's good for all of us. going to be a... over a two billion dollar (\$2,000,000,000) project in southern Illinois, fifteen hundred (1500) jobs, four hundred (400) permanent jobs, good-paying jobs, not services... not service industry It's environmentally friendly, jobs, long-term. pollution, and it's pro-consumer because those contracts are going to provide for substantial lower than market rates for consumers. So, I stand in strong support with Representative Hannig. That Tenaska project that's on the cutting edge of technology, but one of the previous speakers talked about how consumers wouldn't be affected or it'd be anticonsumer. In fact, it's the reverse. you can provide additional energy, additional power because the power increase is going to be in the future, that's pro-consumer. Because we do have free markets and the more power generated that's more competition and that drives prices down for consumers. So, I strongly urge an 'aye' vote on this because it's very, very pro-consumer, it creates jobs, it's good for the people of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "Representative, I had some concerns when this... the first version of this Bill came up in May. I want to make sure I understand the impact of some of the changes and what some of the impact might be if this goes forward."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Hannig: "Sure."

Fortner: "First of all, the study. What's the anticipated date that we would have that back?"

Hannig: "I think we're looking at probably a year, maybe a year and a half."

Fortner: "And then if that went forward about how long would it take to have this plant up in operation?"

Hannig: "I think, you know, assuming we would give it the green light, if the study came back and things look good..."

Fortner: "And that's... with the assumption, I mean..."

Hannig: "...it would probably be about a three-year project to build."

Fortner: "Okay. Now, one of the concerns that a previous speaker raised was this question of how the cap is applied between the util... the utilities versus customers who are buying through ARES or other... other sources, other than the resident utilities. And as I understand in this version there is still a distinction in the application of the cap in that the cap only applies to those resident utilities. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "Yes. That's correct."

Fortner: "So, what it seems to me is that in order to keep a level playing field between those possible sources, what we're really doing is we're relying on this Body and our fellow Members across the building to utilize that study and should the rate come in higher than the cap, we certainly could approve that higher rate. But at that point, that would be the place and that would only be the place, as I understand it, where we would open up that

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

discrepancy between the… the utilities and the ARES and other third-party energy providers. Is that… that's really the only place where we could get that disparity to the customers. Is that right? Do I understand that?"

Hannig: "I guess I'm not quite sure."

Fortner: "Okay. Let me... let me ask it a different way then. Let me assume that the study comes back. It's economically feasible but the rate that it would take in order to be economically feasible is a dollar amount higher than the cap that's provided in the language of this Bill. Should that happen, as I understand it, there is the potential then that people who... whose contracts roll over after that point... after this point contracts before this point whenever this would become effective or grandfathered in but a newer contracts could then be impacted with a higher rate if they were not buying it through ComEd or Ameren, the companies which would be covered with the cap under this Bill. So, in that circumstance it looks like that would be the one case where that could open up."

Hannig: "So, I think... I think, Representative, the early part of your... your remarks are important as well. When we say that it takes a year or year and a half to do the study and we'll see where we're at then. And then as they begin... and that's really the time where we'll start to have to make some hard decisions and we'll see what impact that it..."

Fortner: "Right."

Hannig: "...could have on consumers and we'll say yes or no. And we'll see what potential impact it may or may not have on ARES and we may make some adjustments to the law there. No

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

one's saying that this Bill today should be a final way of... of beginning or of... of regulating the industry. We're simply saying that this should be the beginning, that we should begin to look at the process."

Fortner: "And I appreciate that comment because certainly it seems to be one of the paths that we might have to adopt should we find that it is economically viable, but would require a higher rate, would be in fact to come back as a Body and say we seriously need to revisit what that cap amount is if we want to keep a level playing field between all the possible electric suppliers to our residential commercial customers."

Hannig: "I would agree with that, Representative."

Fortner: "So, and I appreciate that comment. I think that certainly clears up the questions I had what I saw were some of the potential pitfalls. I think it's important for this Body to understand that, as I think you've accurately portrayed, this is not the end of the line. We may be forced with some very tough decisions, either to say we don't think we can afford to go ahead with this or in order to keep a fair and level playing field we may need to relook at that cap amount that we had in the Bill to keep an even playing field. Is that... is that a fair assessment of your earlier comments?"

Hannig: "I think that's a fair assessment. Yes. I mean, so I think some of the groups always look at a worst case scenario and how it could affect them, but clearly what you pointed out is... is very true. There's going to be a period of time that takes place, a study's going to come back, and

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

then we have to begin to make some really difficult decisions perhaps on which way do we go, but let's not... let's not jump to the conclusions and vote this Bill down today because of what may or may not happen five (5) years from now. Let's... let's cross that bridge when we get there."

Fortner: "I appreciate your answers. I think that's a realistic portrayal and I hope everyone was paying attention because these will be, I think, important decisions that this Body is going to be faced with in the coming couple years. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flider."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, first I'd Flider: like to congratulate you. I know you've worked awfully hard on this Bill. This legislation is vitally important for not only central Illinois, but also all of Illinois. As many of you know, this will provide a number of goodpaying jobs should this project go through for our area, not only from a construction standpoint but also from the standpoint of permanent jobs. But I think from a long-term standpoint, you know, this is a very, very important Bill for the State of Illinois because I think it's important to recognize that there are no power plants being built in the State of Illinois right now. And it's because of the changing nature of our industry, nobody's building any power plants and certainly none that would utilize Illinois So, these two (2) projects represent some of our best chance... chances to have Illinois coal used and if we don't move forward with projects like this, if Illinois

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

does not exhibit the kind of leadership necessary on these kinds of projects and to use Illinois coal, we will, quite frankly, see the Green Movement pass Illinois by and it'll be too late to be using Illinois coal because we're going to be seeing other alternative energy programs and nobody's going to be building any projects, nobody's going to be building any power plants. And we need these power plants for our growing economy. So, if we don't build this plant, if we don't move forward, Illinois coal will suffer, Illinois can suffer and we certainly don't want to see that from an economic standpoint. We need power. We need it to be power by Illinois coal and again, Mr. Hannig, I commend you for all your hard work and hope this gets all the votes it needs to pass. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative May."

May: "Thank you. I stand in strong support of this and while many others have spoken to jobs and other issues, I'd like to speak to the environmentalism. There are really three (3) points that are very important for people who care about the environment. One is the sequestration, the demand response, and the renewables. I'll first speak to the renewables. We are doubling the renewable portfolio standard in this state and that is very, very important and what's new, I can have the Sponsor to indeed confirm that, it's the capture and sequestration of carbon. This is very, very important to the environment. While I would like it to be 100 percent right away, this starts us to be thinking about the sequestration of the carbon. It's going to be 50 percent for the coal going to 90 percent and right

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

away 90 percent on the gas. A rough estimate is that this would save three and a half million (3,500,000) tons of carbon a year. So, this is a very inexpensive way to deal with it and I think it's important that we're starting to look at carbon sequestration in our state. Also, if the Sponsor would confirm the… the penalties included in the demand response. There are penalties, aren't there? Representative Hannig, there are penalties if they… the utilities are being asked to…"

Hannig: "Yes. Yes that's correct."

May: "Yes. How strong are those penalties? Very strong?"

Hannig: "Yeah. So the ICC can take action, Representative..."

May: "Okay."

Hannig: "...and I think they can... they can apply the appropriate penalty."

"Yes. And the demand response really to explain it is... May: This is a new part of the Bill, too, which I complement you on, it allows the utilities to shave off peak prices. This will also help the consumers with rates. It's avoiding the purchase so that we're not purchasing power at the very top rate. This will help homeowners and small businesses by avoiding the purchase with this new demand response provision which I think is very important. I heard some misinformation going round. The Sierra Club, someone would say that they're against this Bill. That is false. is absolutely false. The Sierra Club is neutral on this Bill and many of the environmental Sierra Club members are applauding some portions of this for what they're doing for the environment. The Environmental Law and Policy Center,

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

I think, is strongly in favor of it because of the increase in our renewable portfolio standards. So, this is taking a great step forward for the environment to use a resource we have and to make sure that we are not polluting, in fact, we are capturing the carbon and we are also shaving off the peak usage of electricity and bringing down the prices. So, Representative, I am pleased to join you in supporting this Bill."

Hannig: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Tha... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The question is put. Mr. Hannig to close."

Hannig: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We need the record to reflect that Representative Krause is excused."

Speaker Madigan: "Yes, we will. Thank you."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. How often can someone get up and say that this Bill's being supported by environmental groups and the Illinois Coal Association. It seems to me that when we can bring those two (2) groups together to do something that's good for the environment and that's good for Illinois coal that we as... in this chamber ought to be supportive of that legislation. So, let's... let's just understand that this is the Bill that

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

will help us use Illinois coal. It will create jobs here In fact, in the Tenaska plant it's estimated in Illinois. that fifteen hundred (1500) construction jobs, two hundred (200) permanent coal mining jobs, and a hundred and fifty (150) permanent operating jobs would be created if the study indicates that it's feasible to produce this clean coal. We know that the Power Holding would create five hundred to eight hundred and fifty (500 to 850) full-time jobs and over fifteen hundred (1500) union construction jobs. So, these are real jobs and good-paying jobs for people. We know that the legislation has safeguards. gives the Illinois Commerce Commission great authority to impose penalties and to review the purchases that would be made at Tenaska. It does not mandate that any or any... that any current or future power company use clean coal, it simply provides a framework for those who wish to use it. So, it seems to me, Ladies and Gentlemen, that when we have an opportunity to create jobs, when have opportunity to burn Illinois coal in an environmental way we should... we should seize that opportunity. So, please join me in voting 'yes' on this important Bill so that we can provide jobs in Illinois and that we can provide a future for people who wish to be in the coal mining industry in Illinois. This is a very important Bill to me and my district and I'd simply ask each and every one of you to help me make this happen. Please vote 'yes'."

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

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 86 people voting 'yes', 5 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk... Mr. Clerk, please put House Bill 5701 in the record and let's go to Motion 8. Motion 8. Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We had in Motion #7 had a discussion about some of the cuts in the Department of Alcohol and Substance Abuse agency. This is the larger reduction Veto. This only requires 60 votes for community-based addiction treatment services for non-Medicaid eligibles. This was a 50 percent reduction in services. This is the large forty-three million dollar (\$43,000,000) cut and I'm encouraging an 'aye' vote for restoration. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm just going to speak to the Motion. Regardless of what we just heard when we debated #7, I received information from three (3) of the different groups that I consider to be the experts in alcohol abuse, one is IADDA, the other is the Community Behavioral Association and another is Serenity House and Advocacy Group in my area. According to them, the budget cuts are forty-three million dollars (\$43,000,000) cut from addition... addiction services. The budget cuts will relo... will result in a loss of fifty-five million dollars (\$55,000,000) in federal matching funds. Now I know Representative Dunkin you called the Governor's Office but this was given to me on fact sheets by three (3) different

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

organizations that, I think, are experts in the field. The cuts in Motion 8 will redust... reduce the treatment system by 43 percent, a brutal and indiscriminate reduction that will devastate the treatment providers across our state. We spoke before that 70 percent of the people in our prisons are dual diagnosis, mental health and substance abuse. A 43 percent cut of one agency is unfair and it will result in more people in the prisons, more people in our state institutions, more people in our emergency rooms and more people in deaths like that little girl that was on the cover of the newspapers today. I encourage you to support this Motion and keep DASA as a whole agency. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thanks for the clarification, Representatives Feigenholtz and Bellock. I, too, got some clarification from the organizations along this line and...

Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. I want to add to the comments of my colleague who just stated. You know, the obvious are all the cuts with the children with the homelessness because one of my main programs back in my district have to do with helping homeless individuals and people who are becoming homeless and that's... that's a resounding sound throughout the state on the issues that we have in this state with mortgage rates. But what I want to address besides getting information from my area, Breaking Free, that serves Kane County, DuPage and Grundy and the

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

cuts they're going to go through is the things that we're not talking about. But one of the our colleagues on the other side that I have great respect for has spoken about and that is veterans. That is post traumatic stress in veterans and how they deal with issues. What they do is they don't ask for a handout. What they do is they go to a bottle and start drinking. They go to drugs and start using drugs. So, what my main concern is what we're doing to devastate my veterans, especially the ones that are returning that are homeless, that have nothing to look forward to but a bottle of booze, drugs, methamphetamine, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. And if you didn't believe in the, you know, vote 'yes' to the last one this gives you a chance to, because these issues especially... The reason why we sit here is someone died for our right to sit here. We should not allow our veterans that are going through so many issues that come back on ground right now in our history, in this country in Illinois have to suffer these drastic blows even more issues that we promised them and now we're not given them again. So, I strongly urge a support of the Veto override for this 'cause this is just going way drastically overboard, not to mention the matching funds we get from federal to support our veterans and now we're not going to do that. So, I... I strongly urge a 'yes' vote to veto override the Governor's. Thank you." "The question is, 'Shall this line item be

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this line item be restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Have all voted who wish? Please. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 65 'ayes' and 22 'noes'. The Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, this line item is declared restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor. The next Motion will be #6. Rep... Representative Dugan on Motion 6."

Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker. Motion #6 to override and restore the hundred and forty-eight... a little over a hundred and forty-eight million (148,000,000) for the 2002 schools that have been waiting for their construction money. know that there's a lot of questions on this. explained it every year. We've done legislation to re... to put that money back in the budget so that these schools can get paid. This was an agreement and an obligation of this state since 2002. As we continue to move forward and talk about the money that we... we should spend and the priorities of this state, I certainly think it should be something that has been promised to schools from southern Illinois to Chicago since 2002. So again, I'll be glad to answer any questions, but this is something that's had bipartisan support for the last four (4) years every time we've passed It's important to these schools and it's only living up to the obligation that this state has had. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Dugan requests leave that these item be considered on a single Roll Call. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Dugan, this basically refers to the school districts... the twenty-three

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

(23) or twenty-four (24) school districts that have waited since '02?"

Dugan: "Correct."

Eddy: "Specifically, this would fund those projects and it was... it was cut by the Governor."

Dugan: "Correct. Yes, it was vetoed out by the Governor and it is those twenty-four (24) schools."

Eddy: "Just those twenty-four (24) schools."

Dugan: "Correct."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion pass, notwithstanding the item Vetoes of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. 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 'yes', 26 voting 'no'. The Motion fails. The next Motion is Motion 22. Representative Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Motion #22 is the reinstatement of the Governor's Total Veto of MAP grant and formula funding consisting of eighteen million dollars (\$18,000,000)."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this line item pass, notwithstanding the item Veto of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 57 'ayes', 30 'noes'. The Motion fails. The next Motion shall be #23.

Mr. Miller."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- Miller: "...you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion #23 is restoring the Total Veto for the diversity higher education facility program in Illinois worth 2.8 million dollars (\$2,800,000). This is not... this was not an increase in the initial budget."
- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this line item pass, notwithstanding the item Veto of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 55 'ayes', 32 'noes'. The Motion fails. The next Motion will be #24. Mr. Miller."
- Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion #24 restores the ten million dollars, fifteen thousand nine hundred (\$10,015,900) for increase in the operating grants for the Illinois Community College Board to the Governor's introduced... introduction level."
- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this line item be restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This requires 60 votes. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 58 'ayes', and 29 'noes'. The Motion fails. The next Motion will be #25. Mr. Miller."
- Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Keeping with my perfect track record right now. Motion #25 is a restoration for the Community College Board for the P16 initiative grant through the ICCB worth two... two million, seven hundred seventy-nine thousand (2,779,000). Thank you."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, we'd like to change your fate here in your record a little bit. This is a very important issue, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We have been dealing with trying to reform education and connecting early childhood all the way through higher education for several years. We've passed a P-20 Council. We've got the State Board of Higher Education engaged in working with other... with the State Board of Education and with other groups to look at this whole issue of how we can collect data, how we can work with the different groups to... to look at the continuity to look at the growth of our students. Mr. Speaker, I... or Representative Miller, do you have some thoughts about the P-20 Council and how important this is to reform in the State of Illinois?"

Miller: "Absolutely. Representative Pritchard, I'm glad we're on the same page. You know, I've been sitting here all day and as we said when these Bills first came up in May as I never looked at Higher Education fighting within itself, I thought it was fighting in terms of Corrections and other departments. Not that you're trying to put Peter against Paul, but if higher education is where all children should be then we need to get in the game of trying to really put our votes where our mouth is in terms of educating our children. You... you and myself... you started the Education Caucus here in the House and are very much concerned with the continuity of those children who attend elementary

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

school to... for them to attend college and have more of a seamless flow between the two (2) instead of competing against each other. This initiative is... is exactly where we need to go. It's exactly what we need to do as a state. Representative Mitchell, as you know, has been a tremendous proponent of this... the P-20 Council and others. So, it's for us to put the money where the... where we need to go as a state in the direction of higher ed. If we're trying to reduce graduation rates, if we're trying to decrease the despairs... disparity of those who attend college and don't... don't, if we're trying to look at those who are first generation college, which are all realistic things in our state, then this is where we need to go. This is what we need to do and this is just only to me makes good sense and public policy."

Pritchard: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we can talk all afternoon about how this budget may not be balanced and how there may not be dollars here, but what we have to do as elected Representatives of this state is make some priority choices. If we don't make a priority choice to change the education outcomes that we get, we're always going to get the same thing. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is an item that is a priority that we ought to vote to override. I ask for your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Riley."

Riley: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I'd like to add my support for this initiative. You know, many of us and... as far as these Motions for overrides having to do with higher education, let's get on a positive roll in terms of

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

overriding these initiatives. This kind of initiative has gotten support from both sides of the aisle. It is extremely important and certainly it's very important in my district and I think it's important that we really get off the dime as a state with regards to supporting higher education. So, I would add my support to the passage of this Motion and all other subsequent Motions. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this line item pass, notwithstanding the item Veto of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. 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 53 'ayes', and 34 'noes'. The Motion fails. The next Motion will be #26. Mr. Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion #26 restores various cuts, Total Vetoes made by the Governor to Chicago State Community College Board, Governors State, Higher Ed... the Board of Higher Education, Illinois State University, Northern Illinois and University of Illinois."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the override of this line item Veto. I think that our children getting into and going into college is extremely important. One of these pieces assist students and families with an approximately fourteen-page application for college admission. A number of people come to the State of Illinois and they are prepared with their applications on a more than timely basis. One of these programs assists the students in the State of Illinois to attend any college in

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

our country, any college, public or private, with an application that is correct and timely. Another one of these programs helps with the AIDS Policy and Prevention. The AIDS Policy and Prevention program. They do AIDS testing and they also do the teaching to young people and olders about how to go out and council people on AIDS prevention. I think these are some very valuable programs and I believe that we should certainly consider our young people and their opportunities to get into college and to be prevented from getting AIDS. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, there's a question on our side regarding one of the line items for the health service education grants."

Miller: "Right."

Eddy: "Those are grants for nursing and other health related..."

Miller: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Do you have the amount of the FY08 funding for that line item? Do you know what that was funded at in FY08? 'Cause this is a... this is an area that also funds scholarships to a critical shortage area of nursing in the state."

Miller: "Representative, I don't have the numbers in front of me on '08, but I think it was zeroed out. I think when we talked and put this in, I think the key... Yeah, this was zeroed out in '08, I believe. We restored this..."

Eddy: "Okay. So, in '08 we passed an amount in that line item that was zeroed out, so the attempt is to restore it to

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

twenty-one million (21,000,000) in this year's budget and in effect his cut would zero it out again?"

Miller: "No."

Eddy: "In FY09. I'm sorry, okay."

Miller: "No. My understanding is that the amount for the grant was zeroed out completely in '08 and so we were trying to restore it to try to get matching funds into this. It wasn't a increase in appropriations for this line item."

Eddy: "I guess I'm still a little confused, Representative, and maybe I've asked the question in the wrong way. But I guess what I'm trying to get at is basically whether or not there is a budget amount that would support grants for critical areas like nursing, if there's a budget amount that remains in the budget if this is not restored that would perform that grant?"

Miller: "One second, Representative. Okay. Yeah, there...

Representative... Yes, there was money in there, I think... I
think to answer your question, yes. There's funds in
there. We bumped it up and his reduction to what the
initial budget what he introduced in."

Eddy: "Okay. So, the choice here is zero or restore the twenty-one million (21,000,000) which was an increase over FY08, because you have to restore the full amount?"

Miller: "Yes. That's correct. That is... that is correct."

Eddy: "Okay. So, last year's amount, whatever it was that was funded, was essentially cut when he zeroed this line item out and to restore it we have to put the amount in, even though it reflects a little bit of an increase because that's your only choice."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Miller: "That's... that's correct. That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. All right. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there leave to take these items on a single Roll Call? Leave is granted. The question is, 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion pass, notwithstanding the item Vetoes of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. 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 55 'ayes', 32 'nays'. The Motion fails. Motion 27, Mr. Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion #27 is a restoration to Illinois State University for scholarship grant awards totaling forty-eight thousand dollars (\$48,000)."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this line item be restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Veto?' Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Leitch. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 53 'ayes', 33 'noes'. The Motion fails. The next Motion will be #17. Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Budget override Motion 17 addresses the Community Care program which is the fastest growing program for seniors in the State of Illinois. The cuts that the Governor imposed on this line item represents 33... We're restoring the full amount of ninety-seven million, six hundred and eighty-six thousand (97,686,000). I've been informed by the department that the Governor's Office just yesterday imposed a 3 percent

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

reserve which is going to be applied to this line also which is going to require substantial service cuts. That means that seniors that work through triple A's in your communities will lose services or will be... they will stop taking applications. It is also unclear how the wage increase of sixty-four million dollars (\$64,000,000) that was passed out of both chambers and signed by the Governor is going to be able to be spent and that is what is going to cause substantial service cuts. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Speaker. Representative, I don't want to beat a dead horse here, but what was the FY08 budget line item amount prior to the Governor's... excuse me, the FY08 line item amount?"

Feigenholtz: "It was one hundred and fifteen million dollars (\$115,000,000) less than this year."

Eddy: "Okay. So the original introduced four hundred and forty-six million, eight hundred and ninety-nine thousand dollars (\$446,899,000) was an increase of one hundred and six million (106,000,000) over the previous year?"

Feigenholtz: "The budget that we passed, Representative Eddy, was one hundred and fifteen million dollars (\$115,000,000) higher than 2008."

Eddy: "Okay. And the Governor's action reduced that by ninety-seven million, six hundred and eighty-six thousand (97,686,000)?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Eddy: "So, the enacted amount, the final amount that the Governor allowed in that line item was still higher than the FY08 amount."

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Feigenholtz: "It was a reflection of program growth."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, wasn't that line item cut, though, the year before?"

Feigenholtz: "It was."

Mulligan: "Would you refresh my memory."

Feigenholtz: "It was cut twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000)."

Mulligan: "So, the money you added in is a sum total of how much of an increase and how much of what would bring them up to where they should be including program growth."

Feigenholtz: "Sixty-four million (64,000,000) of this restoration, Representative Mulligan, is for a wage increase that was passed in House Bill 4144. That and the twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000) that was cut last year or taken out in cycle, adds up to the restoration we're trying to... to do today."

Mulligan: "All right. So, it's a combination of... it wasn't an annualization, it was the beginning of a wage increase?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Mulligan: "So, it was a combination of a beginning of a wage increase, underfunding by a significant amount for FY08,

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

which I remember we were concerned about that at the time, and then program growth..."

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Mulligan: "...from the number of people that needed the program.

So, even though it was an increase, what would you legitimately consider as an increase?"

Feigenholtz: "It's... I don't consider..."

Mulligan: "Just give me the rationale of the amount."

Feigenholtz: "Yeah, I don't consider it. As you know, we sit through hours and hours of this and you've looked at the numbers in this budget longer than I have. And you've seen that the Community Care program now has more senior citizens in the program than nursing home... nursing homes have residents over the age of sixty-five (65). have... this program allows people to age in their homes and choose from a list of services so that they are not prematurely admitted into nursing homes before they have to It's a very popular program, as you know. The... the boomers and the aging population is growing exponentially and this is a very cost-effective program. There is no fat in this program and as I said earlier, Representative Mulligan, I'm sure that you'd be interested to know that there will be substantial service cuts because Governor's Office is also imposing a 3 percent reserve which is going to be applied directly to CCP in their budget. Ultimately, as you know, this is really going to start cutting into the bone."

Mulligan: "Perhaps you or Representative Hannig could tell me at what point in order for these Vetoes to be addressed so

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

that anything would happen, would the Senate have to address what we are doing today?"

Feigenholtz: "One would hope that the number of Vetoes that are going to be sent to the Senate would be enough to compel them to come back."

Mulligan: "Well, you and I, you know, I could tell you a fairytale, too, but we won't go there at this point. But I'm just wondering how many days do we actually have..."

Feigenholtz: "They have fifteen (15) days to act."

Mulligan: "That's what I thought. Okay. So, within fifteen (15) days... In order for any of the work that we've done today to go into effect and this not to just be a ceremonial exercise, they would have to come back within fifteen (15) days and do something about this, correct?"

Feigenholtz: "That is correct."

Mulligan: "I'm going to make a statement to all of this 'cause I think we're getting pretty close to wrapping this up. Seems very hard to comprehend that many of us that work in this area wouldn't have been willing to work on a budget in good fashion with our compatriots on the other side of the aisle and probably in a better fashion than what was happened because obviously this was done to the extent of a great deal of money that was put in here that was extra that's going to make it difficult for any of these things to actually survive, whether the Governor cuts them or not, there's... even if all his cuts go into effect we're still going to be over budget. We're going to have a problem. We haven't worked together on this. I don't think we're adequately representing the people of the State of

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Illinois. I intend to support this because I'm just making a statement over what's happened the last few years and how we run programs, but quite frankly, we all know what's going to happen with these. It's really too bad. I think what you should do is you should be a little more ecumenical on how you handle this and that we should come together better in order to represent the people of this state. We're not doing them justice and we're making a really big mistake here. So, I know in some instances, particularly Representative Feigenholtz have work... and I have worked together on this before. I think this is a very disturbing year. What's happening with this budget is going to have impact and after the election we're going to find out just how big an impact it really is."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hannig is in the Chair. And the Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis."

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

Reis: "Representative Feigenholtz, just a couple of questions.

I want to make sure I heard correctly. Even with the Governor's reduction of ninety-seven million dollars (\$97,000,000), this program is getting an increase over FY08. Correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Well, it was... it was cut twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000) in FY08, Representative, let's not forget that. So, it depends on how... how you define 'increase'."

Reis: "Okay. The FY08 amount was less than, for whatever reduction that was, is still less than the amount that's

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- going to be in FY09. So, they are going to see an increase even with these Veto reductions."
- Feigenholtz: "Yes, but Representative, even with that increase there will be serious service cuts."
- Reis: "Which brings me to my next question, that day when we made all those votes we voted on two (2) budgets. One of them was an increase budget which ultimately went to the Governor. The other one was a flat budget that kept everything at '08 levels and you supported that budget. You're on record for supporting the FY08 budget to carry through into FY09. So, I just want to point out to the people reporting on today's proceedings that you can't make us out to be the bad people who are trying to do… bring forth a balanced budget when you in fact yourself voted for a budget that was the same as FY08, which would have been the reduction."
- Feigenholtz: "Representative, there's a big difference in supporting a flat budget when the whole budget is flat, then a budget like this where there are increases... substantial increases in some parts of the budget and substantial draconian cuts in others."
- Reis: "You... we're talking about this particular line item. In... in the flat budget it would of been the same as FY08, which is even less than the amount that's going to remain after the Governor's Vetoes."
- Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry, I thought you were talking about the whole budget when you were making your statement, Representative. I must have misunderstood you."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Reis: "I'm sorry, Representative. I'm glad I cleared that up but... Thank you for your answers."

Hannig: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is an incredible program for... for people who are wanting to stay at home, who need a little bit of help around the house. It's extremely cost-effective. This restoration will do nothing more than just maintain the program and deal with the waiting list of people who are trying to get into the program. I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall the line item be restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunkin, Mitchell and Winters, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 58 voting 'yes', and 27 voting 'no'. And the Motion fails. Representative Feigenholtz is recognized on Motion #13. And the Lady asks leave to suspend all applicable House Rules and to consider all line items on a single Roll Call. And leave is granted. Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Budget override Motion #13 is a Total Veto, two million dollars (\$2,000,000) for school-based health centers, 1.8 million (1,800,000) for the Great Start program, a million dollars (\$1,000,000) for homeless youth and transitional housing. I'd be glad to answer any question."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- Speaker Hannig: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion? So, then the question is, 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion notwithstanding the items vetoed... the item Vetoes of the Governor?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 71 votes. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Rita and Dunkin, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 52 voting 'yes' and 35 voting 'no'. And the Motion fails. Representative Feigenholtz... excuse me, Representative Molaro, for what reason do you rise?"
- Molaro: "Well... Yes, just an inquiry of the Chair. For us older Members who don't like to drive home when it's dark out, how many more of these do we have left? Do you have any idea or indication as to when we might be adjourning?"
- Speaker Hannig: "It doesn't get dark 'til about 9,

  Representative. Representative Feigenholtz is recognized on Motion #14."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Budget override Motion 14 includes two million dollars (\$2,000,000) for Chicago area project, 1.6 million dollars (\$1,600,000) for domestic violence shelters, 1.4 million (1,400,000) that was cut for sexual assault program from the Federal Government, one million (1,000,000) for funeral and burial expenses, seven hundred and fifty-eight thousand (758,000) for homeless youth, and one hundred and fifty-five thousand (155,000) for social... SSI advocacy services."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- Speaker Hannig: "So, the Lady seeks leave to suspend all applicable House Rules and consider all items on a single Roll Call. Is there objection? There being no objection, leave is granted. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the line item contained in the Sponsor's Motion be restored, notwithstanding the item reductions of the Governor?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Munson, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 58 voting 'yes', and 29 voting 'no'. And the Motion fails. Representative Feigenholtz, on Motion #15."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Governor eliminated the ombudsmen program, the increase for the ombudsmen program. It was a Total Veto of four hundred and fifty thousand dollars (450,000). This Motion requires 71 votes. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this line item pass, notwithstanding the item Veto of the Governor?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 53 voting 'yes' and 34 voting 'no'. And the Motion fails. Representative Feigenholtz on Motion #16."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- Feigenholtz: "My average is going down, Mr. Speaker. Budget override Motion #16 is general revenue for the elder abuse and neglect program for two million dollars (\$2,000,000). It's a reduction Veto. It requires 60 votes and rolls the appropriation back to '08 levels."
- Speaker Hannig: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."
- Eddy: "Representative, I just want to make sure again on this one. This simply restores this line item to FY08 and it deals specifically with elderly abuse and we're funding it at the same level."
- Feigenholtz: "Yes, this cuts it back to the '08 level."
- Eddy: "All right. There's no increase. All right. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."
- Feigenholtz: "I'd appreciate your support. This requires 60 votes."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this line item be restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Washington, Tracy, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 58 voting 'yes' and 29 voting 'no'. And this Bill having... and this Bill fails. Representative Jakobsson is recognized on Motion #18."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion..."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady first asks leave that we suspend the rules so that the… all the House Rules so that the Motion can be considered on one Roll Call. And leave is granted. So, Representative Jakobsson."

"Motion 18 is for the independent academic medical Jakobsson: center located at Carle Hospital in Champaign, two million dollars (\$2,000,000) and one million dollars (\$1,000,000) each, so... for a total of three million (3,000,000). With the increasing shortage of physicians looming at the same time that we have baby boomers aging, the reduced funding for academic medical centers really doesn't make any sense. It's these funds that assist hospitals in bearing the costs of educating the next generation of physicians and the education of practitioners is well-known to be costly. Medical centings (sic-centers) need support to maintain the programs that are currently being funded. These funds are used to support both medical students and residents, family practice, and internal medicine. And for some the funds are used to promote the interest in research while attaining medical school and residency training. I would urge an 'ave' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion pass, notwithstanding the item Vetoes of the Governor?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

this question, there are 52 voting 'yes' and 35 voting 'no'. And the Motion fails. Representative Feigenholtz on Motion #19. The Lady asks leave that the… that the House Rules be suspended and all House… and all applicable House Rules be suspended so that she can consider these items on a single Roll Call. And leave is granted. Representative Feigenholtz."

- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Budget override Motion 19 is again Medicaid. It restores a reduction Veto that would essentially have an effect on cycle similar to what we did for hospitals and nursing homes. Prescription drugs, IMDs, transportation, home health, appliances, hospice, and labs are all involved in this Motion. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "And on the Lady's Motion, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."
- Eddy: "Representative, again, compare if you could by line item these to the FY08 budget. Are these restoring these amounts to the FY08?"
- Feigenholtz: "Okay. Let me... let me try and explain this to you. The Governor cut six hundred million dollars (\$600,000,000) out of the Medicaid budget. That cut is a reflection of the department being forced to extend the payment cycle in order to pay the bills. The liability does not decrease. It's the payment cycle that increases. It's like an accordion. Every day is about twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000). So, if we're short on money, what we do is we just wait a day... we just continue to add days to... to the providers and extend their payment

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

cycle. They get paid, but it takes substantially longer for them to get paid. For in..."

Eddy: "So we increase the..."

Feigenholtz: "...for instance, the prescription drug line..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Feigenholtz: "...that is in this Motion increases the cycle from sixty-seven (67) to ninety-nine (99) days. That means that your local pharmacy in your district, when they are attempting to get reimbursed for Medicaid prescriptions, are going to have to wait an extra month and a half to get paid."

Eddy: "Okay. Wh... Does that then change the... There was an increase in the line item in order to shorten that then. So, these aren't the '08 amounts, but the attempt was to increase those amounts 'cause it's a dollar-for-dollar match?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Eddy: "And that way when you bring the dollar-for-dollar match into the equation when an increased amount went into that line item it shortens the cycle from, you said ninety (90)... ninety-nine (99) to sixty-seven (67) on the prescription drugs and there's similar reductions in the cycle that... that this was intended to accomplish all throughout that age... and those where cut thereby actually restoring the longer cycles that we saw in the previous year."

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I... I really am having a very difficult time trying to understand what you're asking. So, let me try and explain what is going on here."

Eddy: "Okay."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Feigenholtz: "If we restore... if you vote 'yes' on this Bill, you're essentially saying I prefer that the pharmacists in my district get paid every sixty-seven (67) days instead of every ninety-nine (99) days. If you vote 'no' and this measure fails, all Medicaid prescription providers will have to wait an extra twenty-eight (28) days to get paid."

Eddy: "And to do that... to shorten that cycle..."

Feigenholtz: "Is that clear?"

Eddy: "...we need to put more money in that line item."

Feigenholtz: "And that's what this Bill will do."

Eddy: "Okay. And that's what the introduced amounts did before the reduction."

Feigenholtz: "That's what the enacted amounts did."

Eddy: "Okay. Now, isn't it also necessary for that to happen that the revenue be on hand to pay for those bills? So if you don't pay them... if there's not revenue, they... they won't be paid. Is that accurate? So, for the cycle to actually be shortened there does need to be revenue to support our part of the match."

Feigenholtz: "That is accurate."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Riley."

Riley: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I think everyone knows here the importance of this initiative. The lengthening of the payment cycle just causes tremendous problems, tremendous problems in the health care delivery system. I've got a hospital that's getting rid of their level one trauma status in my district and one of the reasons why is of the long payment cycle. I would support this initiative and I

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

would hope that all of us would vote in favor of it. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan. Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "It's getting to be that time of day. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, would you explain to me what this cut was. It's a reduction in Medicaid and then it goes through the different things. Is this is this a reduction in the rate?"

Feigenholtz: "The Governor's Office hasn't shared that information with us so we don't know."

Mulligan: "Well, Medicaid's an entitlement program, so if someone walks in and qualifies they get it. The only thing I could see is you're either lengthening the payment cycle or you're reducing the rate, but they can't deny the service."

Feigenholtz: "That is correct."

Mulligan: "Much as I am mystified this last six (6) years, over things that have happened, I would be interesting to know what this actual reduction is. Because whether we vote to restore it or not it would have to be a rate because I don't think it matters what we do because if it's just generally services the only way you could do it is by lengthening the payment cycle or reducing rates. So how can you just eliminate it? People get to walk in and they qualify. So, I suppose what I need is for Barry Maram or somebody to enlighten me or your staff if they actually know what this cut is."

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Mulligan: "I think Mr. Lowder said more than that. Yes was not..."

Feigenholtz: "Well, he did. He actually... what he said, Rosemary, is something you already know because..."

Mulligan: "Well, if he's swearing over there..."

Feigenholtz: "...'cause you have so much wisdom..."

Mulligan: "...I'm swearing under my breath, too, but..."

Feigenholtz: "...you know that it's either going to be cut in rate or cut... or in... they're going to do it in cycle.

Right? It's one or the other."

Mulligan: "Right. But he cannot deny..."

Feigenholtz: "We don't know which one, though."

Mulligan: "...service."

Feigenholtz: "I mean, if somebody is around here from the second floor maybe they'll be able to tell us or maybe they haven't really chosen how they intend on exacting their cuts."

Mulligan: "Well, it looks like they reduced drugs, a hundred and seventy million (170,000,000), transportation, three million (3,000,000). I mean, did you make these increases in these lines and that's what they cut or what's... what was the deal?"

Feigenholtz: "Rosemary, these were his increases in his introduced budget."

Mulligan: "So, he cut himself."

Feigenholtz: "This is what the Governor introduced..."

Mulligan: "Isn't that something you ca..."

Feigenholtz: "...in the '09 budget that he claimed he needed for liability. And then he changed his mind."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Mulligan: "Well, maybe he didn't change his mind, with all due respect, maybe he… the revenues changed his mind for him."

Feigenholtz: "That could be."

Mulligan: "So, you know, I can't always be critical except that if you think the services are going to be used you kind of budget for them because you know they're going to be used and you have to do them. So, I'm just real curious as to exactly what this is, 'cause it is a mystery."

Feigenholtz: "It is a mystery. I agree."

Mulligan: "So, I would prefer to be enlightened before people are calling me and just because there's a whole lot of intrigue and feud going on doesn't mean that some of us aren't worried about how we do our job and what's fair for the people of the State of Illinois. So, I would be curious to know what this actually is and perhaps if they pick this up someone could call me from the department and let me know."

Feigenholtz: "I'm sure that your favorite director would be glad to return your call and answer that question for..."

Mulligan: "Actually, that was Steve Schnorf, a few years ago.

Thank you."

Feigenholtz: "You're welcome."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Apparently we're going to continue this charade for the rest of the afternoon and into the evening with more budget override Motions. It's ironic that today in the <a href="News-Gazette">News-Gazette</a> paper and I think most of you that follow state politics would agree that

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

whether you're fr... wherever you're from it's a pretty knowledgeable group of folks on that editorial board. think they have kind of cut to the chase about where we are today. And while there are people sensitive to the whole issue about how we handle various agencies and how they voted today, I think this really in a nutshell says what this is all about. Lawmakers have been playing games with the state budget, and I'm not going to read the whole thing, but sending the Governor an excessively bloated budget without the revenue to support it and then complaining about the cuts he had to make. Why? because he's a petty, vindictive, heart le... heartless politician, who wants to throw widows and orphans into the streets and wants to see state employees lose their jobs? Even those of us who are longtime critics can't honestly make that charge. The reason the Governor had to make the adjustments is because the Democrats knowingly larded the budget with far more spending than anticipated revenue would allow. In another example of childish gamesmanship that pervades Springfield, lawmakers were delighted to force the Governor to undo their overspending and suffer the political consequences. Incidentally, if lawmakers are looking for another place to trim some spending, we have one worthy suggestion, the cost-of-living raises going to Legislators and other state officials. That money would pay for the rate increase for foster parents and maybe even some more. I don't know how long we're going to keep this up today. Everybody knows this is a ridiculous exercise. They said it best. You set this up. You passed a budget

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

that didn't work. There wasn't revenue to support it and then you wanted to complain about it and we are continuing... and it's been said and I'm repeating what a lot of you We are creating so much false hope for already said. people in this state and it's because of the games that we play. It's because we don't like each other. It's because we don't want to talk to each other. It's because we hate each other. We don't trust each other. It's beyond whether or not we don't like somebody. We're not getting hurt. It's the seniors. It's foster kids. It's people dependent on alcohol and drugs. The list goes on and on... autism. But the childish games are finally catching up. You have to pay the piper sometime and the piper's here and if you're going to keep this up, find a way to pay the And Representative, this isn't aimed at you. You're a... I think, an excellent Representative who cares deeply about the issue about all of these issues budgetwise but to continue this today the way we've been doing it, with no revenue, is a huge mistake and is a disservice to every Illinoisan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make a couple comments and respond to the previous Speaker. I have stepped over to his side of the aisle many times in the last week and asked if some of the Republican Members would be willing to sit down and have a conversation about what fund sweeps might be palatable to restore some of these human service cuts and I haven't gotten a warm reception. I would welcome one. I think that earmarking

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

some of the fund sweeps to restore some of the cuts in human services would be an enjoyable exercise bipartisan... in bipartisan spirit and I... that invitation, Representative Cross and Representative Mulligan, are open to both of you. You both know how to reach me. So, I think that the human service providers and the people who depend on these services shouldn't get caught in the petty politics and they shouldn't have to be too involved in whether or not we should connect this with capital funding. I just don't see the connection. I see a part of the budget that has a tremendous amount of growth, that has a tremendous amount of need. I invite any and all of you to sit in this committee any time we are in hours and hours of hearings and having providers across the state who are concerned about their communities. So, having said that, I'd appreciate a supportive vote for Motion #19 so that we can continue to pay the providers who give these services to the people of the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion be restored, notwithstanding the item reductions of the Governor?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 55 voting 'yes' and 32 voting 'no'. And the Motion fails. Representative Monique Davis is recognized on Motion #28."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion 28 is an override of training grants to the Illinois Manufacturing Association. It's for expanding international markets, training grants to the Chicago Manufacturing Center, and for dollars for technology assistance centers. The original amount of the reduction is twenty million, one hundred sixty-three thousand, four hundred dollars (\$20,163,400), of that eight million, six hundred thirty-nine thousand, four hundred dollars (\$8,639,400) were GRF dollars. I will answer questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady asks leave to suspend all applicable House Rules and consider all items on a single Roll Call. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Representative Dunkin."
- Dunkin: "Yes, thank you, Representative. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Dunkin: "Representative, who are these three (3) gentlemen behind us?"

Davis, M.: "Those are the experts in the field of finance."

Dunkin: "You have three (3) wise men... that's what they are.

So, this is a flat reduction here?"

Davis, M.: "It's not a flat reduction."

Dunkin: "Oh, a Total Veto."

Davis, M.: "It's a... let's see, is it a to... yeah, this is Total ve... Veto and it will require 71 votes."

Dunkin: "Okay. I see tourism retention and trade shows are here."

Davis, M.: "That is correct."

Dunkin: "How important is that to our state's economy?"

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Davis, M.: "Well, I think you and the Governor realize that tourism is a great deal of... it brings a lot of money into our state."

Dunkin: "Twenty-two... 26.4 billion dollars (\$26,400,000,000)."

Davis, M.: "So, if tourism is important to the economy of our state, tourism is important for job production in our state, surely, we must override this Veto."

Dunkin: "So, the tourism retention and trade shows that actually helps keep our hotels, our restaurants, some of our convention centers and keeps sort of average Americans here in this state employed."

Davis, M.: "It certainly does. It brings people from all over the world to the State of Illinois to visit our museums..."

Dunkin: "And then we..."

Davis, M.: "...to visit our manufacturing centers, to become a part of theater. As you know, we've passed legislation in reference to tourism to have movies made in the State of Illinois."

Dunkin: "Oh, yes. <u>Batman</u> is being featured tonight, the premiere."

Davis, M.: "What time? What time?"

Dunkin: "6 p.m."

Davis, M.: "Okay."

Dunkin: "If we leave early, with myself and Bob Molaro, before it gets dark..."

Davis, M.: "Do we get free tickets?"

Dunkin: "This is very critical in our state... To the Bill. In our state tourism is fastly becoming one of the top industries here, generating lots of revenues from

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Europeans, Asians, Africans, South Americans. They're literally coming to the City of Chicago, the City of Springfield, possibly East Moline and Rock Island, maybe Rockford one day. And they are taking full advantage of the Euro being higher than the American dollar by investing and spending their leisure time here in our great state. So, Representative, I support you and your effort to restore, retain these cuts that have been made, even though we had two (2) opportunities to... to avoid this conversation or this measure, but I see where you're going and I admire you and what you're trying to do for our great state here. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Moffitt: "Representative, the funding on tourism, is that statewide tourism? Is it the local convention and visitors bureau throughout the state that would..."

Davis, M.: "It's tour... it's the retention of trade shows and tourism for Chicago as well as the rest of the State of Illinois."

Moffitt: "So, it does applies across the entire state as well as Chicago."

Davis, M.: "Yes, it does."

Moffitt: "And on tourism, I believe, generally tourism's considered the second largest industry in the state. Is that correct?"

Davis, M.: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Moffitt: "I think tourism is generally considered the second largest industry in the state."

Davis, M.: "Well, it's a large revenue producer. That is correct."

Moffitt: "Increased revenue to the state as we increase tourism. Increased revenue to local communities. Is that correct?"

Davis, M.: "That is correct, Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you. I appreciate the explanation that it is statewide with local convention visitors bureau throughout the state."

Davis, M.: "Yes."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Stephens."

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

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Stephens: "I was just notified that a company in my district is leaving. A hundred and forty-one (141) families are losing very good jobs and I... it's in the City of Vandalia and we've worked real hard to... to give them all the breaks that we could. The local school district abated property taxes for twenty-five (25) years. The City of Vandalia put together a package and the school district and the county put together a package that compares... that is not comparable. It's far better than the City of Festus, Missouri, where this company is consolidating their operations. When the company was asked well how about the package that the State of Illinois gave us? No comment. Now we worked real hard with the Governor, Jay Hoffman, Leader Cross was... was working on it over the weekend. I

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

can't thank them enough, but the fact of the matter is that people are moving from Vandalia to Festus, taking a hundred and forty-one (141) good-paying jobs, ruining... ripping the hearts out of those families and the kids and everything that's involved in the fabric of life in this small town and it'll be changed forever. And it's the climate in Illinois and I can't help but think that as Cargill leaves Vandalia and Illinois they'll look back and laugh at this process today. We are the reason the jobs are leaving Illinois. We are the reason that jobs are Illinois, because we can't create the climate that makes them want to come here, provide the jobs and make a decent profit and not have to worry about providing benefits for God only knows how many people for however many years. have got to get over this... this concept that if you are... if you're pro-business you're a bad guy. Pro-business Republicans just don't get it. Pro-business means projobs. Pro-jobs is pro-family and pro-family is pro-America and we've just lost a little bit of America today."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise at a point of personal privilege. I'd like to welcome the newest member of the Osterman family to the Illinois General Assembly on the most contentious day. Katie Patricia Osterman. Katie Patricia, born May 20, weighed 8 pounds 3 ounces and she has no socks or hat on and it's freezing in here."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Molaro."

Molaro: "Well, on... on that note and I don't know where Tim Mapes is at. Harry, this is got nothing to do with you,

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

but where's her pass? She's got to get a pass otherwise I'm going to ask for her to be removed."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Davis to close."

- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We need 71 votes to override this Veto that takes dollars away from manufacturing companies for training grants and it also takes away dollars for procurement technology assistance centers where businessmen are allowed to market their businesses in the State of Illinois and their products. This is a significantly important piece of legislation. I urge 71 votes to override the Veto."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion pass, notwithstanding the item vetoes of the Governor?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Representatives May, Jakobsson, Franks, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 50 voting 'yes' and 36 voting 'no'. And the Motion fails. Representative Davis, you're recognized on Motion #29. The Lady seeks leave to suspend all applicable House Rules and to consider all items on a single Roll Call. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Representative Davis."
- Davis, M.: "This is a budget override for Motion 29. And Motion 29 is legislation to override the Governor's Vetoes in reference to employer investment training grants, job training, and economic development programs. It also overrides the Vetoes in reference to the entrepreneurship

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

center programs, grants to units of local government for the promotion of their economic development. This override is also for funding the Illinois Global Partnership, grants for other offices of tourism, the Build Illinois grant, the wine industry grant. The original amount... the amount of the Veto is twenty-three million, nine hundred fifty-two dollars... fifty-two thousand, three hundred ten dollars (\$23,952,310). Of that, the GRF funds are only sixteen million, three ninety-five... three hundred ninety-five thousand, eight hundred ten (16,395,810). I'll answer any questions."

- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis."
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Spe… will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield. Indicates she'll yield."
- Reis: "Representative, again with our question, these... with these reductions, how do they compare with the FY08 levels that were passed and implemented in last year's budget?"
- Davis, M.: "Some of these will take these agencies or these programs below the '08 level."
- Reis: "Which ones are those? So, we can be aware of those."
- Davis, M.: "All of them were below the... will be below the '08 level except the tourism. Except for the tourism... the tourism promotion programs, Chicago Convention and Tourism Bureau and the tourism balance of state. All the others will be below the '08 level."

Reis: "All right. Thank you."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Davis, M.: "You're welcome."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Davis to close."

- Davis, M.: "I would just urge the votes that we need to pass this reduction. To restore these will put them at the '08 level. We need 60 votes in order to put them at the '08 level. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion be restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? This requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Representative Poe, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 52 voting 'yes' and 35 voting 'no'. And the Motion fails. Representative Flider, you're recognized on Motion #33."
- Flider: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With this Motion I'm asking that we vote to restore important funding for programs that benefit some of our most vulnerable citizens. They are the developmentally disabled, troubled teens, adults and children with mental health issues. And by restoring this funding we can enhance the services that we offer those in need and have a tremendous impact in improving the quality of life and the quality of health that we can provide. I ask for an 'aye' vote on restoring these fundings."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Sponsor seeks leave to suspend all applicable House rules and to consider all items on a

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

single Roll Call. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

Eddy: "Representative, I want to pick out the DD community services line item in this budget. The original budget amount was five hundred and ninety-five million, (595,000,000), around five hundred and ninety-five million (595,000,000). The Governor vetoed out almost twelve million (12,000,000), leaving in that budget five hundred and eighty-three million, seven hundred and thirty thousand dollars (\$583,730,000). Can you tell us how the final amount after the reduction compares to the FY08 amount for these DD community services?"

Flider: "It is 2 percent less than the budget that we passed."

Eddy: "Okay. So, that is a 2 percent reduction in DD community services over FY08. Is that the same for each of the line items contained within this Motion?"

Flider: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. So, for every single one of these there... there is a 2 percent reduction by the Governor from the '08 amount."

Flider: "Yes."

Eddy: "And it's across the board."

Flider: "Right."

Eddy: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Speaker Madigan in the Chair. The question is, 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion be restored, notwithstanding the item reductions of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

'no'. 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 58 'ayes', 28 'noes'. The Motion fails. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to do four (4) more Motions and then move toward adjournment. So, the next Motion will be #5. Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This would restore ninety-six thousand dollars (\$96,000) that was appropriated in personal services for one new attorney and also cover a deficit from the prior year for the Education Labor Relations Board. I know that people who are in the education community have talked to me about this. They feel that this is a minimum that they need in order to keep this agency, which is a small agency, even... to keep this agency even with the workload that it's facing and this reduction will put them severely in... in a deficit. And so, it's important I think, if we believe in these agencies, that we give them the appropriate personnel for them to do the mandate that we require of them and so I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this line item pass, notwithstanding the item Veto of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. 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 51 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no'. The Motion fails. The next Motion will be #30, 30."

Hannig: "Okay. So Mr. Speaker, I'd move that we suspend all the applicable rules and hear this on one Roll Call."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Speaker Madigan: "Leave is granted."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This deals with the Capital Development Board programs, 1.975, one million, nine hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars (\$1,975,000) which is reappropriated from non-GRF to DCEO for the Illinois Renewable Fuels Alternative Act for grants. And as we talked earlier about some of the items in the Secretary of State's budget, this is nearly two million dollars (\$2,000,000) that is not GRF. That is... that we had put in the budget for the purposes of continuing the renewable fuels development grant program. The Governor also vetoed in the Department of Corrections four million dollars (\$4,000,000) for community... forty (40) community-based reentry programs. He vetoed 1.2 million (1,200,000) for the Cook County Sheriff's Office, women's justice services pilot program, seven hundred ninety thousand (790,000) for a reentry program and a hundred and fifty thousand (150,000) for the long-term prison study grant. We have a Long-term Prison Study Commission that's come to a halt because they need some additional funding. So, these are all... these are all items that the Governor has vetoed that I believe we need in this budget in order to move forward. And I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Representative Hannig, are these new spending items?

Are these the same FY08 approps? The renewable fuel alternative grants would... for example, would they fund..."

Hannig: "That's a reapprop. So, that's... that's not new."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Eddy: "Okay. So, that's the amount for ethanol? Would ethanol be supported by that type of a..."

Hannig: "Yeah. Right. So, these... almost two million (2,000,000) is reapproped to DCEO for the Illinois Renewable Fuels for grants and this is not even GRF. So, I'm not certain why the Governor vetoed it."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion pass, notwithstanding the item Vetoes of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 55 'ayes', 30 'noes'. The Motion fails. The next Motion will be #31. Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I would move to suspend the appropriate rules and hear this all on one Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Leave... leave is granted."

Hannig: "Okay. This deals with the Department of Corrections and the juvenile justice system, 1... 1.5 million (1,500,000) from the shared services lump sum, three hundred and thirty-seven thousand (337,000) from the capital improvement line. In juvenile justice, which we know is the... which evolved from the Department of Corrections specifically to try to deal with problems of some of our youthful offenders it would cut 3.2 million dollars (\$3,200,000) in the after care contractual line and a hundred and eighty-six thousand (186,000) from the capital improvement line. I believe that these are items that are all necessary to the Department of Corrections at the

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

- juvenile justice and I'd ask that you share with me my enthusiasm and vote to override the Governor's Veto."
- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the line items contained in the Sponsor's Motion be restored, notwithstanding the item reductions of the Veto?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 54 'ayes', 32 'noes'. The Motion fails. The next Motion will be #32. Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

  Last but not least, we have five million dollars
  (\$5,000,000)... five million dollars (\$5,000,000) which was
  added to the budget as a technology emersion pilot program
  to the State Board of Education. The Governor zeroed out
  the program. Many of us would believe that it's an
  important initiative that needs to be funded. And so I
  would ask for your 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Madigan: "Shall this line item pass, notwithstanding the item Veto of the Governor? 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 41 'yes', 45 'no'. The Motion fails. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 1386, offered by Representative Watson. House Resolution 1435, offered by Representative Watson. House Resolution 1436, offered by Representative Reboletti. And House Resolution 1437, offered by Representative Sacia."

281st Legislative Day

7/16/2008

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. The House is prepared to adjourn. It is our intention to adjourn until the dates agreed to with the Senate in Senate Joint Resolution 105, which for the House was the date of Thursday, October Perfunctory Session and then Wednesday, November 12 for regular Session to consider Vetoes. If the need arises in may call the House interim, I into Session. Representative Currie moves that the House adjourn in accordance with the Senate Joint Resolution 105 or subject to the call of the Speaker. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House stands adjourned."