285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

- Speaker Madigan: "The House will now convene in regular Session. Is there leave to use the quorum for the Twenty-fourth Special Session for the purpose of a quorum of the regular Session? Leave is granted and the Attendance Roll Call of the Twenty-fourth Special Session shall be used for the purpose of the quorum call of the regular Session. All right, Ladies and Gentlemen, the plan is for Party caucuses immediately and for committees to meet at 12:30. So, Mr. Brady."
- Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans will caucus in Room 118 immediately upon our release. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Democrats will meet in Room 114 immediately. Mr. Clerk, would you announce the committee meetings."
- Clerk Mahoney: "The committee meetings for this afternoon at 12:30 or immediately following caucus are: Revenue Committee in Room 114, the Revenue Committee will meet in Room 114. Appropriation-Human Services will meet in Room 118, Appropriations-Human Services in Room 118. Judiciary-Civil Law will meet in C-1, Judiciary-Civil Law in Room C-1. And the Tollway Oversight will meet in Room 122B."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege. I just want to... I really didn't have a chance to prepare many thoughts today, but I just wanted to thank everybody for... on both sides of the aisle. You know, in some ways it feels like I never left because it's overtime and we're back, but in a lot of ways I think we saw the best of what can happen in politics when I was gone. I

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

mean, whether it was a colleague that sent an e-mail or card or a colleague that stepped up and came to my office every week to hold office hours or a Democrat who came across the aisle and said, I'll help you with some ag issues. Or a Democrat who came up and said, I'm going to take care of your district in the floods and those parts of the area, or a Leader that came in to talk to a group or a Speaker who said, if you need something my staff's here. That's the opportunity that we have when we look at what we can do. And I guess I like to say this experience... I learned a lot about Iraq, I learned a lot about leadership, but I also learned what we can do when we come together and I hope that's our paradigm from this point forward. And to the staff, to my colleagues, thank you so much. To the men and women that I served with, please take acknowledgement of what I did as what we have done in Iraq and Afghanistan. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Again, let's go to Party caucuses immediately. Democrats in 114, Republicans in 118. Thank you. The House shall come to order. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Fritchey, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary-Civil Law, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on September 10, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2536. Representative John Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on September 10, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendations:

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2595. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Tollway Oversight, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on September 10, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 4888."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Fritchey, on House Bill 824. Mr. Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. I believe that we are on the Order of Motions to override?"

Speaker Madigan: "That's correct."

"Thank you, Sir. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are Fritchey: unfortunately but predictably where we knew we would be when we passed the product of three (3) years of work between both chambers of this Body and all the Members in this chamber, and that is to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto of the pay-to-play ban. I'll try to stay very short on the rhetoric. I will tell you that at a time when it would seem to take a lot for the Governor to surprise and/or offend me, he really has managed to do it. The Governor put forth in his Amendatory Veto some ideas that may in fact be laudable. He has put forth four (4) various concepts, one of which had to do with a differing ban on campaign contributions. One had to do with what the Governor alleges to be double dipping. Another one having to do with increased lobbyists' disclosures. And the fourth having to do with how we vote for the pay raises. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'll submit to you, there may be

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

merit in some of the Governor's proposals. And to that end, in keeping with my commitment, I have filed the Governor's proposals both as one unified Bill, it's House Bill 6700, as well as four (4) separate Bills. Governor, through his Amendatory Veto, is not trying to clean up Illinois. He's not trying to make our ethics laws tougher; he's trying, in a last desperate attempt, to prevent this Bill from becoming into law. Whether or not the Governor has respect for the Legislature, I still do. I respect me, I respect all of you and our jobs. Governor's ideas are not to be taken in a take-it-or-leaveit form the way that he's given to us. So what we've done is allowed them the opportunity to be filed and they can be vetted as they see as we see fit and proceed from there. I met at length yesterday with the Governor's lawyers in keeping with our commitment there. I'm not going to get into the content of those meetings. I will say, though, that there was an agreement that we were going to try work in an honest and straightforward manner to see if we could make progress on this legislation. I was disheartened but not surprised to read the Governor's comments from his press conference today. Among the things he said today was that he does not want us to file these Bills in separate legislation, saying unbelievably, that he believes that we would come up with reasons not to call the Bills or find ways to make sure they don't pass. This is the same Governor that sent me a letter, Ladies and Gentlemen, two weeks ago asking me to not only introduce the legislation but saying that he wants to work with me to get

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

the legislation called in the Illinois House. He has proven time and time again that he will say whatever it takes wherever he has to to forward his agenda. I don't want to belabor this into the sideshow that he has turned it into. Let me say this, this Bill has seen more hurdles than the Beijing Olympics. This is simply one more of those hurdles. I ask you to join me in overriding the Governor's Amendatory Veto. We can come back to look at his ideas later on. Let's go ahead and give the people of the State of Illinois what they want and what they deserve and that is an end to pay-to-play politics in Illinois. This Bill passed without a dissenting vote out of both chambers. I have every confidence in you, my colleagues, to do what we told our constituents we would do and move this legislation forward. I would then trust that we can rely on the Senate to uphold their commitment to do the same thing and that once and for all we can put this practice to rest. I'd be happy to answer any questions. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We'd like to add State Representative Saviano to the excused absence list today, please."

Speaker Madigan: "Let the record reflect that request. Mr. Fritchey moves that House Bill 824 do pass, notwithstanding the specific recommendations of the Governor. This vote shall require 71 votes. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 110 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Supermajority, House Bill 824 is hereby declared passed, not withstanding the specific recommendations of the Governor. Mr... Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Report. Representative Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriation-Human Services, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on September 10, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6350; Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 790; and Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1103."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang. Mr. Lang, do you wish to call House Bill 953? Mr. Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I move to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto of House Bill 953. This is a Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen, that was worked on for a very long time. And may have that... I think passed this chamber unanimously or close to unanimously, which would have allowed folks to make sure that when they went to see a marriage and family therapist in the same way they would see a psychologist or psychiatrist, that it would be covered by insurance in the same way that those other providers were covered. The Governor took the opportunity to amend this Bill with significant language regarding the coverage of autism. And while I commend the Governor's spirit and while I support what the Governor wants to do and indeed am preparing to propose legislation to do

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

exactly what the Governor's has proposed to do, I move to override because the Governor has broadly overstepped his authority under our Constitution. And no matter how we feel about the families with autistic children and I know most of us feel strongly about it and no matter how desperate we are to find better help and aid and support and coverage for these folks and I know most of us are, we must still insist that we follow the Constitution of the State of Illinois. We must not allow the Governor to, in essence, run amok and become a super Legislator over all of If he wants to be here and be a Legislator he ought to run for the State Legislature and as I recall, he was here and had a chance to do this while he was here. while I support the Governor's goal, I cannot support the way he's done this and I will have to explain to these families why I'm opposed to this on constitutional grounds, and I ask you to support me in this Motion."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Hamos: "Representative Lang, we were here just a few weeks ago, I believe, it's hard to keep track of our time and we had before us on that day two (2) Amendatory Veto Bills and one of them took this exact concept of insurance coverage and we added to that, if you remember, a new provision to allow dependent coverage up to the age of twenty-five (25). Do you remember that?"

Lang: "I do."

Hamos: "So, did you support that at that time?"

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Lang: "I'm sorry, please ask your question again."

Hamos: "Did you support that Bill?"

Lang: "I did, but at that time the particular Amendments the Governor did at that time, while very broad, were germane to the issue of dependent coverage. This Bill... the autism coverage the Governor has provided is not in my opinion germane, while it still amends the Insurance Code, they are not related."

Hamos: "Well, I... I think I'm in kind of a quandary here because I do support the concept, not the process, but certainly the concept of coverage for autistic families is something we hear about over and over again. And I think it's difficult to have some consistency between two (2) different... between two (2) Bills that look a lot alike in some ways, try to do the same thing in terms of germaneness and how do we explain back home that we were able to support one but not the other for autistic services?"

Lang: "Well, Representative, I just gave you the reason. On the previous Bill, the changes were germane and right on point and while I thought overly broad, I drew the conclusion that at least they had some relation to each other. In this case, they do not. And again, I agree with you that what the Governor's proposing here is something we would like to do. As you know, we had Bills on the floor this year relative to autism coverage which I support and will continue to support and if I'm successful on this Motion, would invite you to Sponsor with me stand-alone Bills to do this. But at some point, we have to speak

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

up for the Constitution of the State of Illinois. If we're going to allow the Governor to rewrite our Bills any way he wishes, anytime he wishes, perhaps we don't need the 118 of us who are here. Now I know there are some who really don't like government much and really don't care about the Constitution, who would say, well sure, let's do it without the House of Representatives. Let's let the Governor make all the decisions. But I'm not prepared to do that and in your heart of hearts I don't really think you are either."

Hamos: "Well, no, but I think that we are dealing with... these are strange times. So we're trying to do the best we can to enact public policy and this is one of those important public policies. Now, do you remember why the two (2) different versions of autistic Bills did not pass in the first place? Why they did not get to the Governor's desk?"

Lang: "Well, as I recall, Representative, there were some procedural issues in those Bills that dealt with Amendments that were added to them. The bottom line is, they did not get to the Governor's desk. Perhaps, we should all work a little harder to make sure they do."

Hamos: "Well, but that's the point here, is that when you say to me and to all those families out there who are waiting for this public policy to be enacted, well let's just reintroduce a Bill and why don't you be a cosponsor, that all sounds great, except we already passed two (2) Bills unanimously, if I remember, and we still could not get them to the Governor's desk. And unless a lot of dynamics around here change, we're still not going to be able to

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

pass those Bills, even if you Sponsor it and I'm cosponsor. So maybe this is the only opportunity we have in the State of Illinois to do the right thing for the parents of autistic children."

Lang: "Well, I'm certain, Representative, that the parents of autistic children will agree with you and it's going be a very difficult sell back home, but the bottom line is, that I'm not prepared on my Bill, if you're prepared to do it on your Bill, go ahead and make your Motion. I'm not prepared on my Bill to allow the Governor of the State of Illinois to be a Legislator. I'm prepared to allow the Governor to be the Governor. And if he wants to follow the Constitution I'll be happy to work with him all day long and I would invite him to come to my office to work with me on the issue of how we help families with autistic children. In my view, this is not the way to do it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black. On the Motion, please, Mr. Black.

Mr. Black on the Motion."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of anything but, but it's certainly good to see you."

Speaker Madigan: "Please proceed, we're all waiting to hear from you."

Black: "All right. Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time I want to talk about the picture I saw of you in Denver that has swept the nation, but at an appropriate time. Will the Speaker... or the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Black: "Representative, why... why did this even get reported out of Rules? Why wasn't it ruled gubernatorial noncompliance?"

Lang: "Well, as you may have seen on the Calendar, Mr. Black, I filed two (2) Motions on this..."

Black: "Yes, I noticed that."

Lang: "...Bill, one to accept, and one to override. The Motion to accept is still in Rules. The Motion to override is on the floor and I indicated to the Speaker that the underlying Bill, to help those who need marriage and family counseling to be able to get insurance coverage for that, it's so important that I was prepared to have this fight on the floor over this issue."

Black: "Okay. Borrowing on what the previous speaker had... had brought up, my family has not escaped the emotional distress of autism. But it would seem to me if I'm following your logic about the Governor rewriting to do right is not covered under the Constitution, but there is a Bill on concurrence in the House, House Bill 415, that would address the autism issue. So, perhaps you could use your influence to move the... that Bill on autism coverage, since it is on our Calendar on the Order of Concurrence, and then vote on this as your Motion has indicated."

Lang: "Well, I believe I'm a cosponsor of that Bill and I will certainly do all I can do to get that to move through the process. Let me also add that I'm a strong supporter of those families and if I could... if I thought that there was an appropriate constitutional way to do what the Governor's doing here, it wouldn't bother me at all to be the hero for

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

those families. I just don't think it's the right thing to do, Sir, and I don't think you really think..."

Black: "No."

Lang: "...the Governor legislating from the second floor of this building is appropriate either."

Black: "All right. But thank you very much, Representative. And Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. I think Representative Lang is correct. Having been here for awhile, if you allow this to happen then there is no protection on anything you want to pass. You could pass a very simple Bill that would simply say that according to a study by the Safety Council all fire engines should be painted a phosphorescent lime green. The Governor could then add language that would say every state automobile should also be painted phosphorescent lime green, and that every Legislator's car should be identified with a lime green license plate with their name and phone number. Now that is... the Governor is misusing his authority, adding language that was not approved by the General Assembly on this Bill. If he wants autism to be covered, he could have filed a Bill that we could have acted on. And in this case, Representative Lang is absolutely correct. There is a Bill on the Calendar that would add this coverage, and I might add, badly needed coverage, on a Bill that is on the House Calendar on That is the Bill we should direct our concurrence. attention to for those of us who want to see autism covered under various insurance. The bottom line underlying Bill passed out of here with a substantial

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

majority. I believe the Sponsor is certainly within his right and within his purview to ask that we override the Amendatory Veto, and I concur with his remarks that the Governor's Amendatory Veto far exceeds his constitutional authority on how Bills are to be amended or vetoed. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Lang moves that House Bill 953 do pass, notwithstanding the specific recommendations of the Governor. The vote shall require 71 votes. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 84 people voting 'yes', 29 people voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Supermajority, House Bill 953 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the specific recommendations of the Governor. Representative Mulligan, do you wish to call House Bill 1533? Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to concur… accept the Amendatory Veto. Basically, the Bill is a good underlying Bill. The only thing it does is it cuts down the number of newspapers that the information would be printed in. But there's other good parts to the Bill that he left intact."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan moves to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor, relative to House Bill 1533. This vote shall require 60 votes. Those in favor... those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Please

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

record yourselves. The Clerk shall take the record. The Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 1533 are accepted. Representative Coulson. Representative, one second. The Chair recognizes the Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and or Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on September 10, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'approved for floor consideration' is Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 790; Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1103; and Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 2595."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Coulson on House Bill 3286."

Coulson: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to accept the Amendatory Veto on House Bill 3286."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves to accept the Amendatory Veto on House Bill 3286. The question is... this vote shall require 60 votes... and the question is, 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 113 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 3286 are accepted. Representative Currie on Senate Bill 2595."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I move adopt... First of all, can we move this Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, put the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment 2 and 4 have both been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Amendment 2."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move adoption of Amendment... can we... can we adopt both of the Amendments and then debate the Bill on Third?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Yeah. The question is, those in favor of adopting Amendment #2 say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #4 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie moves that Amendment #4 be adopted to the Bill. All those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted to the Bill. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No other Amendments have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2595, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. It's been almost ten (10) years since Illinois engaged in a major capital program. And in the meantime, our roads and bridges are crumbling, our school buildings need help and mass transit is grinding to a halt in the northern part of the state. Seventy-five percent of our roads were last repaired forty (40) years ago, more than forty (40) years ago, and they only have a forty-year life expectancy. More than three hundred (300) school buildings are waiting for help for a price tag of about \$8.2 million (\$8,200,000). The Transportation Coalition for Illinois tells us that our roads and bridges need more than ten billion (10,000,000,000), mass transit needs more than ten billion (10,000,000,000) as well, not including moneys for rail passenger and for airports. The solution to the capital program, at least twenty-five billion (25,000,000,000) of it, lies in Senate Bill 2595. While many of us have searched hard and long for a revenue source for capital that we think meets the needs of the people and is appropriate to the task, we've come to this point, here we are on September 10, 2008, and there seems to be only one game left on the board, one item, one program on the table and that program is trying to embark upon a long-term lease of the state lottery to fund capital improvements and to make sure that the education system in Illinois continues to access some six hundred million dollars (\$600,000,000) a The program before you in Senate Bill 2595 is essentially very like that which the Senate sent to us some months ago, that is to say it provides for a lease of the

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

state lottery of at least fifty (50) and no more than sixty (60) years, the price tag has to be at least ten billion dollars (\$10,000,000,000) and we will make sure that the proceeds go into both the Capital Fund and the School Education Fund. We have made some changes to that Bill here in the House. For example, we've added a great deal of transparency and accountability. Under this proposal, the decision who will be the concessionaire who will lease the lottery will be a joint decision by the Governor, the Comptroller and the Treasurer, similar to the way today we decide whether or not to embark upon short-term state borrowing. There will be a great deal more accountability in the Bill because we will beef up, we will enhance the requirements and the responsibilities of the State Gaming Board to provide continuing everyday oversight of disposition of the lottery, both with respect operator and to the concessionaire who actually has entered into the long-term lease. We will see to it that there are opportunities for participation in the construction projects by members of minority groups, by women, and by And we will make sure that there is a the disabled. community development project going on at each project level that will help sustain the participation of individual workers who are women, members of minority groups, the disabled and who are of low income. We will constrain the operation of the lottery so that the games we approve are the games that are played. We will make sure the lottery is not advertised intensively and overwhelmingly in low-income and minority communities. We

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

will, at the end of the day, see to it that the projects that we approve will be listed individually, will be projects specific, not lump sum appropriations. I would be happy to answer your questions. As I say, I think we've come to the point when if we care about those crumbling bridges, the 'L' cars that need help, the school buildings that are in trouble, the only appropriate vote on this measure that provides the revenue to fix those problems would be a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Yes. Representative, this is to be no less then a fifty-year lease, correct?"

Currie: "That is correct."

Black: "Not to exceed sixty (60) years?"

Currie: "And should there be an effort to extend the lease which is possible under this Bill, it could... there could be an extension in five-year increments. There would have to be some... something given..."

Black: "Okay."

Currie: "...by the concessionaire for that to happen and it would require approval by the General Assembly."

Black: "I... I appreciate your remarks about the need for capital. I couldn't agree with you more. We desperately need to repair our crumbling infrastructure, and the longer we wait the more it's going to cost. But I do have some concerns about this particular Bill. Let me ask you... let me specify one of those concerns. If the House passes the

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

sale, lease or privatization might be a better word, of the state lottery, that... would have to bring in a minimum of ten billion dollars (\$10,000,000,000). I don't see anything in there about how the ten billion dollars (\$10,000,000,000) will be spent, so that's... that's an open ended, I don't know, a question, guess..."

Currie: "Well, first of all, Representative, the Bill specifies that seven billion (7,000,000,000) would go into a Capital Construction Fund, three billion (3,000,000,000) would go into a Education Trust Fund. If the lottery brings in more than ten billion (10,000,000,000), then more dollars will go into the Capital Fund and more would go into the Education Fund. When it comes to spending, the spending decisions will be made if and when a lottery lease happens. We could be six (6), nine (9), twelve (12) months from finding out whether anyone's willing to take a gamble on the Illinois State Lottery. And it would seem to me inappropriate to start spending money that we don't have. this does happen, then we will have plenty of Ιf opportunity to figure out how we want to spend the proceeds at a time when those proceeds are available, at a time when priorities will be the priorities of tomorrow, not the priorities of yesterday."

Black: "I also see no breakdown of what the money would go to, highways, mass transit, school construction program. Are you telling me that that percentage breakdown will be dealt with if and when we have a private individual or company that will in fact meet the price of purchasing or leasing the lottery?"

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Currie: "Once we have the money we can start spending it. I will tell you though, Representative, that in this Bill the provisions of your House Bill 5152 are included, and what that says is, that to the extent we're talking about highway money, the money will be spent 45 percent in District 1, 55 percent in the other highway districts. This reflects the traditional spending differences between and among those districts and it is... it follows exactly the Bill you introduced...

Black: "All right."

Currie: "...and passed in the House earlier this spring."

Black: "Yes, and I appreciate you mentioning that because good legislation does survive and has the ability to rise to the I'm so glad to see that that's in there. Let me concentrate on one of the great concerns I have. know, you were here when Representative Pangle and others changed the way the lottery proceeds... excuse me, profit, would be handled. That... I believe that was back in 1985-86 and the profit of the lottery now goes into the Common School Fund. There are people who think that that's all the money that... that we put into education. You and I both know that is not the case. But it grows about 3 percent a year, three and a half percent a year, I think it could grow more. But I think in fiscal '08, if my memory is correct, it will about six hundred thirty-five be (\$635,000,000), six hundred forty million dollars (\$640,000,000) into the Common School Fund. Now, in the summary of this Bill, it says six hundred million (600,000,000) will be transferred to the Common School Fund

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

annually. Will that six hundred million dollars (\$600,000,000) grow each year or is the six hundred million (600,000,000) a cap or is it a floor, not to be less than, but can it be more than?"

Currie: "The six hundred million (600,000,000) is a floor, Representative, but it would not automatically grow. That decision would be a decision for the Legislature to make on a... an annual basis. And as you point out, we spend about five (5) times as much money on public education as comes in from the lottery, so it's not as if we're stuck at a six hundred million (600,000,000) contribution on a yearly basis."

Black: "So, in the answer... to answer a question I have received from some school administrators and school board members, I cannot give them a guarantee, if this were to become law say in 2009, that the 2010 appropriation would match the appropriation that is set aside for fiscal 2009. I can't guarantee them that, correct?"

Currie: "You can tell them that it'll be six hundred million dollars (\$600,000,000) as a floor from the lease of the lottery. That you can tell them. And remember, we're going to put three billion (3,000,000,000) at least, perhaps more than that, into the Education Trust Fund. If the state's 20 percent share of the lottery lease profit is not enough to meet six hundred million (600,000,000), and I doubt that it would be in the first year or two (2), you can use not only the interest from the Education Trust Fund but also some of the principle to meet the six hundred million dollar

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

(\$600,000,000) commitment. And that's the word I would use, Representative, it's a commitment."

Black: "And we all know that the commitment we've made here in the past for education funding has always been kept."

Currie: "It's a statutory commitment, Representative."

Black: "Yes, yes. Let me ask you a question about the Chicago Infrastructure Fund. Would any proceeds of the privatiztion of the lottery go into the Chicago Infrastructure Fund or would that have to be specifically appropriated?"

Currie: "That money it will be appropriated. The money that goes into the Grow Illinois Fund will be appropriated by us in a project specific fashion."

Black: "So, we would have the appropriation authority. Chicago would not automatically get 2 percent of the..."

Currie: "No."

Black: "...amount or 5 percent. So, that would be specifically...
specific appropriation language?"

Currie: "That would be appropriated..."

Black: "Okay."

Currie: "...by us..."

Black: "All right."

Currie: "...but it would be appropriated directly to the RTA rather than..."

Black: "So..."

Currie: "...through another agency."

Black: "...it is not your intent then to... then to take fifty million (50,000,000) or a hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) from the up-front money that an operator

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

would give us and deposit that into the 2016 Olympic Fund on behalf of the City of Chicago?"

Currie: "That will be an appropriations decision..."

Black: "All right. Okay."

Currie: "...like all the other appropriations decisions."

Black: "All right. I'm glad to hear that. A question about the Capital Workforce Development Law. Sounds good to me. Promoting the state's interests in the creation and maintenance of a diverse workforce, particularly in the skilled trades. What I didn't see, where would this money go? Would it go to existing programs in community colleges, or are we creating something entirely new?"

Currie: "We're creating something new here, and the idea would be that there is some money from the overall proceeds of the Illinois... the Grow Illinois Fund that would go into a special fund to distribute to those who win projects that meet goals in terms of making the workforce accessible to and participatory for members of minority groups, lowincome people, women, and the disabled."

Black: "And who would have the decision-making authority to award those training grants to an entity? Would that be a General Assembly..."

Currie: "It would..."

Black: "...a requirement or would it be the Executive Branch?"

Currie: "It would be the Executive Branch, it would be the Illinois Department of Transportation."

Black: "All right. Well, thank... thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bill... or of the Assembly. I appreciate the Sponsor's

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

forthright answers. But let me tell you, and I don't think I'm the only one here that has some concerns about this leaving the House. The lease agreement as understand it, and I don't think if will be refuted, if this becomes law and company X buys or leases the lottery for a minimum of fifty (50) years, whatever the terms of that lease it will be is out of our hands. It does not come back to the Illinois House or the Illinois Senate, as I understand it, for our approval. We may not like some of the terms of that agreement. We may not like some of the restrictions that the operator may put on how that money is to be divided that they bring in. I think we're giving up a great deal of oversight responsibility when we don't make that lease agreement. Once we have an agreement, for ten billion, eleven billion (10,000,000,000-11,000,000,000), whatever it is. And I do like the language that if it doesn't bring in ten billion (10,000,000,000), it's my understanding, that we don't have a... we don't have a deal to begin with. But I think that lease agreement should come back to the General Assembly for its concurrence. think that's a weakness of the Bill. The second concern I have deals with the education reimbursement. I can at least point to the current lottery and say that I would expect the, I believe, in 2008 we will probably see about... 2008, about six fiscal hundred and fortv (640,000,000) going into the Common School Fund. And there is a slight increase in that every year. Now we have a floor of six hundred million (600,000,000), with a somewhat vague guarantee that it might equal the

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

appropriation or again, it may not. The Education Trust Fund while a good idea, and my compliments to those who thought that idea, this is a fifty-year lease. A three billion dollar (\$3,000,000,000) Education Trust Fund is not going to last fifty (50) years, there's no way. last but not least, my concern about some of these, and it goes back to the the proposed sale of the State of Illinois Center, the James R. Thompson Center in Chicago, or the sale of any state asset. You have to be very careful when you sell a hard asset or lease it for a fiftyyear period. You know, and this reminds me of coming home and telling your spouse, I've sold the house. I've sold the house. Now we have enough money to put a roof on it. Well, wait a minute, if we no longer own the house I'm not too concerned about whether or not I have the money now to put a roof on a house I no longer own. You know from your own personal financial budgets that once you begin to sell off assets, once you begin to get into your savings account, you can spend that money rather rapidly and there comes a period of time when that money is gone. And then what do you have to fall back on? Some of us on this side of the aisle have filed an Amendment that simply says, any lease agreement on the lottery should come back to each chamber for concurrence. In other words, we should be able to review the contractual language, specifically everything that is spelled out in that lease and concur with whether or not we think it's a good lease or a bad lease. I want capital dollars as much as anybody in this chamber. I just am not certain this is the best way to do it at this point,

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

and I'm certainly conflicted as to whether selling an asset at this point in time, that may not even give us an answer for another ten (10) months, is the way to go. It... there's risk in anything we do. I think what you have to ask yourself before you vote on this, is the risk of selling off or leasing the lottery worth the return when we don't know what the return may be, and we have no real idea of what we're going to spend it on. I... I'm inclined to vote 'no' on this. As much as I want capital, I'm not sure this is the way we want to do it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, if you could kind of walk me through the numbers a little bit. I'm trying to... I'm trying to understand how the math works to guarantee... I think the concept is that somehow we would attempt to guarantee the education... the Common School Fund, the amount of revenue that is being placed into that fund at this time. Now my numbers might be wrong, but didn't we last year realize about six hundred and fifty million dollars (\$650,000,000) in the Common School Fund?"

Currie: "It was... actually it was million dollars (\$1,000,000), not billion (1,000,000,000), Representative."

Eddy: "Million (1,000,000), I said million (1,000,000), I'm sorry."

Currie: "And... and you're right. And what this does is, just say there will be a floor of six hundred million (600,000,000). Remember that we spend, what, 2.5 billion

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

(2,500,000,000) altogether on public education? The lottery proceeds are a small slice of what we give to public education in the State of Illinois. This Bill will guarantee that there will be at least that six hundred million (600,000,000) floor from this source going forward."

Eddy: "I understand that."

Currie: "And we can do that by virtue of the trust fund on the one hand and the 20 percent of the lottery profits that we, as a state, are entitled to on the other. And I can show you the map. We believe that this will work..."

Eddy: "So, so..."

Currie: "...so that there will be six hundred million (600,000,000) available on an annual basis. We can, of course, choose to increase the money coming from our share of the lottery at any given moment. And as I say, we put quantities of General Revenue Funds into public education as... on top of. More than the six hundred million (600,000,000) that's at stake here."

Eddy: "I understand that. I understand that six hundred million dollars (\$600,000,000) doesn't run state edu... I get it. Now my question is, does six hundred million dollars (\$600,000,000) replace totally the amount that the lottery was funding? The floor..."

Currie: "Well, it depends..."

Eddy: "...doesn't replace the total that the lottery proceeds put
 in."

Currie: "It depends on what year. Some years the lottery brings in more...

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Eddy: "Okay."

Currie: "...sometimes it brings in less. So we took six hundred million (600,000,000)..."

Eddy: "That's how we establish that."

Currie: "...as the absolute floor."

Eddy: "Okay."

Currie: "We figured that was a safe..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Currie: "...reasonable amount."

Eddy: "And then based on the assumptions of interest on the three billion dollars (\$3,000,000,000) that's set aside and using any of that three billion dollars (\$3,000,000,000) that necessary to make up for the..."

Currie: "If the interest is not enough and the 20 percent together..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Currie: "...do not amount..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Currie: "...to six hundred million (600,000,000)."

Eddy: "And you mentioned during the first few years the 20 percent may not be there. It's hard to say how long it'll tool… it would take to tool up these increases that are projected later. So, there's really… there's no way to know exactly how it will work or when the trust fund could be tapped out. But is it fair to say that the potential is there at some point during this lease, for a combination of the interest on the trust fund, trust fund dipping into that trust fund number, and if the amount of the increase and proceeds doesn't come to fruition, that there could

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

come a time during this... that there would not be money for public education at the six hundred million dollar (\$600,000,000) floor?"

- Currie: "No, I think... I think the commitment there is absolutely real. Remember, too, that we've given the Treasurer expanded investment authority just to ensure that the moneys that we need will be there."
- Eddy: "Okay. And I appreciate that and I hope that's the case, but some of the numbers if they're run more conservatively, kind of beg the question as to whether or not three billion dollars (\$3,000,000,000) will last forty (40) or fifty (50) years with interest, even with the projection of the increased sales that are taking place. We don't know that for sure, and I just... I mean for us to make the statement that this is going to guarantee the replacement of that six hundred million dollars (\$600,000,000) as a floor throughout this lease, seems to be something that we're maybe hoping for but we absolutely can't use the word guarantee."
- Currie: "Nothing's certain but death and taxes, Representative. But let me tell you, that it seems pretty clear to me that if somebody out there's willing to spend ten, twelve or fourteen billion dollars (\$10,000,000,000-\$12,000,000,000-\$14,000,000,000) to lease our lottery, the chances are good that our 20 percent take is going be worth a whole lot of cash. So, in addition to the money and the three or four billion dollar (\$3,000,000,000 or \$4,000,000,000) Education Trust Fund, remember that that 20 percent share is likely to grow."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

- Eddy: "And I appreciate that and I hope for that. I really do.

 I just want to make sure that everybody understands that...
 that as you said, there's no real 'guarantee' but there are
 some assumptions here. Another question about the... the
 capital project program part of this. Seven... let's say the
 minimum bid is what we get and there's seven billion
 dollars (\$7,000,000,000) set aside for capital projects.
 During your opening comments you mentioned a twenty-five
 billion dollar (\$25,000,000,000) capital program. How do
 you get from seven billion dollars (\$7,000,000,000) to
 twenty-five billion dollars (\$25,000,000,000) in capital
 spending?"
- Currie: "There's federal match, there's local match, there's a longer-term plan, some of the money could be bonded. It be... not all be pay-as-you-go. So generally speaking, that's the way we do a capital program that is worth more than the amount that the state itself is putting in. You've heard about federal earmarks, I suspect?"

Eddy: "Sure. Yeah, I've heard about them."

- Currie: "Well, that would be an example of additional money that will be coming in to help support a capital program at twenty-five billion (25,000,000,000)."
- Eddy: "The school construction program, there's a local match and I think that there's an assumption that for a billion and a half dollars' (\$1,500,000,000) worth of school construction money, it equals three (3). Those are the types of assumptions on matches that you get to the twenty-five (25). But you mentioned that there's a possibility of bonding for part of the proceeds. Would this then require

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

- a Supermajority vote if there's bonds involved in the appropriation of the project portion of this?"
- Currie: "Well, there isn't, in fact, in the Bill, there's no discussion of pay-as-you-go versus bonding. And generally speaking, in our highway program we do multi-year plans, we do some bonding, so I'd not be surprised if we did that here. If you're talking about general obligation bonds that would require a Supermajority Vote; if we were talking about revenue bonds, it would not."
- Eddy: "Okay. So, there's really no way to know for sure when we get to the spending or the appropriation's portion of this, whether it's going to be straight a seven billion dollar (\$7,000,000,000) cash spending of those proceeds or if there's going to be a bonding portion to this or how we're going to come up with the spending and the project portion. There's no guarantee."
- Currie: "The plan is... the plan is pay-as-you-go. But Representative, you'll be consulted when we get to the spending side of the equation. We welcome your ideas."
- Eddy: "Well, I appreciate the consultation. I'm kind of wondering about one part of the Bill that allows someone other than the Executive Branch or some authority other than the Executive Branch to be kind of responsible for the distribution of some of the grants?"

Currie: "No."

Eddy: "So... so..."

Currie: "It's every... everything will stay with the... Now, someone said that we should, as the Legislature, approve the contract. That's an Executive function and that's why

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

we've given it to the Governor, the Treasurer and the Comptroller. But when it comes to awarding the grants under this Bill, that would all be done by Executive agencies."

Eddy: "So, what you're saying is, whether or not projects are funded would be up to the total discretion of the Executive Branch?"

Currie: "No, no, no. I'm saying that there will be a spending Bill but the actual awarding of contract is done by Executive agencies."

Eddy: "Okay."

Currie: "So we would specify a project, the EPA for example, would go ahead and fix the sewer in Monmouth, right?"

Eddy: "Okay. Okay."

Currie: "That's the way we do business."

Eddy: "Right. So... so... how... how does the inclusion of other Executive Branches or say the choice of the Secretary of State's Office to work into this type of distribution? How does that work exactly where Legislators and/or caucuses would have the opportunity to choose, or is that not part of this Bill?"

Currie: "The Executive includes the Governor, the Secretary of State..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Currie: "...the Treasurer, the Comptroller. Those are all..."

Eddy: "I understand that."

Currie: "...part of the Executive Branch."

Eddy: "So, okay."

Currie: "So I'm not sure what your question's about."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Eddy: "Let me ask a better question."

Currie: "Good, good."

Eddy: "If an individual Representative would like to have their grant or their subject to appropriation or their appropriation handled through the Secretary of State's Office as far as the process of the grant distribution, will that be up to each individual Legislator?'

Currie: "That'll be... it'll be determined by the Legislature when we get to the spending side. I should imagine that there might be some who feel more comfortable with that office then with one of the other constitutional offices but that's a decision that will be made down the line on the project's specific basis that will be the spending side of the Bill."

Eddy: "So that's not... that's not guaranteed in this Bill at all. There's nothing that..."

Currie: "No."

Eddy: "...addresses that in this Bill. Another question I have has to do with the discussions that may or may not have taken place with... of course, we're... we're starting this process... has there been discussions with the Senate President or Members of the Senate or the Governor's Office regarding their feelings as they relate to this approach of lottery? Because they sent a totally different Bill over here. You've... you've done some rewriting maybe to do right, I don't know, but there's a lot of rewriting here. Has there been discussions?"

Currie: "Representative, we've taken their Bill, this is their Bill. We have made what we think are improvements and

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

refinements, I can't imagine that they would find anything objectionable in this Bill. In fact, I would think they would congratulate us for turning a Bill that maybe lacked some transparency, some accountability, into a Bill that should give great comfort to the citizens of this state that their money is well managed, their assets are given full value and full weight."

- Eddy: "So the answer is, you have every confidence that you've done the right thing and they'll accept it, but there's been no real discussions at this point, there's just that warm feeling we all have maybe lingering from the hug."
- Currie: "Well, I'm sure people have had a chance to see this...
 this... these Amendments."
- Eddy: "Okay. Well, I appreciate that. Finally, the question that Representative Black talked about. Why not bring... why not bring something back to the General Assembly..."
- Currie: "Because it's an Executive function to sign a contract and we are not the Executive. This is called Civics 101. We are the lawmaking branch of State Government and we have given the authority to sign the contract, not to just one member of the Executive Branch, but in order to make sure things are transparent, are accountable, we have asked the Treasurer and the Comptroller to agree with the Governor on the question who shall be the concessionaire, who shall be the operator? What more do you want?"
- Eddy: "Representative, we have in the past… and I remember very clearly before we left, there was a clean coal Bill that Representative Hannig had that we gave the authorization

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

for a study. And then that study had to come back to the General Assembly..."

Currie: "Yeah, but..."

Eddy: "...before anything further was done. So it's not unprecedented for the General Assembly to expect to see the details of something, maybe in the form of a study to find out who's interested..."

Currie: "Represent... if this..."

Eddy: "...to shepherd this to some point."

Currie: "If this were a study Bill, of course we'd have to come back and decide whether to go ahead and offer a lease.

This is not a study Bill."

Eddy: "And if it were..."

Currie: "This is a Bill that says..."

Eddy: "...we'd know if the assumptions were correct."

Currie: "...let the administration enter into a lease agreement if it can be for this length of time, for this price and if the person who leases it can meet the accountability standards set by the Governor, the Treasurer and the Comptroller."

Eddy: "Okay. And I understand and thanks for the Civics lesson, I haven't had one in a while, but..."

Currie: "I knew you'd be grateful."

Eddy: "...but I still... I still think there is a way, short of us approving the contract, for some of this to come back to make sure these assumptions that we're placing our vote on, especially regarding a couple of items. One, is how much money we could end up with from this, and secondly, at some point or another we have to have some measure of knowledge

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

or guarantee as to whether these projects are going to be included, what projects are going to be included and to what extent. I appreciate your answers. I... I just... I'm with Representative Black on this, I have a lot of concerns and I'm not so sure, based the fact that there's been no discussions with the Senate, the Governor's Office, no real agreement on this, I don't know how real this is."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoffman."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If I... if I could just address the Bill for a second. First of all, the concept... the concept of leasing the lottery was part of a comprehensive capital Bill that passed the Senate recently, was signed off on by the... and voted for by the President of the Senate, the Governor agreed to it, the Poshard-Hassert Coalition... Illinois Works Coalition agreed to it. I believe Republican Leader Cross as well as Leader Watson agreed to it. Unfortunately, we didn't get that Bill called here in the Illinois House. So the concept of the leasing or... of lottery in order to help fund capital, yet ensuring the money goes to education, I believe is a sound one. Are there some problems with the drafting of this Bill, yes, there are, but at the end of the day, I believe that should part of any jobs program. So what's wrong with this Bill? It's not a capital Bill, it's not a jobs Bill. I voted for Illinois FIRST, I worked for Illinois FIRST, but on the same day we provided for the funding, we provided for the jobs. The problem with this is, where's the beef? There's no jobs. There's no economic development. There's no economic opportunity.

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

There's... you don't know, when you vote for this, if eight (8) or nine (9) months from now, there's going to be a shovel in the ground in your district. You don't know if the new Mississippi River Bridge is going to be funded. You don't know if Route 29 expansion's going to be funded. You don't know if the Illinois State University Fine Arts Center is going to be funded. You don't know if the University of Illinois, the buildings that they need, like Lincoln Hall is going to be funded. You don't know if Route 13's going to be funded. You don't now if the Galena bypass is going to funded. You don't know that one job is going to be created. That's the problem. Now, some would say you would be appropriating on the if come of us selling the lottery for ten billion dollars (\$10,000,000,000), but at least you would be making the jobs subject to this Bill. If you're going to pass a jobs Bill, provide for jobs. Now, I was in Denver, I was there. I enjoyed the hug. was sweet. Even I got an embrace. Even I got an embrace from the Speaker. Something I'll cherish for the rest of my life. But let me tell you, let me tell you, it's time if we're going to embrace something, let's embrace a real jobs program. Let's embrace an economic development program. Let's... let's embrace, roads, bridges, educational opportunities. Let's just not have an embrace at high altitude, let's really create jobs, for people in the State Illinois. Now... now, we can stop this political bickering, this isn't hard to do. Let's sit down, let's get together, let's create a jobs program. First of all, we can have the lease of the lottery be part of that jobs

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

program. This isn't the way to do it without a spending program. Secondly, we should use the existing balances in the Road Fund to create jobs now. The great roads and bridge jobs now. It was part of the Senate Bill we all agreed on. Let's create jobs now by increasing the bonding authority, putting people to work today, backfilling it with the lease of the lottery, creating a jobs program now. This today is a folly. It's a sham, because at the end of the day it's a scam. Because at the end of the day, we're not creating jobs, we're providing for an ability to potentially lease the lottery, to potentially create jobs later. Let's put aside the partisan bickering, let's put aside the inter-Party bickering, let's sit down, let's get this done for the people of the State of Illinois. Let's do it today. Now, I read where the Republican Leader yesterday said we should have this done and a true jobs Bill done by October 1. I would say, let's do it before that. Let's get it done by September 15. Let's start today, let's line item every project out. Let's put it in a Bill, let's make sure people are comfortable with it. Let's do the lease of the lottery. Use the historic balances in the Road Fund and let's create jobs for people in Illinois now, not ten (10) months from now. Let's... I'm voting 'no' on this Bill only because, only because, I believe this isn't a jobs Bill. It's not like Illinois FIRST. It's not putting one single person to work except maybe consultants and lawyers who are going sell the lottery. Let's put people... let's put our bickering aside. Let's, today, make a commitment for jobs and economic

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

development and doing it the right way now, not later to create jobs in Illinois."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Representative, if she would yield."

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

"Representative Currie, I have a lot of respect for the Trvon: effort that you've put into this piece of legislation and I have one been here for the last year trying to work on a capital Bill, trying to look for ways that we might be able fund a capital Bill and I actually believe that conceptually the idea of bringing in an equity partner into the state Lottery makes a lot of sense. I grasp the concept of setting up a Education Trust Fund which will provide for interest to be paid directly to the education along with the 20 percent that we are going to retain as our equity share would maybe even provide for more money for education in the future than we're being... what we're providing now with our efforts of managing a lottery. So, I'm real good with the way the structure is. My problem here with the Bill is there's nothing in the Bill that requires the lease agreement to return back to the legislative chamber for... for approval. Is that correct?"

Currie: "That's exactly right because traditionally we do not approve contracts, those are done by the Executive Branch."

Tryon: "Well, I don't look at this like a contract."

Currie: "Well, it is a contract, would you agree? This is a contract. A contract..."

Tryon: "No, I... I..."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Currie: "...between the state and a concessionaire..."

Tryon: "I think this is..."

Currie: "...to lease the lottery for at least ten billion dollars (\$10,000,000,000). What would it be if it's not a contract?"

Tryon: "Well, I think this is a disposition of a state asset.

I don't think you would sell your house..."

Currie: "It's a contract. It's a contract and it's not our job."

"Well, I got to tell you, that's the part I feel is very Tryon: uncomfortable because I think there are too many... there's too many opportunities here for the concession to approved in a manner that's inconsistent with what I think our priorities are here in this chamber and I don't ... I don't believe that there's not a mechanism at which we could amend your piece of legislation to require a legislative approval process of the actual concession and the approval of the equity partner. We're looking at bringing in an equity partner to manage one of our assets, I clearly think that that's... I think that's within our jurisdiction and because I don't have a comfort level that that's going to happen, you know, I'm not going to support this if we're not going to amend it to require some kind of legislative oversight or legislative approval. think we're coequal partners in... with the Executive Branch and I certainly think in something this big that the final say for the approval should come back to the chamber. And I'll be voting 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Winters."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

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

Winters: "Representative, the major question that I have, again, concerns the six hundred million dollar (\$600,000,000) minimum payment. My concern is that, if in fact, we take 20 per... keep 20 percent of the lottery, today that is kicking off around a hundred and twenty million (120,000,000). And the other four hundred and eighty million (480,000,000) then has to be made up by either investment returns from that School Fund or by a pull down of the principle. Do you know what the investment returns are being estimated by? I assume we have some consultants that have been working on this?"

Currie: "Well, I expect the Governor has. We've been making assumptions between 6 and 9 percent. You'll note that we've given the Treasurer expanded investment authority with respect to the Education Trust Fund. And the state's 20 percent, I'm not sure six hundred (600) is the right basis. They... they... the total profit will be the six... the 20 percent. And remember that we anticipate that... the value of that percentage will grow. If it doesn't grow, whoever leases this lottery has certainly leased a pig in a poke."

Winters: "Well, I agree."

Currie: "'Cause you wouldn't spend that kind of money if you thought that we were going to be stuck in the six hundred million dollar (\$600,000,000) mark."

Winters: "A number of us were looking at this fairly intensely last spring and when you say, in fact, I had written that

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

comment down, the expanded investment authority. Does that mean he can take a higher risk investment so that we hope that the returns are better?"

- Currie: "Similar to those that are allowed to the state pension systems, not identical but similar."
- Winters: "Okay. But if we expand our risk, there's also the opportunity that we would be investing some of this money at a high point and suddenly we don't have anything close to the returns that we're hoping, if in fact, those stocks or bonds don't yield what we think they are, if their market value goes down."
- Currie: "You know, this is always possible, right? No question about it. Some people thought the whole idea... the Governor's whole proposal to lease the lottery, maybe wasn't a very sound one. But I think we're moving forward because there is no other game in town and only time will tell. It'll be some time, it won't happen tomorrow, but my only guess, looking at the numbers, is that it should absolutely work to make the six hundred dol... six hundred million dollar (\$600,000,000) payment on an annual basis. Given that we spend more money on public education from one year to the next, never mind the lottery is flat, I'm not worried that this General Assembly or any future General Assembly will leave the school kids in the lurch."
- Winters: "My... my concern again is, though, if we just look at the raw numbers. If we're expecting to pull out of that School Fund, the three billion dollars (\$3,000,000,000) that's set aside, if we just pull a number out and say it's going to earn 8 percent interest. I think that's a

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

reasonably strong return. That is going to give us about two hundred and forty million (240,000,000)."

Currie: "Our numbers actually are based on 6 percent. We're more conservative than you. Think about it."

Winters: "That... that is..."

Currie: "But in any case, again, I just reiterate that there is principle that can be used during the years when the state's share..."

Winters: "But let's..."

Currie: "...of the lottery profit is not enough to fit the bill."

Winters: "Let's take the first year, though. We want to get six hundred million (600,000,000) to the schools. We only have approximately a hundred and twenty or a hundred and thirty (120,000,000 and 130,000,000) from the 20 percent share that the state retains. So we're still... we're short four hundred and seventy to four hundred and eighty million (470,000,000 to 480,000,000). You have three billion (3,000,000,000) invested at 6 percent, is only a hundred and eighty million (180,000,000). We need four eighty (480,000,000), you have to draw down a tenth of your principle the first year.

Currie: "We actually... actually we believe that the state's 20 percent is worth more like two hundred twenty million (220,000,000), so if the hundred eighty (180,000,000) is right you're already..."

Winters: "How... in the first year?"

Currie: "...you're already at four hundred million (400,000,000) so you don't have to do much invasion of principle in that

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

year in order to meet the six hundred million (600,000,000)."

Winters: "Well, okay. I'll grant you. I think your numbers are wrong. But even if you've got two hundred million (200,000,000) plus (200,000,000) or two hundred investment return and another two hundred (200,000,000) in, you're still going to be drawing down... even at a hundred and fifty millions dollar (\$150,000,000) draw down, you've only got twenty (20) year's worth of principle. What happens if... if... this is a basic question. What happens if everything turns sour and we've spent the three billion dollars (\$3,000,000,000), there's no more interest coming in and the lottery has not grown. we do then in year twenty-five (25) or year thirty (30) when we suddenly have a six hundred million dollar (\$600,000,000) hole? And that is... even if it's a minor question or a minor possibility, even a 10 percent chance of having a huge hole in the School Fund, twenty-five (25) years out is worthy of our addressing it. And just platitudes that we think that it's going to be there is not strong enough. Is there any fall back in this legislation if the School Fund has disappeared? That's the bottom line question."

Currie: "Well, I have to say that if you look at the out years, there's no question the 20 percent will do the job."

Winters: "I... I wish I could take that as a guarantee. I think it is a risk and the public of Illinois needs to be aware of that, that there could be a hole develop twenty (20) years, twenty-five (25) years, none of us in this room will

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

probably he here at that point, although given his legendary longevity, the Speaker may still be in the Chair, but the rest of us probably won't be here. A future General Assembly will be tasked with coming up with hundreds of millions of dollars because this... this lottery proposal has some weakness built into it. I wish we could address I it better, but I did not hear satisfactory answers. Thank you very much."

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan. Thank you for putting your coat on."
- Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."
- Sullivan: "Representative, in committee today we talked a little about... and I know this has been kind of beat up and talked about a little bit here. You're talking about 20 percent which would represent about a hundred and twenty million (120,000,000) of current profits of the lease. Hundred and thirty million (130,000,000), I'm sorry."
- Currie: "It's... it's actually... it's the gross revenues from the lottery."
- Sullivan: "I'm sorry, yeah, you're right. I meant gross revenues is about six hundred (600,000,000) plus, so it's a hundred and thirty (130,000,000) million. Your idea here is to have a fund, the Common School Fund, that would... this money... this revenue would be deposited into, plus the interest, plus the principle of the three billion (3,000,000,000) would be this fund, thereby getting the six hundred million (600,000,000) base or floor, annually."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Currie: "Yes."

Sullivan: "Okay. In committee, did you have an opinion as to how long this fund or the principle would last?"

Currie: "I believe that our numbers, and again, we're using conservative figures. I believe that we think that the trust fund would last about twenty (20) years, twenty-five (25) years, maybe even thirty (30). But we believe at that point the state's share of the gross, the 20 percent of the gross, would have to be enough to cover that sum because if not, then the person who leased the lottery didn't know what he or she was doing."

Sullivan: "Okay. Do you have an opinion as to how much the lottery grows year in and year out on average? I know sometimes it's more, sometimes it's less."

Currie: "I think it's a little less than 3 percent. And I would say that our lottery does not grow as quickly as lotteries in some other states."

Sullivan: "Okay. And that's kind of what I... or on our side of the aisle they've come up with. Three percent is generous, but that's fine. So your... what you're saying then, is presently, once we give up 80 percent control in a lease..."

Currie: "We never give up control, we will have strong regulatory oversight..."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Currie: "...over the operations of the lottery."

Sullivan: "I'm sorry, I misspoke. You are correct. What I mean is, once we lease out 80 percent and only have a hundred and thirty (130,000,000) coming... a hundred and thirty million (130,000,000) coming in, over twenty (20) to

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

twenty-five (25) years, maybe thirty (30), you think that we're going to grow the lottery revenues from one thirty (130,000,000) to a floor..."

Currie: "But actually..."

Sullivan: "...of six hundred million (600,000,000), when we're only getting, in your words, less than 3 percent annually?"

Currie: "Two hundred twenty (220,000) is the amount that you should be using, not a hundred twenty (120,000,000), and in addition, the expected growth would be 6 percent a year over at least the next ten (10). Don't know that I can project further than that."

Sullivan: "Can I ask you a question? Why we're using two twenty (220,000,000) as a figure?"

Currie: "Because we're talking about gross, not the… just the profit."

Sullivan: "Okay. All right. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, there's been talk of gambling and a passage of this certainly will be gambling. We are hoping that the revenues will meet expectations. We are looking at something that... let's just use the Majority Leader's numbers that say two hundred and (220,000,000)... we want to grow two hundred and twenty million dollars (\$220,000,000) to six hundred million (600,000,000) as a floor over twenty (20), twenty-five (25), thirty years (30). That's just not going to happen. Secondarily, in this Bill it allows for whoever the concessionaire to give us six million dollars (6,000,000) up front, not the ten (10,000,000). That is about the worst public policy we can talk about today because that

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

exacerbates the situation of drawing down this Common School Fund. It's a spend down fund. You will have no money at the end and in twenty-five (25), thirty years (30), we will be six hundred million (600,000,000) in the hole. Hopefully, that won't happen, but once again, we're talking about gambling. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise in support of the Lady's Bill. Sometime ago, I guess a year or more ago when the proposal to lease or sell the state lottery came before us, I was opposed to the idea. opposed to the idea because I felt the public policy of the state required that we not sell a long-term asset for a short-term gain. And I still would prefer that we not do this. However, we have other problems in our state today, other current facts that have to be laid upon our issues, our concerns about public policy as it relates to the sale or lease of the lottery, and of course, that would be our need to have capital. A hundred and seventy-seven (177) Legislators, both Parties, both chambers, all of us, all of us agree we need a capital Bill and we've been unable to find a mechanism to get there. We've been unable to find a mechanism to pay for it. We've been unable to agree on how we should go about getting from point A to point B let alone to point Z. And so as time has passed, I have reanalyzed and rethought my position on this. There are certainly other ways we could create revenue. We could provide an additional shot through gambling and perhaps we should continue to look at that. We could, of course,

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

raise taxes, there's a number of things we could do. But in the end and for today, it seems that the only thing that we can do is this. And so while I would prefer to do it another way, this is what we have before us. The plan that was originally proposed by the Governor a year ago and by the Governor and the Senate this year, was a flawed plan. A plan that I did not think was deserving of our support. Today we have before us a piece of legislation that is well thought out. Again, you can argue with the idea that we should or should not sell or lease the lottery. And you can wrestle with it as I have, but once you form the conclusion that we must do something to be able to step forward and provide for billions of dollars of infrastructure needs for our state to put people to work, to provide for economic development, et cetera. Then when you take a look at this Bill, it's appropriate to take a look at the provisions that make it better. The Majority Leader's done an excellent job outlining why this is better, through a new gaming board, through transparency, through the limiting of brokerage fees and attorney's fees, through the joint efforts of the Governor, the Comptroller, and Treasurer. Through the idea that someone other than the Governor, who we don't trust, might be the person who signs off on our projects, and ensures that every region of the State of Illinois will get a fair shot at their need for a road or a bridge or a school or a library. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a well thought out and well constructed And while have... some have argued it won't provide the dollars we need today or tomorrow, it's a Bill that

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

will get us where we want to go in the fullness of time. It's a Bill that'll get us where we want to go with fairness and transparency. It's a Bill that is well crafted. It's a Bill that is far better than the proposals that have been before us. And so again, while I say, yes, I opposed this concept previously, and I would prefer to go other directions, today this all we have. And if we're going to say, as many on the other side of the aisle did a few months ago, let's pass a capital Bill, we'll do anything to pass a capital Bill. We've got to pass a capital Bill. The needs are immense, the needs are today, the needs are great. This is what's before us. And this is a well crafted piece of legislation designed to get us there. I would urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, just a couple of quick questions then I want to make some points. Has this ever been done... I know it's been looked at by other states, has it ever actually been enacted where we can go and use that as a model, so to speak?"

Currie: "It has not, but at least ten (10) or fifteen (15) other states are looking seriously at this issue. And like the operation of an airport or a skyway, the operation of a lottery is not a core state function. So most analysts would say that there's nothing wrong with leasing an asset of this sort."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Reis: "And I would agree with that and I've grappled with this concept for quite awhile. I attended a lot of the meetings that we had in May and on through the summer. And I think that the lottery is an underperforming asset, I think we can maybe do better with it, with the right plan. I'm just not sure that this is the right plan. Before I go into my remarks on that, we... you've inserted some language about the Secretary of State being able to oversee the projects. And something as... as... if this moves forward, something else I'd like for the General Assembly to consider is a form of a JCAR, oversight committee, bipartisan, both chambers to really monitor these programs. That has been done in other state if the Secretary of State option doesn't work. So, I'd like to have your commitment that we would work on... at least look at something like that if this proceeds further."

Currie: "We're willing to look at anything. The only thing that I would say is that if you're talking about an Executive function, if you're talking about an actual award, that's not within our province."

Reis: "No, this isn't for the lottery lease, this is to make sure that the capital projects go where they're supposed to go. It be a joint..."

Currie: "I'd be happy..."

Reis: "...committee on capital improvements so..."

Currie: "...happy to look at that."

Reis: "My concern with this... and a lot of people got these nice little shining fliers from the Governor. There's numbers and there's graphs, but I don't think the numbers add up.

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

I think they could be if this was put together right, but with the Governor's numbers and the 20 percent, the first year with three billion dollars (\$3,000,000,000), assuming that all that went into the Educational Trust Fund, would earn about a hundred and seventy four millions dollars (\$174,000,000)in interest, two hundred million (200,000,000) plus from the 20 percent. We're gonna be quarter of a million down over a dollars (\$250,000,000) from the Trust Fund. And I would entertain anybody, between now and if the Senate takes this up, to run these numbers. My numbers show that the Educational Trust Fund will be gone in fourteen (14) years. assuming the 5.8 percent growth on interest, 6.6 percent growth with the lottery, and you just run those numbers. It's a very simple thing to do. Your banker can do it for you. But we need to make sure that these graph numbers are right and just not something that was printed on a piece of paper. And then my other question, Representative, is if we're putting six hundred and fifty million (650,000,000) now into education, this plan barely allows us to keep up with the six hundred million (600,000,000), not six hundred and fifty (650,000,000), but we want to maintain that six hundred million (600,000,000) over twenty-four (24) years as opposed to having that grow. And this is another easy calculation that anybody can do, but I took six hundred and twenty-five million (625,000,000) and grew it at 3 percent, which is what the lottery has grown at for the last three (3)... or five (5) years. After twenty-four (24) years it's over one point two billion (1,200,000,000). We're being

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

satisfied with only putting six hundred million dollars (\$600,000,000) hopefully, into education twenty-four (24) years from now. We just know that that's not going to go as far and I think we need to be cognizant of the fact that, yes, we're putting that six hundred million (600,000,000) in, we're trying to protect it right now, but it also needs to grow as our needs for... in costs for education grows into the future. So, I'd be happy to share my numbers. I would look forward..."

Currie: "And we will share..."

Reis: "...to working with your side of the aisle..."

Currie: "...our numbers with you, because we think your numbers are wrong."

Reis: "I'm... What was that, Representative? I didn't hear your comment."

Currie: "I said we think your numbers are wrong. We think you've underestimated the return. We believe that in the hands of the lottery operator and concessionaire, the lottery will increase earnings more quickly than your estimates tell you."

Reis: "I'm just using the Governor's numbers of 6.6 percent growth the first ten (10) years and then 3 percent growth thereafter. That's pretty easy to calculate. And I don't think you can argue with my point that six hundred and twenty-five million (625,000,000) at 3 percent growth per year is over 1.2 billion (1,200,000,000) twenty-four (24) years from now. That's an easy calculation to figure. And it's something that... we're taking education dollars away. So, to the Bill. I'll finish up. I want to make this

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

happen, too. I mean, I'm not somebody that supports gaming and as my part of the contribution to helping build our roads and bridges, I'd like to see this happen. I just don't think this is it just yet. I think we need a little more work with it. I would like to see a plan where we just give permission to market the lottery, see what it's worth, come back to the General Assembly for its approval. Maybe by then we could have a spending plan in place to tie together with it, we're all a little more comfortable where the money's coming from and where it's going to be spent."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Like to ask her some questions..."

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Cross: "...if you wouldn't mind yielding, but I guess... I'd like to clear some things up before I ask the question. I guess right off the bat, Representative, the audacity of anybody on your side of ai... of the aisle calling this a capital Bill is rather insulting. Let's call this what it is, it's a sale of the lottery or lease of the lottery proposal and that's all it is. To call it anything else, to call it a capital Bill, to call it a spending Bill, to call it a jobs Bill, to call it an infrastructure Bill, is not accurate. It's a lease of the lottery Bill, nothing more. And can we pass a capital Bill? Yes, we can, but not in this setup. And I'm... to be perfectly blunt, Representative, pretty skeptical. What does this Bill do to access federal money that we have available to us as a state?"

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Currie: "Well, first of all, we passed a Bill just a few weeks ago with your help..."

Cross: "That doesn't do anything. Okay."

"...that if the Senate were to act would make sure that Currie: those federal earmarks come to the State of Illinois. this Bill, you're right, this is not a spending Bill. This is a Bill to raise the revenue in order to spend money for a capital fund. As you know, this Bill is not self executing. There's no money in this Bill and there will be no money in this Bill unless and until such time as there is a lease of the state lottery. That could take months. I'd love to put a shovel in the ground tomorrow right with you, I'd love to, but there is no way that we have money to do that under this Bill, under any Bill we pass today. It's going to take months to do the arrangement. And the worst thing we could do to the people of the State of Illinois is to say, here comes your capital construction program, start breakin' out the shovels, break out the champagne, everything is hunky-dory, it's not true. Ιt would be a lie; it would be total hypocrisy to say here's the money to fix your schools when we don't even know if the money will ever come in."

Cross: "Was that a yes or a no? The bottom line is, let's just call this what it is, it is a Bill or discussion on leasing the lottery at a very, very, opportune time for your side of the aisle, a month and a half before the election. Now, I'm rather skeptical, I'm rather cynical, and let me tell you why I'm cynical and why I'm skeptical about your proposal that does absolutely nothing to create jobs, does

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

absolutely nothing to access federal money. And I think we need to go over the history of what's gone on in this place over the last year to a year and a half and wonder if at all... yeah, Mr. Speaker, maybe just a... maybe a little order. Why would anybody be skeptical? First of all, this is on a Senate Bill that has to go back and the Motion over there would to be to concur or nonconcur. It is a take-it-orleave-it attitude that you, on your side of the aisle, have been complaining about on this issue for the last year and a half or two (2) years. And now you are doing the very thing without having a single meeting with Legislative Leader, without calling for a legislative meeting... or meeting with any Legislative Leader without even having the decency to ask our side of the aisle, while you told us you were going to do this, you did nothing to ask us for input. A year and a half ago, Representative, we were told that we were going to have a capital Bill done in the fall, it didn't happen. We were told we were going to have a capital Bill in the spring, it didn't happen. And now about a month and a half away from an election, when we never meet in September, we never meet in October, you call us back down to talk about the lease of the lottery that does absolutely nothing to put people to work. The best... the best we would do under your proposal, Representative, if my estimation is correct, is to come back here next spring, maybe next summer and start to talk about spending. Is that correct? Is that correct, Representative, we'd come back next spring?"

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Currie: "Representative, I'm prepared to spend the money as soon as we have it. If we've got the money, let's spend it. The highways need it, the 'L' trains need it, the schools need it, the community colleges, the public universities need it. I'm prepared to dig that shovel in the minute the cash is in hand."

Cross: "How do we do our budgets..."

Currie: "Whenever that happens, maybe it'll be the day after tomorrow."

Cross: "How do we do our budgets around this state? Do we do it on estimates? We do it on revenue estimates every year, been doing that for every year I've been here. Estimate the numbers that are coming in. The revenue, we do our budget. We couldn't sit down... we couldn't sit down in a room with the Speaker and the President, the Minority Leader of both Houses, and the Governor, and say, this is what we think we're going to get revenue-wise and this is how we're going to spend it."

Currie: "Yeah, Representative, we could do that in the ordinary course of things when we know we have sales tax collections, income tax collections, we might differ as to whether they're going bring in 'x' or..."

Cross: "We could do it if we were serious."

Currie: "But you can't do it with this..."

Cross: "If we were serious..."

Currie: "...because we don't know..."

Cross: "...about a capital Bill, wouldn't we?"

Currie: "...we don't know whether..."

Cross: "But you're not serious."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Currie: "...anybody is going to..."

Cross: "You're not serious are you, Representative?"

Currie: "We don't know if anybody out there..."

Cross: "You're not serious, Representative."

Currie: "...is serious about taking us up on this offer. And it would be real disservice to start spending money that we don't have, that we may never, ever get."

Cross: "Every year we sit down, Gary Hannig, Mark Beaubien, Donne Trotter sit down at a table and work on a budget. We don't know how the economy is going be six (6) months down the road, a year down the road. We don't know how people are going to do in business. We don't know how we're going to do in income taxes. We're not going to do... know how people go to gaming boats. But yet, we are able to craft a fifty-five billion dollar (\$55,000,000,000) budget on an annual basis, on estimates and we can't sit down, we can't sit down and do a capital Bill?"

Currie: "Representative, apples and oranges, yes. We know sales tax is collected. We know the income tax is coming in. We know fees are on their way. We may differ as to exactly how much they will bring in, because you're right, we don't know. But here there is a fundamental issue, we don't know whether we're going to get anything at all. This could be worth zero, it could be worth zero or it could be worth seven billion dollars (\$7,000,000,000) for capital."

Cross: "So... so we shouldn't..."

Currie: "There's nothing in-between."

Cross: "...call it a capital Bill."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Currie: "We shouldn't start spending the money..."

Cross: "So... we should... so..."

Currie: "...until we know we've got it."

Cross: "So, we shouldn't call it a capital Bill because you're saying you don't know if we're going to get any money?"

Currie: "This is a revenue Bill available..."

Cross: "Okay."

Currie: "...if it works, to fund a statewide capital program."

Cross: "We worked on a budget... or you worked on a budget this year and your estimates to make that budget balance factored in a tenth license, did it not? Yes."

Currie: "Yeah, it did. It did."

Cross: "Okay. We didn't know if there was going to be a tenth license and we didn't know how much we were going to get for that tenth license..."

Currie: "But we did have experience with the riverboat gaming industry..."

Cross: "Okay."

Currie: "...we knew that there was takers out there."

Cross: "All right."

Currie: "We don't know if... And again, Representative, the minute, the minute the lease is approved, let's come right back here, let's get to work, let's do the spending plan. I'm totally with you on that."

Cross: "Well, I wish I..."

Currie: "But I'm not prepared to spend money we don't have and may never get."

Cross: "Well, you were able to... you were certainly willing to pass a budget we didn't have this past year and you did a

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

pretty good job of that. But let me ask you this, in the interest of finding out how sincere we are, have the Speaker and the President of the Senate set down to talk about the merits of this Bill and whether this Bill has a chance over in the Senate?"

Currie: "We've taken the Senate Bill. We've made some major improvements, major refinements."

Cross: "My question was, have the Senate..."

Currie: "And Representative, a month ago I told you we were working on the lottery lease and I asked if we might talk to you."

Cross: "Now let me ask..."

Currie: "You suggested we talk to staff and so we've begun that..."

Cross: "That's..."

Currie: "...but late."

Cross: "Okay. Let me... let me ask my question again. It's a simple yes or no. Have the Speaker and the President of the Senate sat down to talk about..."

Currie: "I don't know."

Cross: "...whether or not the President of the Senate is going to entertain this Bill or not? Yes or no?"

Currie: "I don't know."

Cross: "Well, you... maybe I should ask the Speaker. Do you want me to?"

Currie: "All... but I do know is that..."

Cross: "Would you like me to ask the Speaker or do you want to give me an answer?"

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Currie: "Well, I don't... I don't understand. Is this... is this relevant to the Bill? I don't think so."

Cross: "It's relevant as to whether or not..."

Currie: "We have a substantive..."

Cross: "...we have a complete package or whether we're going down a political road..."

Currie: "I was in a meeting..."

Cross: "...that you obviously are going down."

Currie: "I was in a meeting with you and the Governor and the Governor said let's not talk about gaming anymore, let's talk about leasing the lottery. And that's what we're doing, we talking about..."

Cross: "All right."

Currie: "...leasing the lottery. We've taken the Senate Bill, a
Bill that passed that chamber, we've done some tweaks,
we've made some refinements, we've made some improvements.
I don't see any reason to think there's anything about our
proposal that should give pause to the Governor, to the
Members of the Senate, to anybody else."

Cross: "This so... a huge capital Bill, when we get the money going to solve all the state's problems, and a Bill that only you and your staff have drafted, with no input from the House Republicans, the Senate Republicans..."

Currie: "We offered..."

Cross: "...the Senate Democrats or the Governor's Office. You're doing it all on your own. It's take-it-or-leave-it, because you think it's a better Bill. Is that the attitude?"

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Currie: "Let me just remind you, we asked you to help us with this enterprise."

Cross: "Well, when I... our office asked your office whether or not the Speaker was willing to talk, we were told the Speaker's not talking to anybody on this Bill. So I guess the approach and the attitude Representative, I apologize if I've raised my voice and I apologize only for raising my boce... voice, but not because I'm cynical and not because I question the sincerity of this effort. This has been an unbelievable journey in the last year and a half, where every attempt to come up with a real live capital Bill has been blocked by your side of the Every other caucus in this building has tried to work through their differences. Time and time again, you have blocked efforts. And now when we come close to an election time, miraculously on Tuesday, September 10, why you picked that date I'll never know, we end up being called down here, and again, September 10, Tuesday, no one else... Wednesday, nothing else planned in this state, you call us down. Interesting date, but nevertheless, we're here without any... without any approach to spending. Now, I hope I'm wrong, I hope that you are sincere, but the history of the process suggests you're not. I would offer this challenge to you and your side of the aisle and to the Governor, and to the President of the Senate. We are a group of folks that know all the issues when it comes to spending. We know what the needs are with roads. We know what the needs are with schools, with water, and sewer, with higher education, with state facilities. We know what

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

the potential revenues are. We can't get everyone of them. We can be honest about our expectations. But the point is, we can get this done. I would suggest to you and challenge to you that we get together immediately and have this done by October 1, of this year, if you are sincere. that's going to mean talking with the Governor. It's going to be more than just hugging the Governor, but actually talking to the Governor. It's going to mean sitting down with the President, the Minority Leader of the Senate and If you are sincere, we can have this done by the House. October 1. And I would suggest to you, Representative, that if you cannot accomplish that by October 1, you are not sincere, you are not real, you don't care about capital, this is nothing but a political ploy. I hope, I hope that I'm wrong. I would like nothing more for five hundred thousand (500,000) people in this state to have a new job. I would like nothing more, nothing more, than to access nine billion dollars (\$9,000,000,000) in federal money. I would like nothing more than to see Route 30 in Will County widened. I would like nothing more than to see the school construction bond program funded. Representative, I believe and your side have got to prove to us the sincerity and the only way to prove that is to have this done by October 1. If not, this is all for show. It doesn't mean anything. It's a scam, it's not real, and it's nothing more than the biggest political hoax this year we've ever seen. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Franks."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's tough to follow my esteemed colleague and the Minority Leader after... after that. I disagree, though, with him that he's saying the Majority Leader isn't serious. I.. I believe she's serious. I think the Leader might be a day late on this. I... I do, however, agree with much of what he said to the extent that this is not a jobs Bill and this is not a capital Bill. And I think... and I talked in caucus today about this, and I think we have to ask ourselves what is a philosophy that we want to have as a Legislature as it pertains to the lottery. There was a very interesting article in this month's Governing Magazine for those of you that had a chance to read it, and it was about other states and talking about what they're doing with their lottery. the... the title of the article is Turning the Lottery Loose. Many other states are looking at the same issues as we are, California primarily, as well as Virginia. So we have to ask ourselves, is our philosophy when it comes to the lottery to use it as a supplement for our education funding to the tune of six hundred and fifty-five million dollars (\$655,000,000) a year as it was last year... or six hundred and fifty-seven million dollars (\$657,000,000) a year, or whether we want to turn the lottery into an explosive way to gain additional revenue from the citizens of our state? Do we want to increase the number of players and also increase the amount of money that we are taking from each of our citizens who play? We have to first answer that question before we go forward. Now, the lottery numbers came out on Monday and it had a record fiscal year in 2008

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

with more than two billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000) in sales. Much higher return than what the Governor is saying This year, it was two billion the lottery has done. seventy-eight million dollars (\$2,078,000,000) in sales. That contributed six hundred and fifty-seven million dollars (\$657,000,000) to the Illinois Common School Fund. And they also raised two and a half million (2,500,000) for Illinois veterans, 1.4 million (1,400,000) for breast cancer, and 1.1 million (1,100,000) for AIDS charities. Now we have to look at how our lottery is run while we're voting on this Bill, because this Bill is only about the lottery lease, nothing else. Because there's no line items, there's no capital, there's no jobs, this is all about the lottery lease. Now understand, other states run the lottery differently than Illinois. I was fortunate enough to be able to chair our Committee of the Whole last July on this issue on whether we should sell the lottery at that time. At that time, only 7 individuals voted for it and 97 voted against it. This Bill, though better, is not that much different. Understand that the State of Georgia, for instance, has a return at over two (2) times the per capita return that we have here in Illinois. Okay? Having understood that and we received six hundred and fifty-seven million dollars (\$657,000,000) this year for education. The numbers that are being floated just don't add up. They sound too good to be true because they are. The only way that anyone who is to lease the lottery is going to have the kind of return that they need to pay the six hundred and fifty-seven million dollars (\$657,000,000), to pay

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

their cost of bonds when they purchase this and also to have some type of profit, is that they are going to have to double the return on the lottery at a minimum. Now, last lottery instant games netted \$1.1 billion vear the (\$1,100,000,000) or 53 percent of the total sales. those numbers would have to about double. Let's assume for the sake of argument that that could be done. Why would we be selling an appreciating asset that grew 2.8 percent? When you see other companies in this country, the Dow Jones is down significantly; it's down double digits this year. We have an appreciating asset that is underperforming. if we're able to create six hundred and fifty-seven million dollars (\$657,000,000) this year, if we changed it like Georgia did, if we wanted to keep this asset, we'd be able to return \$1.3 billion (\$1,300,000,000) a year. would ever sell an appreciating asset and give up the upside is beyond me. What we ought to do, if it is our philosophy to try to maximize the return on this... in this asset, is that we should hire people and run it for us and change the law if necessary to increase the return. But to sell this asset or lease it, 80 percent of it for fifty (50) years, makes absolutely no economic sense. numbers here don't add up. I'd ask for you to vote for this Bill only on the merits of this Bill not on a promise, because we haven't seen any line items. We don't know if there's any capital, we don't know if there's jobs. This is a Bill to sell an appreciating asset. I'm going to be voting 'no'. I'm going to ask you to do the same. Look at the numbers. When you look at them honestly you will

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

understand that they don't add up and that we should be keeping this and having it run much better."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Joyce."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question.

Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Chair recognizes Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This measure's much improved from the version that came to us Strong ethical provisions, strong from the Senate. regulatory oversight, concurrence of the Treasurer and the Comptroller in the decision to lease the lottery. don't spend the money yet, because we don't have it yet. But I'll be the first to help all the rest of us roll up our sleeves and start those shovels going. We care about the capital needs of the state, the eight billion (8,000,000,000) the public schools need, the three billion (3,000,000,000) for public colleges and universities, ten billion (10,000,000,000) for transit, ten billion (10,000,000,000) for highways. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' The vote shall require 71 votes. 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 75 people voting 'yes', 38 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Supermajority Vote, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

- Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson some the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and or Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on September 10, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'approved for floor consideration' is Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 790. Referred to the House Committee on Rules is House Resolution 1517, offered by Representative Lang."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig, on Senate Bill 790. Mr. Hannig, on Senate Bill 790. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 790 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig, on Amendment #2."

Hannig: "I'd like to withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Madigan: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig, on Amendment #5."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Very briefly, the underlying Bill is a sweeps Bill. This would exempt the bankers. It would exempt the A.B.A.T.E. people and it would exempt the fire people from the fund as discussed in committee. So, I'd ask for its adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

- 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #9, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

 This would exempt the Conservation 2000 Fund from the sweeps, and I'd ask for its adoption."
- 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? Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time. Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 790, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As this Bill came over from the Senate, it would have provided that the Governor could sweep up to five hundred and thirty million dollars (\$530,000,000) from any fund that he desired at any time. And the history and tradition in our chamber has been that we try to work with the Governor to find additional money during difficult times, but we want to identify the fund and we want to identify the amounts. So we came up with a proposal that we thought

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

fairly dealt with the needs that we had available, that is the moneys that we had available and the needs that we were facing. And we asked the staff to take a look at these dedicated funds that exist and a look at those that are growing and to look at those that seem to have more money than they need for... in operations of the year and those seem to have enough balance that they're worth sweeping. And so, we came up with a number of Bills that we presented to the Appropriation Committee just earlier today. There was objections in the committee, primarily on the Republican side of the aisle, about our efforts to sweep money from the banks and trust, credit unions, from the Fire Protection Fund and from the fund that deals with motorcycle training. And after a lot of discussion, we put Amendments in to delete those funds from the sweeps, along with the Conservation 2000 Fund which we now believe probably doesn't need to be or should not be a part of this sweeps. So this would provide that we could sweep up to two hundred and twenty-one million (221,000,000), that we would... sweep up the two hundred and twenty-one million, two hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$221,250,000) and that we would deposit it into a special fund for the purposes of restoring in a later Bill, an appropriation Bill, some of the moneys that the Governor reduced from... with his Veto. So this would create the Budget Relief Fund and it would find a mechanism to... by sweeping dedicated funds to provide us with two hundred and twenty-one million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$221,250,000). It's... it's always difficult... excuse me, it's always difficult to sweep funds,

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

it's not something that we ever wish to do, but I think we find ourselves in a very tight and difficult budget situation. We've seen some of the reductions that the Governor's made in human services and in the state parks and in historic sites, and with constitutional officers and we think that we need to find a way to address it. The Senate has said that they wish to see some additional revenue come over with our spending Bill, and so this is the mechanism to do that. I'd be happy to answer any questions. And I ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Can you just go over, Representative Hannig, the three (3) funds now that you have agreed to exempt after we had the discussion in the committee?"

Hannig: "It's actually more than three, (3) but we… we… we… there were the…"

Bellock: "Oh, the three (3) more, right."

Hannig: "...the discussions in the committee and one had to do with some funds that dealt with the banks and trust..."

Bellock: "Right."

Hannig: "...and we... there were three (3) funds there that we've taken out.

Bellock: "Okay."

Hannig: "The fire protection..."

Bellock: "Right."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Hannig: "...people came in and I think there were two (2) funds,

two (2) funds that they were concerned about."

Bellock: "Fire prevention."

Hannig: "Fire Prevention Fund and the Fire..."

Bellock: "And the Fire Truck Revolving Loan Fund."

Hannig: "...Fire Fighters Revolving Fund for the fire trucks. And then... and then the A.B.A.T.E. came in and... and protested that we would sweep their fund which their members contribute in order to do education for people who ride motorcycles. And then lastly, it came to our attention that probably the Conservation 2000 Fund was being used to pay health insurance benefits for the soil and water conservation employees and so we thought it was best to leave money in that fund. So that's, in the end, what we would exempt from what we talked about in committee."

Bellock: "Okay. Thank you very much and we want to thank you for negotiating on that Bill after the contentious discussion in the committee, because those of us that are on the Human Services Committee want to support giving this money to the disabled, the mentally ill, and the DASA groups, but we found it hard to give it without exempting those couple of funds. So, we appreciate your work on that and Representative Feigenholtz, in working with us. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Moffitt."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Moffitt: "Representative, I just really want to also add my thanks and appreciation to you. When we left the

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

committee, we weren't finished but you in good faith said you'd continue to negotiate and have dialogue, so I commend you for doing that. Really, both sides of the aisle stood up for the fire service with this and the chair, Representative Feigenholtz, really appreciated your courtesy in allowing us to have all that discussion and both the Leadership on your side and ours. So, the people have won by protecting that Fire Prevention Fund and the fire truck loan and the open discussion we had is kind of like the way it should work. So, Representative, I thank you for that very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sullivan. Sullivan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sullivan, we want to thank you profusely

for putting your jacket on. Thank you."

Sullivan: "I try to be as formal as possible."

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Thank you. Representative, in your opening statement, you talked, and I'm... and I'm... hopefully, I'm quoting you correctly. It said some of these funds seem to have more money than they need. Is that an accurate description of what you said?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think the point I was trying to make is that we were try... we went through a process where we tried to weed out the funds and there were some of the funds that are clearly declining in balance and there's no need to sweep those moneys, they're going to... they're going to have difficulty soon enough. And so, we set those aside. Then there were other funds that had... were either

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

breaking even or maybe having some slight increases but not enough to really worry about and no real money there. And then there were a third set of funds, I think, that we looked at and put on this list that we said that appeared to have growing balances and a significant amount of money that we could use some of that for other purposes and that's how we developed the list. And I guess that's the point I was trying to make."

- Sullivan: "Well, and that's nice, so you did analyze these. In your analysis of the funds, the third category that you just described, did you come up with any potential reasons why these funds are growing and why you... I know you chose... the reasons you chose, but why are those funds growing like that? Is there a specific reason that you were able to find out?"
- Hannig: "Well, Representative, I mean... some people would argue that the... the Governor is suppressing spending in an effort to increase these fund balances for the purpose of sweeps. I don't really know the answer. All I can tell you is that it does appear that these have balances that are increasing."
- Sullivan: "Would it be possible that maybe the fees are too high in those funds?"
- Hannig: "It's... it could be that the fees are too high, but I think if you talk to the advocates most of the time they would say that they think that the money's not going out. In fact, that's the argument that A.B.A.T.E. made. They said, look it is increasing, but it's increasing because the Governor won't appropriate the money and if the

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Legislature appropriates it the Governor won't spend it. So, yes, the balance would go up. But they thought is was unfair that we should try to sweep them."

Sullivan: "Well, and I understand that, but going back to what you just said that, potentially, the Governor is not spending some of the money. Why don't we work on that aspect of it, because in essence what you're doing is, it's not tax and spend anymore, it's fee and spend. Because these are fees that are going to go to dedicated purposes and if the Governor's not spending the money as you say, that means there's a balance built up and here we are, lo and behold, with a budget crisis and now we're going to sweep this money. Wouldn't that be a fairly accurate characterization?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I mean we've been sweeping money out of funds since I came down here in the 1980s. It's not a new idea, but certainly..."

Sullivan: "Does it make it right?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I mean any of us are free to introduce Bills to lower or raise fees and we see those kinds of proposals introduced all the time. So if you feel that some of these fees are too high, you know, you have the right as well as I do to introduce a Bill to lower those fees."

Sullivan: "And I thank you for that right. Thank you for your honest answers. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we certainly would like to restore some of the moneys that have been politically cut by the Governor moving forward, but I think a lot of people in this chamber

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

would be more willing to sweep some of these funds if we would then correspondingly cut some of the fees. Because the reality is if we have, and the Representative said that some of these... probably... fees are too high and we can look at that, but the reality is, these fees are too high, we should cut them before we start sweeping them. I advise a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, this sweeps Bill, this fund sweeps Bill totals how much now? In... after all... there's two (2)

Amendments, right?"

Hannig: "After the two (2) Amendments it's two hundred and twenty-one million, two hundred and fifty thousand (221,250,000)."

Eddy: "Two hundred and twenty-one million?"

Hannig: "Two hundred and fifty thousand (250,000)."

Eddy: "And as I understand it, there's an appropriations Bill that will, in some way, encumber or at least there's a fund created where this two hundred and twenty-one, two hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$221,250,000) will be secured in some fashion so that it must be spent on certain appropriations?"

Hannig: "Well, so we would create the Budget Relief Fund and then we would transfer the money into that fund. I think if we put it in the General Revenue, I mean... the Governor could take the money that we swept, but then never... never spend it."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Eddy: "Okay."

Hannig: "Or he could spend it on some other item."

Eddy: "How much... how much... and is that Senate Bill 1103, is that the accompanying legislation that... okay."

Hannig: "Yes, that's the companion spending Bill."

Eddy: "How much spending... what's the total dollar amount of spending in 1103?"

Hannig: "I'm advised that from the new Budget Relief Fund, the number's two hundred and twenty million, two hundred and ninety-eight thousand, seven hundred (220,298,700)."

Eddy: "Okay. So it's within... within a few hundred thousand dollars of equaling the same amount as the sweeps?"

Hannig: "It's very close. It's very close. We have a small surplus."

Eddy: "And from the original list of appropriations, it's my understanding that Soil and Water Conservation Districts' Funds were restored and CFAR funds were restored?"

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. The other question I have has to do with an Amendment I filed to the Bill that was not adopted and it had to do with a phone call I received from the folks at the March of Dimes. And it relates to the Metabolic Screening and Treatment Fund for newborns. And it's a five hundred thousand dollar (\$500,000) line item. Can you tell me what process you use to decide which of the fund Amendments that were filed were approved, and I appreciate the fact that some were. I'm just kind of wondering what the determination was that this particular fund wasn't spared?"

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Hannig: "Well, Representative, the Rules Committee has to make those determinations, but I think for the funds that we did change, it was because of the testimony that we heard in the Appropriation Committee. So we heard a significant amount of testimony. We delayed the House from convening for a period of time because we were down in Room 118 having extensive testimony on why those three (3) groups should be exempt. And ultimately, because of a lot of pressure from your side of the aisle and some from mine, we decided that we would just allow those Amendments. So, it was..."

Eddy: "But... I appreciate that. There has... there's a timing involved here. However, I'm sure the Amendment I filed was after that hearing took place. My question is whether or not you would give consideration to placing this Bill back on Second, adding my Amendment and moving it to Third so that we could save that money for the metabolic screening for the prenatal care? It would take a couple of minutes. And... obvious... actually, in the totals here, it looks as if the amount that I'm talking about would actually fit into... make the amounts equal, as well. Would you consider that for the..."

Hannig: "Well, Representative..."

Eddy: "...for the March of Dimes?"

Hannig: "...we also need a little cushion in our... in our account because one of the provisions that we put in, I probably should have spoke to this in my introduction, is that we suggested if... if our... our calculations on these sweeps are wrong that we would allow the com... that we would allow the

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

appropriation to be replaced. So we have to keep some amount of... of cushion in the fund or we won't be able to do that. And so, we... I didn't really want to allow any Amendments, to be very honest with you, but we had some very compelling arguments made in the Appropriation Committee, and in the spirit of compromise with your side of the aisle, we exempted those three (3) big hitters. But we're, basically, about even now with our spending and our revenues and I'm... you know, I think we're out..."

Eddy: "So, the answer's no. The train..."

Hannig: "...I think... I think we're out of money."

Eddy: "...the train is down the tracks, basically."

Hannig: "I think we're out of money."

Eddy: "Okay. Well, and I appreciate that and I appreciate the consideration of my request even and I understand why you can't do it. However, this... this whole system, this whole process is difficult, because what we're doing is picking and choosing anyway. And it makes it difficult when you get individual calls, especially from causes like that. I wanted to advocate to the last second for those folks, and I certainly understand where you're coming from. I also appreciate the work you've done on this. It's not a good situation for anyone. It's very, very difficult to hear the stories and get the phone calls we've all received in the last several weeks from DD providers, from folks in alcoholic and drug and substance abuse. I really... I really wish that the Governor had not decided that these were not the priority. And he has actually put us in a very, very difficult situation. We don't have much choice in this.

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

We have to take care of people. The Governor's cuts hurt people and if this is the only possible way to take care of the people we should be taking care of, we're almost in a situation, we have to do it. I appreciate your work on this and thank you for the answers."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, you've been here awhile and while we have done this in the past, I don't think this is a regular way of doing business. This was an exception when you and I were here a few years ago. It seems now to be the rule. Would you agree with that?"

Hannig: "I agree with you, Representative."

Black: "You know, we used to sit around a table and look at these things, take a little from here, add a little there, and I remember Governor Edgar, and people have forgotten, we were in difficult budget times then. And Governor Edgar made it very clear, no new programs. And we had to cut and we had hiring freezes, but we worked our way out of that. We don't do that anymore. I'm not blaming you, we know where the blame is. In fact, I don't... is the Governor even here today? Do you know? I haven't seen him."

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

Black: "I think you and Representative Sullivan have made some very excellent points. I think Representative Sullivan is right. I think some of these fees were increased five (5) years ago with the plan that there would be money left over

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

and the ability would then be to sweep the excess money. And I will have staff draft any number of Bills to see if we can't address that problem. But be that as it may, some of these budget cuts were not run by you. They were not given to either of the caucuses. We didn't sit around and talk about them. I still don't have the common courtesy of a press release, a phone call, or a letter explaining why three (3) state recreation areas in my districts were closed. That's... that's a lack of common courtesy, at best. Displays maybe a complete incompetence at worst. not the way to do the public business. But given the list that we're working off of, let me ask you some questions that I don't... I don't understand. We're going to put money back in the Department of Natural Resources, I have been told, can you confirm that that will open up the eleven (11) state parks scheduled to close and the twelve (12) or thirteen (13) historic sites that were scheduled to close on November 1?"

Hannig: "I've been advised that that's what will happen,
Representative."

Black: "Okay. But then let me ask you why in this fund sweep Bill, if you'll look down this list, the Illinois Historic Sites Fund will be swept of five hundred and twenty-two thousand dollars (\$522,000)? The Parks and Conservation Fund will be swept by two million dollars (\$2,000,000)."

Hannig: "So, Representative..."

Black: "Where... where is this money? Is it from dedicated funds?"

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

- Hannig: "Our thought is to put it into the Budget Relief Fund and then appropriate from that fund to try to make it clear that when we sweep this money that is doesn't just go over to GRF where the Governor could use it for some other kind of items, but that it should only be available in this fund for that purpose."
- Black: "All right. And I understand that and I appreciate that and I think unfortunately we have to do that. But if... if DNR is going to get a little less then \$2.7 million (\$2,700,000) in order to maintain their operations, why then or from what source are we sweeping two million dollars (\$2,000,000) from the Parks and Conservation Fund? Are these lease payments, Robertson... Pittman-Robertson Funds? I don't understand how on the one hand we give them 2.6 million (2,600,000), on the other hand, we take two million (2,000,000) out of Parks and Conservation."
- Hannig: "So... so again, part of what we are trying to do is to highlight on the spending side that it's our intention and our legislative intent that these parks and historic sites stay open. And we thought that the best way to do it was to number one, take... make sure there's money to fund it and then secondly, to appropriate from that fund so there's a specific line item. And now you're in a situation where the Governor can't just use that money and pay some other bill with it. He could let it sit there, but he can't use it for something else. So we're trying to tie his hands as best we can, Representative."
- Black: "Well, you know, he was a Golden Gloves boxer and he has very quick hands."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Hannig: "Very quick."

Black: "So, I hope you're using the appropriate restraints. But Representative, if you'll look on the first sheet, second line from the bottom, all right. Oh, you might not have the same sheet that we do."

Hannig: "Yeah, but go ahead. What's the fund?"

Black: "Well, it's Park and Conservation, 0962 is the fund code. It show an available balance as of September 9, 2008, of ten million dollars (\$10,000,000). Now, I think that goes back to what you said earlier. He's not spending money that was appropriated for parks and conservation. So in the sweeps Bill, in the Bill before us, we're taking two million dollars (\$2,000,000) of that out and putting it into DNR so we can keep our parks and historic sites open."

Hannig: "That's correct, Representative."

Black: "So, in other words, as I understand it, of the three (3) recreation areas in my district that closed, we've had a broken gang mower, you know, a batwing mower that hasn't worked all year for the lack of a two hundred and seventy-nine dollar (\$279) flywheel. Every purchase requisition to Springfield is rejected. Don't have the money. Don't have the money. So we didn't... they couldn't mow the grass. Well, I get the complaints, not the Governor. And it looks to me like there was plenty of money to buy a flywheel for the batwing mower so that we could mow the grass in the campgrounds and what we call the meadow. So, I think what I heard you say is that he just slows down spending and then we have money available to sweep. Right or wrong?"

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Hannig: "It... it has been suggested that that's what the administration is doing, at least in some of these funds and indeed, during the Appropriation Committee hearing, the people from A.B.A.T.E., the motorcycle people suggested that that's exactly what was happening in their fund and that's why the fund was growing. And they would suggest that there was need for that motorcycle training, but that it wasn't being appropriated, or that if it was appropriated, it wasn't being spent."

Black: "Well, and I appreciate your honesty, I really do. The Governor, by Executive Order, increased camping fees at all of our state parks and recreation areas by 100 percent on all state holidays: Memorial Day, Fourth of July, Labor Day. Do camping fees go into the DNR General Revenue Fund or are they in a dedicated fund?"

Hannig: "I'm advised into the State Parks Funds."

Black: "State parks. Well, you know one of the things that shows how little thought was given to closing state parks and recreation areas, almost... I think all of our state parks and recreation areas are given federal money from the Pittman-Robertson Fund, the tax on sporting equipment. It's also my understanding, in a phone call to a Chicago regional office, that if any of those parks close, the Federal Government will demand any and all dollars be returned to them that they expended on wildlife habitat, canoe ramps, boat launching ramps. Is that your understanding?"

Hannig: "That's what I'm advised, Representative."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Black: "Okay. So, we weren't going to save any money by closing these state parks, in fact, we were going to... it was going to cost us money. What... it's a rhetorical question. Why do we... why do we have to do this? Why does this Governor do this? I've never seen so many people so upset over the closing of a state park in my area as they have been in the last two (2) weeks. And I don't think it was necessary. I don't think it was thought out at all. I think it was just what we're used to. Bluff and bluster and threatened and we're going to barricade this and if you so much as put one foot on thus property after November 1, we'll arrest you for trespassing. I intend to step one foot on that state park on November 2. And I have never been arrested in my life, but by golly, it'll be worth it if that happens to me on November 2 and I have a hunch I won't be alone in Vermilion County. And I have it from good source that Speaker Madigan has said he will be there with my bail. And I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, when all is said and done, what a way to run government. I mean, even in the heyday of the robber barons, you didn't even run railroads this way. rhyme or reason to these cuts, threatening people, raising camping fees, and this... you know, these parks have been starved out for the last three (3) years. All I can say is hallelujah, the parks appear that they won't close on November 1. Our historic sites will stay open, because if this didn't happen I have a Resolution drafted that will change what our license plate says. It will retain Land of Lincoln, but we'll add the words 'Welcome to the Land of

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Lincoln' underneath it will be 'We're closed'. As we begin to celebrate the 200th birthday of Abraham Lincoln, the Herndon-Lincoln (sic-Lincoln-Herndon) Law Office open one day a week, New Salem closed two (2) or three (3) days a week, the Old State Capitol closed two (2) or three (3) days a week. This whole situation is ridiculous. not the way we worked out our budget problems in the past. This is ridiculous. I think it's the result of personality clashes, personal dislike or whatever it is, but this is no way to run government. It's no way to treat the people who pay the taxes to maintain these parks and I think the idea of a fund sweep is bad public policy, but here I am. under duress, as one of our Representative's said in caucus I have to vote for this so that I can keep three (3) state recreation areas in my district open. So I don't have any drug and alcoholic abuse programs open in my district. I don't have mental illness treatment centers open in my district. Governor, there's a better way to do this. Sit down with us, go over the budget, become involved in the process. It works. Governor inherited a huge deficit and when he left office eight (8) years after he was inaugurated, he left this state a one billion dollar (\$1,000,000,000) surplus. Was he magician? No, he met with Legislative Leaders Legislators on a regular basis. And guess what? He lived Springfield, at least all the time durina Legislative Session. It's ridiculous that it's come to this. But I have no choice. I want to see some of these vital services restored, this it what it takes to restore

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

I think this is bad public policy. I think Representative Sullivan was right on target. I think some of these fees were increased deliberately to let a balance exist. That's not the way government is supposed to work. I'm over a barrel. I appreciate your work, I appreciate your effort. There are fund sweeps in here I don't agree I appreciate the fact you've taken some out, but the bottom line is, my district can't go the balance of the fiscal year, closing state parks, denying treatment to those who need alcohol substance... and alcohol and substance What money do we save by diverting them to the court system. None. It costs us money. How much money have I already lost in my district by people going to the Indiana State Parks? This will be a full chapter in my book as to what is wrong with State Government. It's a classic example. I intend to vote 'aye'. I respect those who won't, but I'm simply here to say, Governor, I don't agree with the way you did it, I don't agree with how you did it. It didn't have to be this way, but I will vote to restore necessary and vital services in my district and throughout the state, and I will vote to open the three (3) state recreation areas in my district that are heavily visited. And by the way Governor, Kickapoo State Park was purchased by donations from people who live in Vermilion County back in the 1930s. They purchased it from the United Coal Company. It was spoil land, it was moonscape. We bought it. We donated it to the state. And thank you very much for threatening to close it. So much for our generosity."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

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. The Chair recognizes Mr. Hannig to close."

Hannig: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Sweeping funds is a difficult thing to do, and certainly we wouldn't have come back to Springfield for this Bill unless there was an underlying reason that was compelling. And indeed I think when many of us look at the reductions that the Governor made in his Vetoes, it seemed that they were very disproportionately targeted toward human services and state parks and some of the constitutional officers. And it just doesn't seem fair I think to many of us here in this chamber that we would just let those Amendatory Vetoes stand. So this is a method that we can employ that will allow us to sweep some additional money that will then be available to restore those items. So this is part of the process. We'll do the companion spending Bill next, but I would ask for your 'yes' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The vote shall require 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 97 people voting 'yes', 16 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Supermajority Vote, is hereby declared passed.

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Mr. Hannig, on Senate Bill 1103. Okay. Mr. Clerk, take that out of the record. Mr. Brosnahan, on Senate Bill 2536. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2536 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brosnahan."

Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This issue... this Bill..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brosnahan, I think we have to take the Bill back to Second for the purposes of an Amendment."

Brosnahan: "That's... that's correct."

Speaker Madigan: "So, Mr. Clerk, put the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Brosnahan, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brosnahan, on the Amendment."

Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd move to adopt Amendment #1. What the Amendment does, it allows a duly appointed assistant state's attorney to serve as a county board member for a county located outside the jurisdiction of the State's Attorneys Office that he or she serves. There's also some safeguards in place in this Bill that would prevent the state's attorney from engaging in anything that would be a conflict of interest. And I'd move for 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?"

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

- 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 2536, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to be recorded as a 'no' on that Bill that we had quite awhile back that was House Bill 953. A 'no' on the Motion to override."
- Speaker Madigan: "The... You heard the Lady's request. That shall be reflected in the record. Thank you. Mr. Black."
- Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."
- Black: "Representative, we've talked about this. Could you clarify... there seems to be conflicting information. Some people, and I defer to those who are attorneys, have said that there is an Attorney General's opinion that says an assistant state's attorney cannot hold a public office. Other attorneys have said that has changed and there is now an Attorney General's opinion that says they, in fact, can hold public office. Are you privy to which Attorney General's opinion is the latest?"
- Brosnahan: "Yes, Representative Black, this issue has just come up a number of times and there are a number of informal opinions from the Attorney General's Office going back eleven (11) or twelve (12) years ago when the Attorney General was Jim Ryan, including Attorney General Madigan. And originally, the position of eleven (11) years ago,

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Attorney General Ryan, he indicated that... and it wasn't so much a state's attorney and a county board member, it was the positions of an assistant state's attorney and a park district commissioner, and that opinion was that they... as long as the State's Attorneys Office would put certain restrictions on that ASA, then those two (2) positions are perfectly compatible. The latest informal opinion from the Attorney General's Office, Attorney General Madigan, it's her office's position and again, it's an informal opinion, but her office's position was that the position of assistant state's attorney constitutes a public office. And holding a public office is prohibited, so you couldn't be a county board member as well as an assistant state's attorney. Now that being said, there have been a number of laws that the General Assembly has passed that would allow other employment. For instance, the General Assembly has passed a legislation that would allow a county board member to be a planning... regional planning commission member, an alderman, a village trustee, a forest preserve district member. So what we're trying to do here is also add the position of assistant state's attorney. And we're trying be careful, that's why we also included in this legislation the provision that there would have to be some internal mechanisms in the State's Attorney's Office that would make sure that this assistant state's attorney would not be involved in any conflicts of interest with that job. So we've tried to tailor it very narrowly."

Black: "All right. So, the conflict... excuse me, the conflict of interest that would normally exist for any of us, will be

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

even more carefully spelled out for this individual who is an assistant state's attorney, correct?"

Brosnahan: "That's correct."

Black: "All right. Okay. Fine. You've answered my question.

Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Durkin."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Durkin: Bill. Representative Brosnahan did raise the issue of what the Attorney General opinion does say. I respectfully disagree 'cause the analysis, at the end of the day, is that the assistant state's attorneys, are they managerial or are they part of the Executive Branch or not? think both of us could probably agree. Both of us served in those capacities that an assistant state's attorney does not have the discretion to make many of the decisions that go on in a courtroom. I would suggest that they do not have that managerial experience. Ninety-nine (99) percent of them don't. So I... the analysis that has been traditional that the assistant state's attorney does... takes on this managerial executive authority I believe is misplaced based on the factual circumstances that we both know of which occur in those offices day in and day out. So I think this is a good Bill. And I recommend everybody support... to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This Bill shall require 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 105 people

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

voting 'yes', 8 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Supermajority vote, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Order of... Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and or joint action Motions were referred, action taken on September 10, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'approved for floor consideration', referred to the Order of Resolutions is House Resolution 1517, offered by Representative Lang."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. When we passed a former Resolution to create a committee to study the Marriage and Dissolution Act, it appears that we made that committee a little too small. There are some... many people with some great ideas about how to make that committee work better. This Resolution would simply expand the committee that's already been created. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Resolution. The Chair recognizes Representative Cole."

Cole: "Mr. Speaker, my comment is to a different Bill. I'll wait 'til... we're done with this vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... I, like Representative Sullivan, I also had to put on my jacket."

Speaker Madigan: "Very good."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Rose: "Respect the process. I have a question of the Sponsor if I may, briefly."

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Rose: "Representative, who are you adding to this because our computer system, or at least on my computer system it seems to have gone down. What positions are you adding to this committee because we've not met yet? Our first meeting is suppose to be Monday night."

Lang: "I didn't hear the question, I'm sorry, Sir."

Rose: "That's okay. Who are you adding to the composition of the committee, because our first meeting, I believe, is this coming Monday?"

Lang: "We... we gave the Minority Leader and the Speaker each two
(2) more appointments. So many people have been calling
and suggesting that they have expertise..."

Rose: "Okay."

Lang: "...that we thought it would be a good idea to add more people to make it work."

Rose: "And will they be available for our first meeting to have quorum Monday?"

Lang: "I think... I think it would depend when they're appointed.

I think it may be that some names are available today to be appointed and... but that we should not hold up the good work of the committee. It should go ahead and start next week."

Rose: "And the deadlines aren't changing for... the deadlines are not changing?"

Lang: "I'm sorry, Sir."

Rose: "The deadlines are not changing for issuing the report."

Lang: "No, not at all."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Rose: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the Resolution?' 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 113 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does adopt the HR1517. Representative Cole."
- Cole: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker on House Bill 953, could you have the record reflect that my vote would be 'no'?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative, we'll reflect your request in the record. Thank you. Mr. Hannig, HJR142. Mr. Hannig. Mr. Clerk, take that out of the record. Mr. Crespo, did you wish to do House Bill 1432? Mr. Crespo, House Bill 1432."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I move to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto on House Bill 1432. I reckon I'm a rookie. I'm trying to understand this whole process of Amendatory Vetoes. And what I do understand, Speaker, Members of the House, is that under House Rule 78 the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to the Bill return shall be limited to addressing the Governor's objections to portions of the Bill, the general merit of which the Governor recognizes and shall not alter the fundamental purpose or legislative schemes set forth in the Bill as passed. This Amendatory Veto doesn't do that. As a reminder, House Bill 1432 was to add anorexia and bulimia nervosa to a list of mental illnesses covered by the Illinois Mental Health Insurance Parity Act.

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Both anorexia and bulimia are recognized as mental illnesses by the Diagnostic Statistical Manual (sic-Diagnostic Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders) published by the American Psychiatric Association. On the other hand, the Governor's additions are not diagnosed as defined by the Diagnostic Statistical Manual. secondly, the adjustment disorders referenced in the Amendatory Veto would be covered by the list of mental illnesses already included under this Act. Could be depressive disorder, posttraumatic disorder and generalized anxiety disorder. Basically, he's comparing apples to oranges, Speaker, and Members, and it does not meet the definition of what an Amendatory Veto should be. This was a Bill that we worked very hard to pass. First time I introduced the Bill, a year ago, it failed by 1 vote. worked hard in a bipartisan fashion. We worked with the Senate, and when it came back as amended, it passed the Senate unanimously and we received close to 90 or 94 votes in the House. I understand what the Governor's trying to do, folks. I think some of his ideas are noble, but we need to follow the legislative process, folks. It's not that complicated. And I hope we all understand that. And I'm looking forward to get your support on this override."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunkin."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, I recall this Bill, you've been working on it for quite some time, and I commend you for trying to address this issue. It's certainly taken our

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

state and our country by surprise with how many people are a part of this eating disorder. My question is, there are a number of mandates that we require insurance companies to adhere to. How do we enforce such a measure if we were to pass this here?"

Crespo: "How would we enforce the mandate and the underlying Bill, the 1432?"

Dunkin: "Exactly."

Crespo: "Well, being part of the law, Representative, it'll be a requirement that insurance companies at a minimum meet the requirements of the parity law that's currently in the books right now, which applies to schizophrenia. Yeah, so it's already... it's already the law. We're just saying this will now be part of what the..."

Dunkin: "Part of..."

Crespo: "...the mental parity law that we currently have in the State of Illinois."

Dunkin: "Okay. I mean the reason I asked is because there are a number of us who are insurance carrier, we carry insurance from our jobs, our respective companies, and oftentimes, various illnesses occur and we find ourselves, constituents in particular, find themselves fighting to have certain illnesses covered. Either they don't meet a certain threshold or they're... in other words, they're costing too much and the insurance companies sometimes are doing sort of a pushback from us and we just find that the insurance that we thought we had is not what we actually have when it comes to certain illnesses. And so I'm just curious as of how we can avoid that particular fiasco or

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

issue that we have with certain insurance companies not actually paying for 100 percent or even 80 percent, in its entirety, various measures or various eating disorders or any ailment, but in particularly, this issue of eating disorder, anorexia, et cetera."

Crespo: You know, I see two (2) issues here, Number one, is how do we deal with the Representative. insurance companies in the state or perhaps in the country, on one hand. On the second hand, what House Bill 1432 did is exactly that. It recognized that eating disorders has the highest mortality rate in the country and the state. It's also recognized by the Diagnostic Statistical Manual (DSM) as a mental disorder, hence we feel that issue be covered as a mental illness. If there's anything else out there how insurance companies operate, I'll be more than happy to entertain that, but it's not part of this Bill and should not be part of an Amendatory Veto which is the Governor's trying to do. Again, I'm not taking exception to what he's trying to do, you know, maybe we should include domestic violence. I mean, we need to vet these things, we need to go through the process and what you're referring to now, I think, is something that perhaps we should sit down and start looking at the whole process with insurers and you know, if you have an illness, yes, the fact that you have to claim you have an illness to get a hearing and to get paid, is an issue. But that's something totally..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Crespo..."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

- Crespo: "...different then what House Bill 1432 is supposed to do."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Crespo, are you prepared to go to Roll Call?"
- Crespo: "Yes, Sir."
- Speaker Madigan: "Okay. Mr. Crespo moves that House Bill 1432 do pass, notwithstanding the specific recommendations of the Governor. This vote shall require 71 votes. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Sullivan. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 77 people voting 'yes', 36 people voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Supermajority, House Bill 1432 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the specific recommendations of the Governor. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or joint action Motions were referred, action taken on September 10, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'approved for floor consideration', 'recommends be adopted' is Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1103."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, what was the content of the Rules Report?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1103 was approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reitz."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a quick point of personal privilege."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

- Speaker Madigan: "State your point."
- Reitz: "I'd like to have the House join me in wishing my seatmate, Brandon Phelps, a happy 38th birthday."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig, are you prepared to call Senate Bill 1103? Then, Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 1103?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1103, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations, is on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 3, 6, and 7 have all been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig, on Amendment #3."
- Hannig: "I'd ask to withdraw 3 and I'd have to withdraw 3."
- Speaker Madigan: "Withdraw Amendment #3. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Hannig: "Withdraw Amendment #6 as well."
- Speaker Madigan: "Withdraw Amendment #6. Mr. Hannig, on Amendment #7."
- Hannig: "Yes, that becomes the spending Bill. I'd ask that we adopt the Amendment and then we'll debate it on Third Reading."
- 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 have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1103, a Bill or an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a companion Bill to the sweeps Bill that we just passed. So in that proposal we were able to find some additional money, in this proposal we allocate how we believe that that money should be spent. And it comes out the new Budget Relief Fund that we created. essentially falls into, I guess, several broad areas. One, is that the human services cuts that the Governor made to any number of areas, we believe were too deep and would cause a great deal of pain and perhaps even some problems for a number of the constituents that we represent. so, we would ask that those items be restored to the '08 levels. We talked about it earlier, as well, this situation that exists with our state parks and our historic sites and this would provide additional funding to ensure that all state parks and historic sites would be able to remain open. It would provide that people who have positions with the State of Illinois, front-line jobs with Illinois, whether it's a constitutional the State of officer or if it's an office under the Governor's Office, that these people would be able to retain their jobs. those are the kind of the broad areas that we try to address with this spending Bill. It appropriates two hundred and nineteen million, eight hundred and sixty-four

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

thousand, nine hundred dollars (\$219,864,900) in the new Budget Relief Fund, and eleven million, eight hundred and eighty-two million (sic-thousand) dollars (\$11,882,000) in the other funds... other state funds. So that's what it does. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, in Amendment #7 there's just... can you...

I would hope you could explain to me, as I understand it,

Amendment #7 removes the state's attorneys appellate line

item that was in every other version. Why did we take out

the state appellate defender line item?"

Hannig: "I think, Representative..."

Black: "Pros... prosecutor, not defender, I'm sorry."

Hannig: "As we simply tried to put these... these spending plans together, I think that one was added inadvertently. Perhaps some would argue that we would need it, I'm not suggesting that we don't. But the point, I guess, I would make is that as we... we came to the end and we tried to make sure that the spending and the revenues were relatively balanced. In our final review, I think, there was a determination that that had been in the Bill from the beginning but that it was in error."

Black: "Well, we all… we all make mistakes on occasion, but you generally make so few I was just kind of flabbergasted by this sudden appearance."

Hannig: "I was so, as well."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Black: "Yeah. Well, let me... let me ask you a question, and it isn't a rhetorical question. There are a lot of people who are getting press releases ready to go out: state parks will reopen, drug and alcohol substance abuse programs to be restored. Isn't that just a tad premature?"

Hannig: "Well, we also have a Body called the Senate..."

Black: "Oh."

Hannig: "...and we have a branch of government called the Executive Branch..."

Black: "Oh."

Hannig: "...where the Governor has this pen, he calls it the 'Veto pen'."

Black: "Ah."

Hannig: "Sometimes he vetoes and sometimes he signs Bills with it."

Black: "Yeah."

Hannig: "And then of course, the Governor may not even release this money. So yeah, there's... there are some hurdles to overcome, but I think it's important to as least say that here in the House we're trying to take that first step."

Black: "You've been a negotiator on budget items for a number of years. Do you have any sense or any communication with your Senate colleagues? Are they planning to come back some time in the future and deal with these sweeps and budget restorations or do you know?"

Hannig: "I do not know, but what I've heard and read in the press is that the Senate President has suggested that if we're going to send some additional spending that we probably should send some additional revenues. And so,

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

that's part of what we tried to do when we did the sweeps Bill and then tied it to this Bill. I think we tried to... we tried to address the Senate's objections in that respect."

- Black: "So... I... I think, if I hear you correctly, I don't think people should be celebrating the restoration of things that they want and in many cases, things that we really need, at this point because this still has a long arduous process it must go through, correct?"
- Hannig: "That's correct. I think we can all say that we've taken a good first step, that we've done the things that we need to do here in this chamber. We made some hard decisions, but we have to have some help from the Senate and the Governor before these things will actually happen."
- Black: "And in this Bill before us, have we balanced what we are restoring with the amount of money that we gained from Senate Bill 790, or are we spending money we've actually put in by virtue of the fund sweep?"
- Hannig: "Yeah. I'm advised that the fund sweeps will net two hundred and twenty-one million, two hundred and fifty thousand (221,250,000) and the spending Bill will appropriate two hundred and nineteen thousand (sic-million) eight hundred and sixty-four thousand and nine hundred dollars (\$219,864,900). So, there's... a couple of million dollars (\$2,000,000), there's a little bit of cushion, but not very much."
- Black: "All right. So, in effect, this vote is simply saying we've provided the revenue, now we're trying to restore some of the vital services that the Governor, in our

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

opinion, my opinion, I won't put you in there, did not think through as completely as I wish he would have. So we're now spending or allocating real money for real services to real people. Right?"

Hannig: "That's correct."

Black: "Okay."

Hannig: "We found some money, we've identified where we'd like it to be spent, and we would say that these are our top priorities."

Black: "All right. I thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. I would... I would hope that this gets a resounding majority, and I know that some of you don't like the way that we came up with the money and I understand that. If this were a more perfect world, we wouldn't even be debating some of these cuts. But it's what we've learned to deal with and I would say as a downstater, my thanks to those people who negotiated more money for the Council on Food and Agricultural Research. Thanks to people who are trying to keep our soil and water conservation districts operating, our agriculture programs operating. Agriculture is a very important part of the economy of this state, and I certainly didn't understand nor agree with the cuts that were made earlier. I think this is a good exercise, it's not what many of us would prefer to do, it's not the process that we've worked through in the past, but this is money that is here. Money that will be appropriated, and I think as Representative Hannig pointed out, specifically appropriated to those

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

accounts where we think spending needs and should be restored. It's worth an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Joyce."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question.

Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question has been put. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Bill shall require 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. McAuliffe. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Supermajority Vote, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Hannig on House Bill 6350. 6350, Mr. Hannig. House Bill."

Hannig: "Yes, I'd ask that we adopt the Amendment and then debate the Bill on Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, is the Bill on the Order of Second Reading?"

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6350 is on the Order of Second Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Amendment #1 by Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, I just move for its adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

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

Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill a third time."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6350, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."

"Yes, thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Hannig: House. This is a proposal that reflects the hopes of some of those people and advocates that were not part of the sweeps Bill for whatever reason. And it reflects, I think, some of the hopes and desires that many of our Members in the Appropriation-Human Services Committee and I think really Members of this Body share and it would appropriate from the General Revenue Fund a total of three hundred and seventy-one million, five hundred thousand (\$371,500,000), much of which... most of which is matchable from the Federal Government. The bulk of this money, two hundred and eighty-five million (285,000,000) would go to the institutional providers to try to maintain a payment cycle. There's also fifteen million (15,000,000) for the noninstitutional providers to maintain a payment cycle, twenty-five million (25,000,000) for the CCP programs, twenty-four million, five hundred (24,000,500) to restore the personal service cuts in various state agencies and twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000) for the ICFDD payment cycle cut. There's also two million (2,000,000) for the Oak Forest Hospital in Cook County. That's what this Bill does. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schmitz. Schmitz."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Schmitz: "Representative, is... this is... as I'm glancing through the notes, this is the amount that the Governor vetoed originally?"

Hannig: "This is all... these are all items that the Governor has vetoed. That's correct. For these lines. There's more, I think, out there, Representative, but all of these items that I just explained were part of a Veto message."

Schmitz: "And for these lines, do we have a dedicated revenue source or suggestion where these types of funds would come from..."

Hannig: "These would be..."

Schmitz: "...totally over..."

Hannig: "...appropriated from General Revenue. So, this... this would be... this appropriation would be from the General Revenue Fund.

Schmitz: "And the General Revenue Fund can handle this kind of appropriation at this time?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, for the Governor to... for the Comptroller to issue a check, a number of things have to happen. One is that, you know, a voucher gets processed and there's a determination made that services are provided, that all that's okay. Then there has to be an appropriation on the books, and then lastly, there has to be cash in the bank. So, this doesn't deal with the issue of... this doesn't make cash in the bank, and this doesn't say anything about the voucher, but it does give the Comptroller some additional spending authority in this

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

area. And as I said in my introduction, these are for the most part matchable funds through Medicaid, primarily."

Schmitz: "Right, and I caught that part that these were matchable funds. My concern is that we don't have the funds to match, so we're almost back to what, in my view, of what we did last May where we passed all... the Bills were passed out of here in the budget and the funds weren't there and the Governor does the reductions, House came back, Senate came back, went through the overrides. Are we back to where we were? It's a six hundred-plus million dollar (\$600,000,000) line item appropriation without the money behind it."

Hannig: "So the Governor... I think he vetoed somewhere around \$1.4 billion (\$1,400,000,000). I think that's the correct amount in that ballpark. And so, we found in the other Bills, some moneys we could sweep, but obviously, we can only sweep so much and we paired that off with some items that we'd like to see restored. There's a great amount of money that we have not found a revenue source for, but there were a number of items and these are those items that we felt were high enough priority that we needed to go forward with an additional appropriation Bill. Now, these would simply be part of an overall spending plan that the Governor would have to manage. We're not suggesting that we've created any new money. We just simply feel these are priority spendings. People who didn't... who were not part of the sweeps appropriation wanted to have an opportunity to have their needs debated. A number of the Members on both sides of the aisle wish to do that, as well.

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Bill would pass the House it still has to go to the Senate for their consideration. But I think that we, in the Illinois House of Representatives where we always considered ourself the peoples' chamber, we want to give these opportunities to debate these things, debate these Bills, a fair hearing and a fair chance. And that's what this is about."

"Representative, my final question is, and you said it Schmitz: a second ago, is we give this to the Governor to manage. The budget was sent over to the Governor, the Governor took management pen and did about 1.4 (1,400,000,000) in cuts, and then it came back to the chambers and the chambers took out their management pens and shipped it back. And up to this point, today, I believe, was the first day there was a revenue associated with some of the cuts. I still don't see any revenue associated with this cut that the Governor used to manage the budget. And with that, I would caution Members that we're getting in the shell game again of passing appropriations without the funding behind it and these agencies are going to be sitting here waiting for it, going, but you passed it, you passed it. Yes, but there's no money."

Hannig: "Yes, so I think that the point is, Representative, that we... we feel strong enough about these limited items that we want to give the Governor a second chance. We want to give him a chance to think about this a little bit more, and to look at the situation a little in more detail. He knows that we've addressed some of our concerns through a

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Bill where we could find sweeps. We can only sweep so many dollars. We would ask him to take a look and see if he can't fit this in, the spending plan that exists today. This would be a supplemental appropriation for our FY09 budget."

Schmitz: "Thank you, Representative. I would just beg to differ on the last point that this is a rather small item. Six hundred-plus million dollars (\$600,000,000) is pretty substantial and considering the sweeps that were just passed a little bit ago is just slightly over a quarter million dollars (\$250,000). I'm sorry, a quarter of a billion (\$250,000,000) at two hundred twenty-six thousand (226,000), I believe... two hundred and twenty-six million (226,000,000). So, thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "The last speaker will be Mr. Winters. Here he is, the last speaker."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Gary, when a... an employee of DNR or the Historic Preservation Agency comes up to you next week and says, thanks for putting that money back in, when can we expect to see these... these cuts restored? What's your answer going to be to them under this Bill? Where... where is the money? Is it going to come from some other program? The Governor, yes, will have authority to spend money there, but it's going to have to come out of another agency, isn't it?"

Hannig: "Now, the park Bill and the employees who work for the parks and who work for Historic Preservation, that was in our previous Bill..."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Winters: "Right."

Hannig: "...and that dealt with a dedicated fund. So it still has to have Senate action."

Winters: "Right. This is the hospital and the nursing homes, excuse me."

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

Winters: "Our analysis still shows something on Historic Preservation, DNR. But the whole question is... I'll wait... I'll wait until your conference ends."

Hannig: "Okay. So, yeah... so, I'm advised that the personal service items that we're trying to restore in this Bill here would not result in layoffs, but they would simply allow people to be replaced when they retire or leave for whatever reason."

Winters: "Is the DNR... there is money in here for DNR, is there not?"

Hannig: "Yes, but it doesn't deal with layoffs as much as..."

Winters: "Right."

Hannig: "...it does with attrition."

Winters: "Right. Now, my understanding is when we add back the money that we earlier appropriated where we had actual revenue from the fund sweeps, and what you're restoring in here, that the DNR budget is actually larger than what was vetoed by the Governor, if you add those two (2) elements together. Is that correct? Our understanding is that you were trying to appease AFSCME in some of the job positionings that they..."

Hannig: "I'm... Now, our staff says that they cut about twenty (20) and we're only restoring about seven (7)."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Winters: "Twenty (20) what?"

Hannig: "Twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000)."

Winters: "Okay. Our analysis showed on the specific line items it actually was an increase over what was vetoed. We may not have restored all of the DNR budget in whole, but the specific line items that we're restoring here are larger than what was vetoed out. I will... I will end, though, with this to the public to be aware there is no money to make these payments. It... it is really a false hope that you're holding out to people by saying, well, we restored this, the nursing homes and hospitals now can be paid by the Comptroller and the Treasurer. The problem is, they don't have any money. We were told today that we're not getting paid for Jul... you know, for per diems that were due us in August. They can't ... they can't write the bill. Comptroller does not have the money to write the checks for something that is routine and comes up all the time. So how are we going to make those payments to hospitals and nursing homes? We aren't. The Governor can... the Governor can order it be done, but if he does, it just delays payment someplace else. You've got a large balloon here and you keep squeezing it and trying to find money. just pops out in another place where we now have another problem in the State Government. There is only so much revenue. Passing this doesn't get us any revenue, it simply increases spending. That's a problem that you passed in May with only Democratic votes. The same problem is back staring us in the face. You haven't done anything with this Bill to make it any better. And I urge a 'no' vote."

285th Legislative Day

- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
 Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Bill shall require 71 votes. Mr. Biggins.
 The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Supermajority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Hannig, HJR142."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. We have in the Legislative Branch of government, a Legislative Ethics Commission and we have a Legislative Inspector General who actually follows up on complaints that are filed with the agency. Tom Homer serves in that capacity at the present time, and in fact, was... has been the one and only Inspector General that we've had for the Legislative Branch. And so this Amendment would reappoint Mr. Homer for another term as our Legis... as our Inspector General for our Legislative Branch."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig, the Clerk advises that there's an Amendment to be adopted. Mr. Hannig, on the Amendment."
- Hannig: "So I would ask for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "So, I think I've explained the Bill. We... we... we've met on the Ethics Committee. I know that the chief of staffs (sic-chiefs of staff) are aware of the view of the Members of that committee. We all agree that we should appoint Mr. Tom Homer for an additional five (5) years and this Resolution would do that. So, I would ask for its adoption."

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig moves for the adoption of the Resolution. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This shall require 71 votes. Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 people voting 'yes', 0 people voting 'no'. Resolution is adopted. All right, Ladies and Gentlemen, let me have your attention. It is the plan of the Chair to finish our work tonight so that there'll be no Session tomorrow. We have eleven (11) items to consider. They all concern the Governor's actions, either that's a Veto or an Amendatory Veto, eleven (11) items. Now, these are matters that were passed by the House previously, and there'll be a Motion to override in ten (10) of the items and a Motion to accept in one. And we can move through these quickly or not. Whatever your desire. But we're going to finish tonight. Those of you that want to get home, you can get home. First matter will be House Bill 4450 and the Sponsor is Mr. Fortner and Mr. Black said that he simply wishes to tell the people that this a Motion to override the Governor, vote 'yes'."

Black: "I couldn't say it better myself, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Great. All right. So, Mr. Black... All right. Mr. Black moves that House Bill 4450 do pass, notwithstanding the specific recommendations of the Governor. This vote shall require 71. 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. The Motion, having... there are 113 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The Motion, having

285th Legislative Day

- received a Supermajority, House Bill 4450 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the specific recommendations of the Governor. Mr. Lang, on 4527."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to override the Amendatory Veto of the Governor. And this Amendatory Veto, the Governor's required all libraries in the State of Illinois to stay open until 9:00, including school libraries. I think that's kind of ludicrous. I don't know who's going to be the school librarian until 9:00. I move to override."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Lang moves that House Bill 4527 do pass, notwithstanding the specific recommendations of the Governor. This vote shall require 71 votes. 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 113 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Supermajority, House Bill 4527 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the specific recommendations of the Governor. Mr. Beiser, on 4602."
- Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I make a Motion to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto of House Bill 4602. It passed unanimously in the Senate and it passed with 101 votes in the House."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Beiser moves that House Bill 4602 do pass, notwithstanding the specific recommendations of the Governor. This vote shall require 71 votes. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 112 people voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Supermajority, House Bill 4602 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the specific recommendations of the Governor. Mr. Leitch, on 4653."

- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Leitch moves that House Bill 4653 do pass, notwithstanding the specific recommendations of the Governor. This will require 71 votes. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Verschoore and Golar. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Motion, having received a Supermajority, House Bill 4653 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the specific recommendations of the Governor. Mr. Joyce, on 5318."
- Joyce: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto on House Bill 5318."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Joyce moves to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 5318. This shall require 71 votes. 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 113 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Constitutional Supermajority, the specific recommendations

285th Legislative Day

- of the Governor as to House Bill 5318 are accepted. Representative Flowers, on 230."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to override the Governor's Veto on House Bill 230."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Flowers moves that House Bill 230 do pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. Those in favor... this shall require 71 votes. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Franks and Black. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Franks. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 85 people voting 'yes', 27 people voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Supermajority, House Bill 230 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. For what purpose does Representative Dugan seek recognition? Dugan. Okay. Representative Jakobsson, on 3106."
- Jakobsson: "Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill do pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Jakobsson moves that House Bill 3106 do pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. This shall require 71 votes. Mr. Rose."
- Rose: "Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote 'present'. I may have a possible conflict of interest. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. And 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 74 people voting 'yes', 38 people voting 'no'.

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

The Motion, having received a Supermajority, House Bill 3106 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. Mr. Sullivan, on 4548."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a simple TIF extension of twelve (12) years for the Village of Libertyville. This is a little unique in that we have entered into intergovernmental agreements to rebate 70 percent of the money back to the local taxing bodies. This is first time in six (6) years that I've been here that this is done. So, this is a benefit to all of our taxing bodies. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Sullivan moves that House Bill 4548 do pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. This shall require 71 votes. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Franks. The Clerk shall take the record. The Motion, having received a Supermaj... there are 108 people voting 'yes', 5 people voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Supermajority, House Bill 4548 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. Representative Monique Davis, on 4668."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to override the Governor's Veto. This is a piece of legislation that requires recyclers to accept identification from those bringing in copper or recyclable metals."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay."

Davis, Monique: "It received 57 votes in the Senate and 112 votes in the House."

285th Legislative Day

- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves that House Bill 4668 do pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. This shall require 71 votes. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mulligan and May. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 111 people voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Supermajority, House Bill 4668 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. Representative Nekritz on 4956. 4956, Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to override the Governor's Veto."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves that House Bill 4956 do pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. This shall require 71 votes. 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 72 people voting 'yes', 41 people voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Supermajority, House Bill 4956 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. Mr. Rita, on 5502."
- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to override the Governor's Veto on House Bill 5022."
- Speaker Madigan: "All right, the Bill is House Bill 5022, and Mr. Rita moves to override the Governor. Mr. Rita moves that House Bill 5022 do pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. This shall require 71 votes. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'.

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

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 73 people voting 'yes', 39 people voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Supermajority, House Bill 5022 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. Let me congratulate all of you. You did very, very well. We should do things like this more often. Representative Dugan."

Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker. A point of personal privilege. I...

I... I, just like Representative Reitz, have a youngster that sits next me as a seatmate who also celebrated a birthday Saturday. So, if everyone could just say happy birthday to Representative Careen Gordon."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 1474, offered by Representative Coulson. House Resolution 1475, offered by Representative Ramey. House Resolution 1477, offered by Representative Yarbrough. House Resolution 1478, offered by Representative Rita. House Resolution 1479, offered by Representative Rita. House Resolution 1481, offered by Representative Hoffman. House Resolution 1482, offered by Representative Coulson. House Resolution 1483, offered by Representative Colvin. House Resolution 1484, offered by Representative Currie. House Resolution 1485, offered by Representative Dunn. House Resolution 1486, offered by Representative Dunn. House Resolution 1487, offered by Representative Dunn. House Resolution 1487, offered by Representative John Bradley. House Resolution 1488, offered by Representative

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Madigan. House Resolution 1489, offered by Representative Howard. House Resolution 1490, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 1491, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 1492, offered by Representative Turner. House Resolution 1493, offered by Representative LaVia. House Resolution 1494, Representative Chapa LaVia. House Resolution 1495, offered by Representative Flider. House Resolution 1496, offered by Representative Hoffman. House Resolution 1497, offered by Representative Coulson. House Resolution 1498, offered by Representative Ryg. House Resolution 1500, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Resolution 1501, offered by Representative Howard. House Resolution 1502, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Resolution 1503, offered by Representative Colvin. House Resolution 1504, offered by Representative Holbrook. House Resolution 1505, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 1506, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 1507, offered by Representative Crespo. And House Resolution 1508, offered by Representative Mautino. House Resolution 1515, offered by Representative Munson. And House Resolution 1516, offered by Representative Dugan."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Agreed Resolutions.

Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, you have an Adjournment Resolution.

Mr. Black."

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

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Speaker Madigan: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Most of you have seen the picture that has been transmitted electronically around the world. It signals détente, a rapprochement, it reminds me of the <u>Summer of Love</u> in San Francisco forty (40) years ago. That being the picture of our own Speaker of the House Michael Madigan hugging our Governor, Rod R. Blagojevich in the love fest known as Denver, 2008. Mr. Speaker, I hope this signifies new beginnings, and I would just like to say, I was so moved by it. Before you leave tonight, perhaps we can line up. I want to give you a hug as well."

Speaker Madigan: "That would be very nice, Mr. Black, but we better get a picture."

Black: "I hope we get lots of pictures."

Speaker Madigan: "All right. How about Mr. Smith, did you want a hug?"

Smith: "Sure, sure. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to bring the Body's attention to the list of hearings that the Education Committee will be having. They're listed on our bulletin today. We have a total of five (5) hearings scheduled on the topic of education funding, and I would encourage all Members, whether you're a Member of the committee or not, to come and join us at one of those hearings. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Inquiry of the Chair. Speaker, did we just have our Veto Session?"

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Speaker Madigan: "Representative, that's a very good question, and I'm glad you raised that. So all of the Members should realize that we have now taken up for consideration all of the Governor's actions on House Bills. House Bills. And so the reason that we would normally come in for a Veto Session for House Bills has been accomplished. That does not take into account the Senate Bills. So there were some Senate Bills where the Governor filed Vetoes or Amendatory Vetoes. And we'll see what happens in the Senate. But that's a very good point."

Hamos: "Well, Speaker, so... but we're scheduled, I believe, for
 six (6) days for those two (2) weeks. Do you... is it
 possible that we won't necessarily be here all six (6)
 days?"

Speaker Madigan: "Just depends on how many Members you wish to hug, Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Well, I'm a big hugger."

Speaker Madigan: "And how often."

Hamos: "I'm a big hugger, so I'll be here. Okay."

Speaker Madigan: "How about Mr. John Bradley."

Bradley, J.: "I... a point of personal privilege. I've been advised that it is Chief of Staff, Tim Mapes' birthday today as well. And... and... and in honor of his birthday, Representative Mautino has hidden a cake somewhere in the desks in here."

Speaker Madigan: "All right, Ladies and Gentlemen, we're prepared to adjourn. Representative Currie moves in accordance with Senate Joint Resolution 105, passed on May 31, that the House stands adjourned until November 12,

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

2008, at the hour of noon or subject to the call of the Speaker. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does stand adjourned."

"House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Clerk Mahoney: House Resolution referred to the House... Introduction and referral to the House Committee on Rules, Resolution 1443, offered by Representative Jakobsson; House Resolution 1447, offered by Representative Poe; Resolution 1465, offered by Representative Holbrook; House Resolution 1466, offered by Representative Mathias; House Resolution 1476, offered by Representative Boland; House Resolution 1480, offered by Representative Dunkin... offered by Representative Durkin. House Resolution 1499, offered by Representative Pritchard; House Joint Resolution 141, offered by Representative Stephens. Introduction and Reading of House Bills-First Reading. House Bill 6699, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government; House Bill 6700, offered by Representative Fritchey, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government; House Bill 6701, offered by Representative Fritchey, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government; House Bill 6702, offered by Representative Fritchey, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government; House Bill 6703, offered by Representative Fritchey, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government; and House Bill 6704, offered by Representative Fritchey, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government; House Bill 6705, offered Representative Black, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation; House Bill 6706, offered by Representative

285th Legislative Day

9/10/2008

Black, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits; House Bill 6707, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government; House Bill 6708, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law; House Bill 6709, offered by Representative Osmond, a Bill for an Act concerning local government; House Bill 6710, offered by Representative Lindner, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."