295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Referred to the House Committee on Rules is Resolution 1628, offered by Representative Brady; House Resolution 1644, offered by Representative Cross; and House Resolution 1650, offered by Representative Madigan. Introduction and reading of Bills... House Bills-First Reading. House Bill 6729, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for Act concerning revenue. House Bill 6730, offered by Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 6731, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. And House Bill 6732, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an concerning elections. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session stands adjourned."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Regular Session of the House will now come to order. Representative Currie requests leave to use the Roll Call of the Twenty-fifth Special Session for the purpose of establishing a quorum for the regular House Session. Is there leave? Leave is granted and a quorum is established. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "The Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson of the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on December 15, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendations: approved for floor consideration 'recommends be adopted' is House Resolution 1650. Approved for consideration and referred to the Order of House Bills... Senate Bills-Third Reading is

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

- Senate Bill 573, Senate Bill 1248, Senate Bill 1985, and Senate Bill 2526."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes, Mr. Jefferson."
- Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the Democratic Caucus, we will meet immediately after Session in Room 114.

 Immediately after we're adjourned here... or we'll recess,
 I'm sorry."
- Speaker Madigan: "Yeah, Mr. Meyer, Jim Meyer."
- Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans will caucus immediately in Room 118."
- Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard these announcements. There will be immediate caucuses. Democrats in Room 114, Republicans in Room 118. Again, immediate caucuses: Democrats in Room 114, Republicans in 118. And then return to the floor. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "The House will be in order. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1630, offered by Representative Mautino. House Resolution 1631, offered by Representative Monique Davis. House Resolution 1632, offered by Representative John Bradley. House Resolution 1633, offered by Representative 1634, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 1635, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 1636, offered by Representative Ryg. House Resolution 1637, offered by Representative Tracy. House Resolution 1638, offered by Representative Crespo. House Resolution 1639 and 1640 and 1641, offered by Representative Brady. House Resolution 1642, offered by Representative Watson. House Resolution

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

1643, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Resolution 1645, offered by Representative Flowers. House Resolution 1646, offered by Representative Hoffman. House Resolution 1647, offered by Representative Tracy. House Resolution 1648, offered by Representative Tracy. And House Resolution 1649, offered by Representative May."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. On Supplemental Calendar #1, under the Order of Resolutions, is House Resolution 1650. Speaker Madigan on the Resolution. Representative Currie, would you like to present the Resolution?"

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House, this is a Resolution that would create a committee to inquire into the question whether there are grounds to impeach the Governor. You've all been reading the headlines. You know that he was arrested last week, and you know that questions have been raised in this chamber and in some committees of this chamber over time, questioning the Governor's fitness to keep his job. And as you also know, impeachment is not something that one undertakes lightly. There would have to be grounds of serious infraction, not necessarily criminal infraction, to determine that a Member of the Executive Branch of Government is not fit to continue to serve. Violations, severe violations of the public trust, serious misuse or abuse of power. This is not a committee to impeach, it's a committee to inquire into the question whether impeachment is in order. This committee is created

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

very much along the lines of the 1997 committee that was created to make a similar inquiry into certain behaviors of then Justice Heiple of the Illinois Supreme Court. And we would provide for twenty-one (21) Members of the committee, 12 Democrats, 9 Republicans. The committee would be able to set its rules; would have subpoena power; would be able to invite testimony from witnesses. All the committee hearings, of course, would be open, and they will all happen in Room 114. I'd be happy to answer your questions, and I hope you'll support the adoption of this Resolution."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves for the adoption of House Resolution 1650. And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with apologies to the Body, I had my speak light on before the Majority Leader gave her opening remarks about House Resolution 1650. And while she was speaking, I... I had this sense that I've seen this Resolution somewhere. And in fact, Mr. Speaker, it's very similar to House Resolution 1644, which was filed by Leader Cross and other Republicans a few days ago. And so that ... that makes me question ... 1644, if I remember third grade math, is lower than House Resolution 1650. So that would mean that we filed our Resolution before Speaker Madigan filed his. If you'll indulge me, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Rule 189g), I would move for the discharge of House Resolution 1644 from the House Rules Committee. Under House Rule 52(a)(2), all Motions are assigned standard debate status and I wish to debate my Motion. Upon the conclusion of the debate, I

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

will ask for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge House Resolution 1644 from the House Rules Committee. Under Rule 49, I am joined by five (5) of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, asking that there be a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I object to the Motion."

Black: "How in the world can you object? It's the same Resolution as you just represented."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, the Lady objects, and under the rules..."

Black: "...why... why am I not surprised. She's objected to every Resolution I've ever had, including one recognizing motherhood and apple pie. I've made my Motion, I move to... I move under House Rule 54(a)(2), all Motions are assigned standard debate status. I wish to debate my Motion. Upon the conclusion of the debate, I ask for a recorded Motion on the Motion to Discharge."

Speaker Hannig: "Rep... Rep..."

Black: "Under Rule 49, my vote shall be a recorded vote and I'm joined by five (5) Members... hold up your hands, don't be bashful over here, on my Motion to Discharge."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, the Lady has objected, and so it's the ruling of the Chair that it does not have unanimous consent, and the Motion fails."

Black: "Yes, and I hope all the assembled press here will notice that we are... six (6) days after the most embarrassing allegations of misconduct, that even the State of Illinois has ever seen, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

press, I... I direct your attention that to get anything done here out of the Rules Committee, requires unanimous consent, which is never granted. Some things in Illinois never change, although it's time for change. Mr. Speaker, you leave me no choice, under House Rule 57(a), I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair, and that there be a recorded vote to discharge House Resolution 1644 from the House Rules Committee, which Ladies and Gentlemen, is an identical Resolution for all practical purposes. Except the House Republican Resolution calls for a bipartisan investigative committee, of ten (10) Members, five (5) Republicans and five (5) Democrats. That's reform, Ladies The same that we did under the Heiple and Gentlemen. investigative committee. Your Resolution says there shall be twelve (12) Democrats and nine (9) Republicans. more things change the more they stay the same. I give you an opportunity to enact a bipartisan Resolution of investigation of the Governor's conduct, rather than the old standard. The Democrats will control it, the Democrats will run it, and the Democrats will control it. Ladies and Gentlemen, what we saw six (6) days ago is simply a continuation, a compilation if you will, of one-party rule. That's what's wrong with Illinois, one-party rule. I ask for my vote on my Motion to overrule the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "And on that question, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Well, Mr. Speaker. To the point of the… of the debate. In… I believe it was 1997, I was a cosponsor of the Heiple Resolution. Not only did it call for a

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

bipartisan committee of five (5) Members each, but it was sponsored bipartisanly. Representative Scully, I believe, was a cosponsor, along with a couple of other Republicans. The Gentleman's Motion is very much in order. Why is it that when the whole world is watching, you can't change your ways at least for one day and let democracy rule. Let us have our Resolution heard. It's a simple request, but you... even under the full light of day, with all the world watching, you have to go back to your old habits. Your old habits, which by the way, are the very habits that brought us here today. I would suggest strongly that if you don't learn from the history of Illinois, only six (6) years ago when George Ryan had a cloud over his head and was seeking reelection, or thinking about it, Republican Leaders went to George Ryan in his first term, and said, Governor, do the right thing. Step aside now. Go and try to clear your Where were you, where were you, Speaker Madigan, name. where were you a year... during Governor Blagojevich's first term when the same investigation was being held? The same cloud over his head. Where were you? You were the Chair of the Party as you are today. Where else were you? You were the Committee Chair to reelect the Governor. Should have done the right thing four (4) years ago, we wouldn't be here today. But now that we are here today, let's at least once in the public eye, do the right thing. Gentleman's Motion should be heard. We should be heard and not silenced again with all the world watching."

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

On the Motion that the Chair should be sustained."

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I find some of the previous comments curious. The previous Gentleman spoke about the whole world is watching, well, I think they are. I think they're trying to know what we do here. We're all trying to accomplish the same goal today, I would presume, and that is to investigate whether this House has a responsibility under the Constitution of the State of Illinois to take a specific act relative to allegations against the Governor of the State of Illinois. It's a serious, grave, and sobering activity that we must undertake. It should be beyond politics. It should be beyond these partisan commentaries. It should be beyond the anger, because Ladies and Gentlemen, all 118 of us are angry. All 118 of us feel betrayed. All 118 of us feel as if we must act, we must do something. And to try to turn this into a partisan game, is absurd and embarrassing. Let me also... let me also add, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, that the comments of the previous speakers are even more appalling, in light of the fact that for the last couple of years at least, the Minority Party's actually been an enabler of the Governor of the State of Illinois. We had a... Mr. Speaker, could I get some order, please? Could I get some order, please, Sir? Point out, point out just one major Bill before this chamber, the... what was known as the capital Bill of the State of Illinois. When those of us on this side of the aisle said, no Governor, we're not going to let you spend thirty-four billion dollars (\$34,000,000,000) any way you want. No, Governor, we don't trust you with thirty-four billion dollars

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

(\$34,000,000,000) of the peoples' money. No Governor, we think that you can't be trusted to make those decisions. The Party who today argues on the floor that there's something heinous going on here, is the Party that said, No, it's okay. It's all right, Governor, take thirty-four billion dollars (\$34,000,000,000) of the peoples' money. We trust you to spend anyway you please. Just go ahead, we'll vote for a capital Bill. We'll give you any Capital Bill you want, Governor. We'll give you anything you want. Just recently, very recently on this floor, we heard from the other side of the aisle how this is a Governor who can be trusted with the peoples' business. This is a Governor we want to decide where a water filtration facility will be built; where a school will be built; where a road will be built. This is a Governor who is under a cloud for bribery, and for trying to sell a United State Senate seat. And they think it's perfectly okay to say, Governor, build whatever you want, wherever you want. And so, Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't understand the rhetoric from the other side of the aisle. We might not be in the position we're in today, if every Member of this chamber called the Governor to task rather than just trusting him to make any decision he wants in any way he wants. If the Minority Party wants to continue to play politics with the peoples' business today, they have a right to do so and we have a right to call you on it. At the end of the day, we know this Resolution will pass, this committee will meet, and this committee will do its business, and the nine (9) Minority Members who are appointed to this committee, will

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

be full partners on this committee. They will provide their input, they will ask their questions, and these twenty-one (21) people together will decide the fate of that committee and prepare a report for this House chamber. Don't turn this into politics, let's go about the business of the people. The business of thirteen million (13,000,000) people live in Illinois, and the business that eventually would lead to giving us our United State's Senator that this state so badly needs right now. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "So we've now had one speak on each side, and the rules would provide that Representative Black will now be recognized to close. Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am so pleased that my good friend and colleague, Representative Lang, didn't make any partisan comments. I know he would be the last person to inject any partisan comments into this process. I was moved. I was moved by his remarks, but then it passed. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, have we no shame here. Who voted to put a sixty billion dollar (\$60,000,000,000) budget on the Governor's desk last May? Nobody on this side of the aisle vote for it. Nobody. You did. The Democrat Party of Illinois did, and what did you say when you left? We trust the Governor to make the necessary cuts. Not partisan, just fact. You gave this Governor just a few months ago a budget you knew of balance by almost three billion dollars (\$3,000,000,0000) and now, and now you say, why, how dare he make these cuts. And yet, your side of the aisle says,

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

don't make this partisan. I would have thought that we could have gotten beyond the old ways of doing business in which the Majority Party must run every aspect of this chamber. We did it in 1997. It was a good committee, had Constitution-chairs, one Republican, one Democrat. Okay, that's not the way you want to do business. Many of us on this side of the aisle are simply want... simply want to tell you that the way of doing business in this state must change. And it should begin today. It doesn't look like it will, but it should and must change. We want to be equal partners with you in that change. I don't intend to debate this any longer. I depend... don't intend embarrass any of you. One of the things I happen to agree with my friend and colleague, Mr. Lang, the issue before us is too important to drag out any longer. I withdraw my request for a vote to Overrule the Chair. We will do the best we can to cooperate with you. I do appreciate the fact that Speaker Madigan let Leader Cross on this Resolution as a cosponsor. I just simply would like to say I had high hopes that we would do this in a bipartisan fashion. You have the Majority; you have the votes to do as you wish. All I can tell you is that I intend to cooperate with you and I think all the Members on this side of the aisle intend to cooperate with you to the fullest possible extent as we are perhaps about to embark on a very serious situation that has impacted everybody in the State of Illinois, and I might add, has besmirched each and everyone of us as well. I withdraw my request, Speaker. You are free to move your Resolution."

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman removes his request. Mr. Clerk, put House Resolution 1650 back on the board. We'll continue the debate, and the Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Cross, is recognized."

Cross: "Question... inquiry of the Chair on a different matter, and I know that this is... obviously, this is important and we'll get to it in a second, but I don't want to let this one go. Inquiry of the Chair as to the original reason we were called here, Mr. Speaker, was to consider the special election Bill or the Bill that would provide for special elections for the U.S. Senate seat. I just don't want to be done with one issue and then adjourn. Can you tell us what the intention of the Chair is with respect to that Bill?"

Speaker Hannig: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "In response to the Gentleman's question, as I told him earlier today, I expected some divisions within the Democratic Caucus on this issue, and that's exactly what happened. And so, the judgment of our caucus is that we want to take some additional time to see if we can work through our differences and come to a consensus position on the question, which is what we plan to do."

Cross: "Could I ask how much time it will take for you to bring your caucus together on... and I think, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to... I know we're here on the issue of impeachment and that is equally important, but clearly the issue of our current Governor having the ability as we all know, to appoint the next U.S. Senator to replace President-elect Obama, is a concern of all of us in this chamber. I think

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

all of us on this side of the aisle believe a special election is the best way to begin restoring the faith and integrity of this system, and to do otherwise I think would be a mistake. So I'm curious what the time line is for your caucus?"

Madigan: "These are Democrats I'm working with, you understand that don't you?"

Cross: "I do, I do, but..."

Madigan: "So, in terms of a timeline, just keep me in your prayers."

Cross: "I guess my concern, Mr. Speaker, and I know you have a challenge with your caucus, I respect that. But every day... the belief I think we all had on this side of the aisle, in fact, I think the people of the State of Illinois had was, we would be here today, be here tomorrow, have a Bill that goes to the Governor's desk, assuming he signs it, I think we all know that's a big assumption. His ability to appoint would terminate immediately. Every day that goes by, and us having to decide how we build consensus, leaves this man with the ability to appoint the next U.S. Senator. We had a very good solution supported by President-elect Obama, supported by President Jones, supported by Dick Durbin. And now we come here tonight because there is some un... some question about what we want to do, and the only way, the only way we can begin the healing in this state after last week, we would agree on both sides of the aisle, something that happened that none of us comprehend. It was so surreal, none of us... I mean, we all spent days going, did this really happen? And we're in the

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

system. We're part of the process. And the people in this state have got to be shocked beyond belief, even for the State of Illinois, even for the State of Illinois. And so along comes an idea that we have a special election. some sense. I agree, as Republicans we benefit by special election. I will be the first to tell you all of that. Let's put it all on the table. But for 13 million people in this state who have been shocked, whose level of cynicism is at an all-time low or all-time high, however, you want to look at it. Why do we want to repeat... why do we want to create a scenario where we repeat just what ... what just happened. Either with this current guy or the new Governor. This isn't about Pat Quinn as a person. believe Pat Quinn is an honorable man. I really do, and I think most of us do share that thought, but... but... in order to avoid any appearance of impropriety, we cannot allow the same setup, the same scenario, the same criteria where one person appoints the next U.S. Senator from this state of a vacancy created by President-elect Obama. We can start the healing and start rehabilitating this system by having a special election. And with all due respect to those of you on the other side of the aisle, and I know caucuses are tough, but to say we need to think about it and we need to build consensus, leaves us all hanging in this chamber, but more importantly and even worse, it leaves the people of the State of Illinois hanging and unknown, what is going to happen? Is the current Governor going to appoint? next Governor, whenever that's going to happen, and who knows when, are going to appoint? Don't we... don't we at

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

least owe everybody in Illinois a little opportunity and a little belief in some hope that we don't approve of this? That we want to make it better. We've taken one good step tonight. Speaker followed through and said let's do it, go down the impeachment road. Not a pleasant task. No one's going to enjoy that. But the other step is special election. Many of you have talked about a special election on the other side of the aisle and want it. This is not the way to go if we're going to move forward as a state. And someone said earlier on your side of the aisle, the impeachment's not about your Party or our Party, it's about all of us, but so is special election about all of us, about all of us. This is what we do. We like what we do, we're good at it. Most of you, I think, on both sides of the aisle are pretty good at what you do. You like what You like talking to people and solving their problems. You want people to have some respect for us and what we do. And tonight by saying, no, we're not going to address the issue of special election. No, we're going to wait awhile. No, we don't have consensus. No, we're just not there yet, doesn't help any of us. The next time you go up for an election, on either side of the aisle and we haven't taken those steps to repair this, people are going to think twice about what we do, on both sides. we're all lookin' pretty bad right now. We're all lookin' pretty bad. So, you guys control the place and Bill Black said it best, but I would... I would... and this is not a lecture to you, we don't need it now. None of us need to lecture, we need to lead and we need to govern.

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

going to tell you what to do, but I would really think twice about where we're all going, both sides of the aisle, on both of these issues and making sure that we think long and hard of the ramifications of not addressing this issue in the proper way. So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the indulgence, out of order. I just did not want us to take on the Resolution on the impeachment and then adjourn, which appears to be the case tonight. So, if that's different, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know, but it appears as of now you plan on calling this for a vote and I assume it'll pass, and then adjourning for the evening. Is that correct? Okay. I would... well, I've made my point. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "On the Resolution, the Lady from Cook, Representative Mendoza."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Resolution. You know, we've heard tonight both certainly in caucus and now here on the House floor. Many repeat time and time again, it seems like it's almost a theme now that the only way that we can begin healing in this state is by doing this or by doing that. But I'd like to just bring attention to this, and I'd like to reiterate one more time, that I think that the best way that we can begin healing in this state, is for the Governor to do the right thing, and that is to resign, to resign now. Not tomorrow, not next week, not when it's most financially doable for him, but to resign now. I think that... the shame that this Governor has brought upon this state is certainly something that we're

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

going to have to deal with for the months to come. Again, I would reiterate that that's not necessary. The Governor... Governor, I hope you're paying attention. I hope you're watching. I hope you actually read the paper and see that this is absolutely absurd that we have to be here actually dealing with this Resolution. That we have to, because of your actions, decide whether or not you need to impeached. Just resign. This is all over. No need for an impeachment, no need for the cost that my constituents and those of all of us here have to pay and burden. additional cost in shame in terms of ... you know, additional cost of shame that we have to face because of the actions of someone else. There's a lot of Members in this Body, I would hope all of us, who are working very diligently, who are honest people and who nonetheless have to carry the burden of this shame brought on by Governor Blagojevich. So, I just once again would reiterate and ask you again, Governor, do the right thing. Resign, and if you won't and you don't, then I'm certainly more than prepared to move forward with whatever impeachment proceedings are necessary. And I would ask my colleagues to do the same; therefore, by supporting this Resolution get started. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "On the Resolution, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

Black: "Thank you. Majority Leader Currie, you had mentioned in your opening remarks that impeachment, and perhaps I misunderstood you, can only be brought about by serious infractions. What does the Illinois Constitution say about the impeachment authority of the Illinois House?"

Currie: "The Constitution does not provide very specific guidelines. It talks about cause for impeachment, and we have some examples from both the Federal Government, from Illinois, experiences and from other states, about what might count as the… something that would give cause for impeachment, but it is a standard that is not at all specified or fleshed out in the Constitution."

Black: "In fact, the language is so vague, as I understand it, that, literally, we can begin an impeachment investigative committee on something as abstract as incompetence. Correct?"

Currie: "That's correct. Or maybe..."

Black: "Okay."

Currie: "...don't like the way someone combs his hair."

Black: "Well now, let's leave hair out... let's leave hair out of this."

Currie: "But... but I would have to say, Representative, that I think that everybody understands the importance, the significance of any kind of impeachment proceeding, and I would certainly hope that people would not undertake those investigations lightly. And I would also hope that when people come to the question in their own minds, what's the appropriate standard, they would be guided by the significance of the activity, the importance and the

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

failure of an individual to respect the trust, the confidence of the public."

Black: "Your point is well-taken, Representative. Can you illuminate what you just said? What standard will this committee be charged with? Will it be a criminal violation, a malfeasance, what... I mean, what standard are we looking for?"

Currie: "Traditionally, the standard has not been one that comes from criminal law. The committee will have its own discussions and individual Members may choose to determine their own sense of what an appropriate standard is. I'm sure we will discuss that question, and I also, as I say, know that we can look to other jurisdictions for help in understanding what might count as cause for an impeachment."

Black: "Let me ask you a question, and perhaps it's premature, because it's my understanding that the committee will establish and adopt... and adopt its own rules, a procedure, correct?"

Currie: "Correct."

Black: "Let me just ask you one procedural question, if I might. The Minority Party will be represented by nine (9)

Members."

Currie: "Correct."

Black: "It's my understanding that this committee will have subpoena authority."

Currie: "Correct."

Black: "If the Minority Members... if those nine (9) Minority

Members want to issue a subpoena to... let me not... I don't

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

want to use names, but a prominent Congressman, who might be tapped to serve in the incoming administration. Will that request be automatically approved by the Majority Party or would we have to seek the approval of somebody on the Majority Party?"

Currie: "I think that you'd have to decide to do a subpoena with the majority vote of the Members of the committee. So that would require eleven (11)... eleven (11) votes of the committee to issue a subpoena."

Black: "So it would..."

Currie: "And also I would remind you..."

Black: "It would be... it would be a majority vote, not a veto by the Majority Party."

Currie: "It would require..."

Black: "If the Minority wants to subpoena..."

Currie: "It would require eleven (11) affirmative votes. And let me make one other point, that the committee... it would be given by this Resolution, subpoena power does not mean that the committee would necessarily exercise that power."

Black: "And what would be the determining factor if the committee would not want to exercise that authority?"

Currie: "That will be up to the committee to decide."

Black: "By a majority vote?"

Currie: "Yes."

Black: "I see. I... I like that concept of majority vote. If...
if tomorrow a Bill could perhaps be advanced from the
Democrat-controlled Rules Committee calling for a special
election, even though there is some confusion in your
caucus, what would be the downside of allowing a majority

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

vote of the elected Members of the House to determine whether we would have a special election? I mean, I like the concept of majority vote, but does... does it only apply to some things?"

Currie: "I think you maybe would like to confine your remarks to this Resolution, Representative."

Black: "I thought so. Yes."

Currie: "Yeah, I don't think you're doing that."

Black: "Yes, in other words we don't want to answer that question."

Currie: "I'm certainly not going to answer..."

Black: "Yes."

Currie: "...questions about hypothetical's."

Black: "Well, well..."

Currie: "We do most of our work on this floor with majority votes."

Black: "Yes, yes."

Currie: "And we can pass... Representative Madigan and Representative Cross's House Resolution 1650 with a majority vote if you'll let us get on to it."

Black: "Well, excuse me for asking a question about a simple majority vote process. It's... I realize it's kind of unusual in a Democrat process... democratic process where we might want to inquire as to a majority vote. How foolish of me, I... I apologize, Representative. I should have known better than to bring up majority vote when it appears it's already been decided that what we will vote on is what the majority party intends to let us vote on. The majority be

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

- dammed. I have no further questions except this. An inquiry of the Chair."
- Speaker Hannig: "State your inquiry."
- Black: "Would it be permissible to add all Republican Members as cosponsors of this Resolution?"
- Speaker Hannig: "Yes, it would... it would be permissible, Representative."
- Black: "It would be permissible? I would ask that all Republican Members be added as cosponsors. If I'm speaking out of turn for any Member on my side of the aisle, they certainly are free to... by the necessary written request to be removed as a cosponsor. But I appreciate your indulgence. And we didn't even need a majority vote to do that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens. Representative... Speaker Madigan, did you... are you seeking recognition?"
- Madigan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. In light of the Motion by Mr. Black, I would substitute that all Members of the House be added as cosponsors of the Resolution."
- Speaker Hannig: "We'll instruct the Clerk to add all Members,
 Mr. Clerk, as Sponsors of the Resolution. And now,
 Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, given the Gentleman from Cook's remarks earlier, and understanding that the Governor's going astray shall we say, is the Republican Party's fault. On behalf of all Republicans in the State of Illinois I would like to apologize to the citizens of Illinois for the part that we

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

obviously played, because we are being blamed for the Governor going astray. So we sincerely apologize and beg your forgiveness. One other thing I would just like to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that I really don't understand why we are avoiding the special election committee and its formation, and hearings tonight even, and on into the rest of the week. As I understood the Speaker, he said that well... he ... behind closed doors earlier this afternoon with his caucus, he couldn't come to a consensus. problems with his Members. And surely our Leader would understand they're Democrats and they're hard to mold together. You know what, welcome to Illinois. If it can't get done behind closed doors and the deal already made, then we're not going to open it up to the debate... the real debate that should take place here on the House Floor, not behind closed doors, not with unanimous opinion of the Democrat Leaders of Illinois, but maybe all of the citizens of Illinois should have some input. I've heard from many voters in my district. No issue before this time has caused more phone calls, messages, and visits to my office than two things. Impeach the Governor, okay, we're heading down that road, and secondly, let's have an honest open election to clear the air and clear the opinion of America and indeed the world, about what happens here in Illinois. another backroom deal, Mr. Speaker, not another backroom deal. Let's air it out here on the House Floor. Why would Democrats be opposed to that? Why, I wonder. Thank you."

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

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I just would like to assure that the process that we go through is so critically important in this, because it is... process is important for open, honest, and transparent government. And it's in many ways the lack of that open process that has led us to be considering this Impeachment Resolution that we're looking at today. And since there is no precedent or any existing rules, either constitutional, statutory or as part of our House Rules on how this proceeding should be run, I would hope that as the committee considers its rules and adopt those rules, that it will consider how important that open and transparent and inclusive part of government is. And I think it's... the really... one thing that will give the citizens of the State of Illinois assurance that this process will be... will result in due process being done. This is our one chance to get it right. We have not done this as I think since we know, since 1832, and it's imperative that we do so. And so I just urge an open process as we go through this. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm amazed and... and... that... that the reaction of the people of this Body and not that they are all in agreement that we should move forward with this Resolution. But I can remember on July 7, 2007, whenever I began to notice the problems, as many as you did, I brought up this word, impeachment, on the floor and I got several calls of,

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

I can't believe you said impeachment on the floor. Well, the reality is is that we've been going down this path with this Governor for a long time. Many warnings have been given from our side of the aisle and some from yours, but unfortunately, everyone from your side of the aisle kept pushing and oh yeah, he's... he's the guy. We do have to move forward with this process. I do stand in support of the Resolution. I still stand in support of cleaning up politics in the State of Illinois. I don't know how you all feel about it, but I've been embarrassed over the last I've been embarrassed to a level beyond comprehension because everyone says it's politics as usual in the State of Illinois. Well, it might be in the northern part of the state, but in the southern part of the state we try to keep it clean. Now, I hate to go down that path, but folks, if you want to start cleaning it up, let's not just do this. I, myself, am a Member of the Elections Committee. And to sit here and say we're going to go this way and we're going to improve State Government and we're going to clean State Government up and we're going to do the investigation and we're going to prepare for a possible impeachment process. And yet, in the same breath and in this same House and the same chamber at the same time, we're saying that we're not for the open election process of the U.S. Senate. I don't know how you can sit there on that side of the aisle and ignore the conversations that are going. And I want you to look and I want the media to look, as we're talking about this, everybody's in their own little conversations, they're focused, it's not

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

important, but it is important. Both issues are important; this Resolution as well as moving forward with an elected Senator, at least for this cycle. Because as the media and many of the Members on your side of the aisle and ours have said, it is a tainted process. How can the public feel that we are actually improving government in the State of Illinois if we just go down the same path. Ladies and Gentlemen, you've shown here how it's the strong-arm politics of those that are in the Majority to push forward with your agenda are only let out that information that you want let out. And I'm afraid as we start down this process, that that might be the case in this committee as well. I hope it's not. I don't... I started to say I look forward to... to working with Members of your side of the aisle to try to cure this problem, but... but I'm actually afraid in a lot of ways. I'm afraid the rest of the embarrassment that's going to come forward in the State of Illinois, and how much some people may be involved with this whole process and with this Governor. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's pretty clear when you add everybody to this Resolution that's going to pass. But I hope that not only does it pass with a positive, unanimous vote, but I also hope that each one of you weighs out seriously things that you've seen, the process, and that you're really wanting change, not just something to get this political monkey off your back. I believe it is time we move forward and I believe it is time that we try to clean up this garbage. And the only way we can do that is working together and I encourage your 'aye' vote."

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

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

Miller: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be very I've heard comments in regards to current State of Illinois and what we're being faced. It is a disgrace. It's a shame. There is still a legal process that has to occur regardless of someone's quilt or innocent that we can't ignore. With that said, a person still has children and a family and things that you have to consider in regards to these attacks. And I'm not saying that it's not justified, but please keep in mind, there is a personal face on this. Now with that said, though, I do support this Resolution. And at the end of the day when I start hearing this partisan bicker of who started what, I think it's ridiculous. Because the State of Illinois needs to come together more now than ever. And we can talk about who began what, we can talk about whose fault was what, but the end of the day, there's still going to be some kid who wants to go to college. And the calls I got before the arrest of the Governor, was how are we going to pay our providers in health care? How are we going to provide day care? How are we going to provide health care for those who are trying to provide it? There was a legislation initiative for us to pay these folks so we can help provide services to the state. People, we are in a recession. are in a recession where State Government is needed more now than in other times since I've served here in 2001. for us, we have to come together. Is this... the impetus for us to come together, maybe so. Maybe so. But at the end

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

of the day, government still has to work for the people and if this is the first step to heal ourselves and the State of Illinois, let's do it. Let's do it together instead of pointing fingers. Let's do it together because the citizens of the State of Illinois want us to come together now more so than ever. I support this Resolution."

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

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor of the Resolution yield for a question?"

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

Reis: "Leader Currie, I rise in support of this concept. I think everyone in this chamber does. And has been pointed out from people on both sides of the aisle, the world is watching what we do. We've never done this in the State of Illinois and we want to get it right. We want to be fair on both sides. And I know the question's been appo... been proposed to you about our ability to seek comments from witnesses and subpoena records and things like that. I guess on the surface, will you give us your word that we will allowed to bring people in? The world wants the right answers, they want the comments to come out. They want everyone to be open and forthright in this process, and that's why we're so strongly in favor of having a bipartisan committee that has the same number of people on both sides. But will you give us our word? I mean, we want this to be a fair and open process. The people of the state want it. They want their questions answered whether it's looked upon favorably in your Party or not."

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

- Currie: "Representative, I would say, yes. I did not anticipate that the committee itself will be adversarial. Within the committee, I think there will be a good deal of common goals, a common understanding of our problems and a willingness to work together to come to some kind of consensus. So yes, we anticipate any... any witness with something in important tell us will be more than welcome with one proviso, and that is that we have to agree that the person has something valuable to tell us. And second, we cannot step on the United State's Attorney's toes in terms of his investigation."
- Reis: "Well, I... I thank you for those... those commitments and I think that's what's so important to our side of the aisle... seeing as how we are going to vote for Resolution where we are outnumbered. So, the people of Illinois really want to get to the bottom of this. We want to find out for sure that there is cause to go forward with an Impeachment Resolution. And I think the openly... the more open we are about that, the more witnesses we're able to call and get testimony from, the more accurate that recommendation will come. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey. The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you, Speaker. I... would the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."
- Eddy: "Representative, I... I think this is the way we have to go as well. My question has to do with the thought process

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

and the purpose. Why is it necessary to have out of twenty-one (21) Members, twelve (12) from one Party? What... what possibly could be the purpose for that?"

Currie: "That would be the representative share of Democrats in this chamber. That frequently goes into the question, what are the appropriate numbers for any given committee, proportionate share? And the proportionate share, 12/9 represents the 43 percent that you are of the House of Representatives."

Eddy: "You know..."

Currie: "And again, I think we will work quite cooperatively, as we do in most of our House committees."

Eddy: "Well, and... and I noticed in the Bill itself, the description of the rules in accordance with House Rules, et cetera, et cetera. One question I have about the Members who would be appointed to the committee. Are those Members subject to removal from the committee by the same type of committee removal that the House Rules govern regular committee?"

Currie: "Yes."

Eddy: "So, is it accurate to say that every Member serves at the pleasure of the Minority or the Majority Speaker?"

Currie: "That's right."

Eddy: "Okay. And I understand the proportionate and I understand having to have rules, but my... my problem with that is, the fact that this isn't an ordinary deal and I'm not sure business as usual or ordinary... this is how we do things, this is the power structure, this is the way it should be, is really truly in the best interests. Now, I

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

understand why it's that way and I appreciate that explanation. My concern has to do with the appearance with that on such an issue. This is... how we... how we handle this will to a large extent for the people of the State of Illinois help determine whether or not they have confidence as we move forward. Wouldn't it be better... wouldn't it be much better policy wise to have this even and to allow the kind of transparency an equal representation would have?"

Currie: "No."

Eddy: "You really believe that, that this is a better way of doing business, this is better to have one person in charge of this process. Because at the end of this, and... and I respect your opinion, I disagree with it because I don't think it's better to have one person. This is not a monarchy. I mean, it appears as one sometimes, but it's not a monarchy. This is a democracy. This is supposed to be a Body and the rules here are suppose to reflect the will of the people and they think they're involved in a democratic committee. I really think that for public perception and that... that real appearance of impropriety, we would be much, much better off if some..."

Currie: "I think..."

Eddy: "...things were changed."

Currie: "I think as the committee goes forward, you will find that there is a great deal of agreement among the Members of the committee. I think is will not be an adversarial committee within itself. And Representative, if you are as concerned as your speech seems to suggest you are on

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

that point, then I would encourage you to vote 'no' on House Resolution 1650."

Eddy: "Representative, you know better than that. I'm not going to vote 'no' on this..."

Currie: "Well, if you're..."

Eddy: "I'm bringing up a point."

Currie: "Then why are we talking?"

Eddy: "So that's how it is. You can't just simply have a problem with the Resolution and try to bring it out. It's either, you know, sit down and be quiet and vote 'no', but please don't question anything in the Resolution. I'm trying make a simple point. Now, let me ask you this. If nine (9) Members want to have a certain person appear before this committee, and eleven (11) Members... or twelve (12) Members on the other side don't, the fact is, the bottom line is, that person can be protected by the majority of the Members of this committee the way this is structured. Is that true?"

Currie: "I don't know what... I mean..."

Eddy: "Could that happen."

Currie: "I was quite clear in my answer to Representative Reis. That it is likely that somebody who has something to offer the committee will be welcome to come before the committee unless that testimony will interfere with a ongoing federal investigation. So, let's not talk... if you're planning to vote 'yes', it seems to me you've said enough. If you want to vote 'no' you may carry on further, but a 'yes' vote shouldn't spend 15 minutes telling us all that is wrong with House Resolution 1650. I invite you to watch how this

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

committee develops and I think you will find it is open, it is fair. The procedures will work to the best interests of the people of the State of Illinois."

Eddy: "Representative, I appreciate that and I hope that's the case. I think we're missing a great opportunity to actually have that in writing and allow the people to not have to question that, no matter what the committee does. Thank you for your indulgence. I certainly support the concept and nobody's going to vote against this, that's not going to happen, but why in the world we shouldn't be allowed to ask questions or bring up problems with it, that... that speaks to the whole problem in this Body and with government."

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

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Durkin: "Representative Currie, looking through the Resolution, I see that we're going to have some basic generic powers, they're going to be able to issue subpoenas for attendance of individuals or for documents. Let's be perfectly clear, there's not going to be too many volunteers for this committee when we start the hearings. How are we going to compel individuals to appear before this committee? Who's going to serve a subpoena on these individuals?"

Currie: "And I can't as this moment answer that question and I would say that to... you can certainly end up with lots of court fights over whether or not you had the power to compel somebody's appearance or compel the appearance of

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

those particular documents. So, I... I understand that you could run into some procedural difficulties and you could find yourself tied up in vary extensive litigation. So, I..."

Durkin: "Well..."

Currie: "I anticipate we would use that power, if we use it all, somewhat sparingly."

"Well, as I... I'd like to think we'd use it Durkin: sparingly, but again, I really doubt we're going to have anybody if we make a phone call, could you please come and testify before this committee? We're going to run into a couple of things. Most of the people who do show up, even if they do it under... voluntarily, they're going to take the Fifth Amendment. Secondly, I would... like I said earlier, I don't expect them to volunteer. So I hope when this committee meets, that you make it part of the rule that there is a contempt of court penalty that's available. You said that there's... in this... in this Resolution, that there's going to be some type of punishment that is going to be made available. What are we going to do, slap them on the wrist? Or how are we going to be able to force them in?"

Currie: "I'm told that under State Law, that would be a possibility, being in contempt of court."

Durkin: "Well, are you going to allow that..."

Currie: "We'll clarify that. We will clarify that."

Durkin: "Are you going to allow that at the committee hearing tomorrow in our rules to allow for some type of contempt proceeding to take place if people do not attend and if we

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

- try to... if we try to compel their attendance through some type of subpoena?"
- Currie: "We believe that it doesn't need to be in the rules because we believe it is covered in other parts of State Law. We'll research that question and make sure we have an answer for you tomorrow morning."
- "I would disagree and I think you need to spell it out. Durkin: It should have been in this Resolution, but I think whether I'm on the committee or someone else, the question's going to be raised. You got to have something with teeth in it to force these individuals to come in. But let alone... again, you're going to have a lot of people if they come in, are going to take the Fifth Amendment. And secondly, you know, what'll we do if someone does take the Fifth? a court of law when someone takes the Fifth Amendment, a court's going to make their own decision of whether or not it's a reasonable exercise of their Fifth Amendment powers. If it isn't, courts going to... may hold them in contempt. I think we need to start thinking about those things. I'm asking you to start thinking about them and also your counsel."
- Currie: "But I would have thought... I would have thought that taking the Fifth Amendment is an individual's right."
- Durkin: "Well, sometimes it's an individual right, if it's a reasonable exercise of their Fifth Amendment. But individuals are held in contempt if it's not reasonable.

 That's what courts do."
- Currie: "Well, I'm not sure I agree with that interpretation, but again, this is also not a criminal trial."

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

Durkin: "What are we trying to do then? Is this just going to be just a powder puff exercise? Come on, this is serious. And I hope you put a lot of these suggestions into... you know, take them to heart. Now, if I want to... expect this. There's going to be some requests made for certain individuals who may have been involved in this quid pro quo for the Senate seat. If one... if there is a request for either Senate candidate one, five, or whatever, to come in before this committee, and it's denied... and if that request is denied... and if that request is denied for the subpoena, does a committee Member have the power to appeal that denial to anybody, or is that final?"

Currie: "Well, you could appeal the ruling of the Chair."

Durkin: "Pardon me?"

Currie: "You could appeal the ruling of the Chair and the committee could vote."

Durkin: "To who?"

Currie: "Just to the committee. This would be within the purview of the committee, Representative."

Durkin: "Well, what I'm saying is, if that request is denied, if it's going to be... if it's partisan denial where it's going to be twelve (12), how do you appeal that?"

Currie: "Right there in the committee. If you lose you lose."

Durkin: "Wow. Well, you know, I... I hope that, you know, that's one of many examples of some sit... of some people that I think that would be relevant towards this committee and if this is going to be an open, honest, and transparent proceeding that you allow reasonable requests made for these individuals, particularly ones that were... we believe

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

the ones that are in that complaint that came out last All right. To a bigger issue. You know, we're to on beyond... after... you know, we have the impeachment proceedings, but you know, there's a issue of a vacant Senate seat. I want the people in the State of Illinois to be at least assured that anybody who's seeking that position, either if we have a special election or by appointment, that they had no involvement at all in this quid pro quo for the Senate seat or were unaware of it. And I hope everybody in here understands it, that that's something that we make sure, whether Lieutenant Governor Quinn or if we have a special election. I'm going to press the issue and I hope the people of Illinois press the issue as well."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Bradley."

Bradley, J.: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Bradley, J.: "Leader Currie, if this is the... the General Assembly, 95th General Assembly quits on noon of January the 14th and the new General Assembly takes over, there's been some concerns about being able to finish this process by noon on January the 14th, and it's my understanding that the work that you're doing on this committee will be continued into the next General Assembly, at least as a form of taking judicial or legislative notice of what's already taken place. So, we won't have to plow the field again."

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

- Currie: "But I think it would be the intention to take whatever work product were available from this committee, whether a report or almost a report or actual Articles that had been filed, I think it would be our intention that one of the first actions in the next General Assembly would be for the House to take notice of the work that had been done. And if, for example, Articles had been approved, have another vote so that that activity could continue in the next General Assembly without starting over again, without reinventing the wheel, if that is the will of the Assembly."
- Bradley, J.: "So, if the matter could get tried in this General Assembly, great. If it could not be tried in this General Assembly, then the next General Assembly could take the work that's already been done and then use that as a starting point going forward."
- Currie: "If... if that were the will of the Members and of course, if there were a report that were done by noon, January 14, that recommended no Articles of Impeachment, then that would settle it with respect to the next General Assembly."
- Bradley, J.: "I think that's a key point for the voters and for the people of the State of Illinois to realize that the work that's going to be done here is beginning immediately is going to be useful to us regardless of the trickiness of the timing of the two General Assemblies. It reminds me of a statement that my Grandfather Bradley told me before he passed away and he said, son, he said, if you get in a fight with a skunk, even if you win you come out stinking.

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

And there's going to be some stink in this process. democracy is messy. And I think it should be our guiding principle and our guiding light as we move forward that regardless of what we may think of the Governor, and he and I have never seen eye to eye and we've been opposed to each other since I took office, but that we keep in mind that we're doing this to protect the people of the State of Illinois, to protect the Constitution of the State of Illinois, and to protect the integrity of the people of the State of Illinois. And as long as we keep those things in our foresight, and as long as we keep those things as our guiding principles, then this process will be a success and we'll be able to get the government managed properly. We'll be able to get bills paid. We'll be able to get the capital improvements moving and to move forward on the vital issues facing our state. I commend you for your work. I'm proud to be a Member of this General Assembly and this House of Representatives who has stood in the gap time and time again when bad proposals came out of the second floor and who now are willing to stand up and take forward on the courage to move something which is absolutely necessary. Thank you, Leader."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you. I'm going to have a question for the Lady if she'll yield, but before I do that can I ask a procedural scheduling question? If I understood this correctly, is it the Chair's intention to adjourn tonight?"

Speaker Hannig: "That's correct."

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

Rose: "Okay. So, we're going to go home without acting on the whole reason we came here, which is the election Bill. Is that correct?"

Speaker Hannig: "We're going to adjourn after we vote on this Bill."

Rose: "Okay. I want... if I can ask a couple of questions of the... of the Lady..."

Speaker Hannig: "She will yield."

Rose: "...then I'll come back to that point. Majority Leader Currie, I have a question about the subpoena power. I want to make sure I understand the procedure as it's outlined. The committee would vote on the subpoena... to issue a subpoena and then says that it would have to be signed by the Speaker and then affirmed by the Clerk. Is that perfunctory or does that mean that the Speaker would have to also agree to issue the subpoena?"

Currie: "Yes, he has... the Speaker would have final authority."

Rose: "So, the final... So, the committee would not have final authority, the Speaker would have final authority."

Currie: "Right."

Rose: "And Representative, you were, I believe, cochair of the Heiple committee, correct?"

Currie: "That's correct."

Rose: "And at that time under Heiple, it was a 5/5 bipartisan committee that you were a cochair of, correct?"

Currie: "Yes."

Rose: "Why would we depart, Representative Currie, from the precedent set under Heiple in this state? Because I heard your answer earlier which is that that's the demographic

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

makeup of the House, Democrats to Republicans. But clearly, Representative, you were cochair of the committee under Heiple that was bipartisan. So, what's good for the goose ought to be good for the gander."

Currie: "Any committee can be set up under different rubrics.

Traditionally, our House committees are set up with a proportionate, or some degree thereof, spread between the Majority Party and the Minority Party. That seemed a reasonable way to approach the creation of this committee; that's what we've done. We'll see how it works."

Rose: "But it departs from the precedent."

Currie: "We'll see how it works and my... my certain view is that it will work very well."

Rose: "Well, to the Resolution. Obviously, I rise in support the Resolution. I wish that we'd adhere to the bipartisan structure of... that Heiple did. But let me just say this, Speaker, and obviously, we're going to vote on this. But I am extremely concerned that the House of Representatives is preparing to adjourn because the Majority cannot figure out what to do on the issue of the special election. And apparently, you're going to send us home having come here on the question of a special election without stripping or removing or frankly, doing anything to address the Governor's ability to appoint the successor to the President-elect. Now, we're going to vote for this Resolution. I'm going to assume... well, it's not assumption, this thing's going to fly out of here. bottom line is, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Majority is going to adjourn this chamber without addressing anything to do

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

with the Governor's ability to appoint the U.S. Senate seat. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Reboletti: "Leader Currie, assuming this passes and we all... we know it's going to pass out of here, when would this committee begin to meet? What would the hours of the committee be? Is it going to meet on weekends, holidays, if you could please inform the Body?"

Currie: "Tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. in Room 114. And it would be the plan of the committee to continue working straight through to the extent that we have available witnesses, documents, testimony. We would plan to work weekends. We would plan to work however long it takes, with exception of Christmas Eve, Christmas Day, New Year's Eve, and New Year's Day. The committee is planning to be here in Springfield working out of Room 114, again, with the proviso that if were precluded from certain witnesses by virtue of the concern for the ongoing federal investigation, that may slow us down, but the plan is to hear what we can hear, look at the evidence that is available and spend whatever time it takes to get the job done."

Reboletti: "So... And that was my other question. Will the... the committee will consume as much time as it needs to do its due diligence, to follow due process, follow the Constitution to make sure that the committee is comfortable

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

with whatever vote at the end of the day transpires. Is that... If it's to move forward, we move forward; if not, then we choose not to do so. So, the committee will meet as long as it needs to meet."

Currie: "I'm sorry. Did you have another... I missed the question, if there..."

Reboletti: "That the committee will consume as much time as it needs to do the peoples' business, correct?"

Currie: "Yes."

Reboletti: "There's no sunset time."

Currie: "Yes, yes. And I can't answer how long this inquiry will take. We don't know what witnesses will be available to us. We are giving the Governor every opportunity to appear before the committee or to have a representative appear before the committee in defense or to interpret things differently. We don't know if that offer will be taken up. So, how the work of the committee develops at this point, uncharted territory."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, to the Resolution. I urge an 'aye' vote, but I would also believe that we've left thirteen million (13,000,000) Illinois residents disenfranchised without a special elections Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Bellock: "So, Representative Currie, if we don't take any action today on the special election and we vote 'yes' on House Resolution 1650, this committee will carry on their

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

proceedings. It could be another week, it could be two (2) weeks, it could be three (3) weeks or a month."

Currie: "Could be a lot longer."

Bellock: "Okay. So, in that time period, we are not in any way going to curtail the Governor from moving forward and appointing somebody for that U.S. Senate seat. Is that correct?"

Currie: "Well, let me... let me... let me remind you that we don't need to. The Democratic Members of the United States Senate, I believe, fifty-one (51) of them have written to the Governor to say that they will not seat any person whom he might name as a replacement for the junior Senate seat from the State of Illinois. So, whatever we do, he's not in a position to appoint anybody and have that person in the position to take the seat."

Bellock: "So, what is your plan? Do you think that this will carry on, this committee, into the next General Assembly?"

Currie: "I have no idea. It can't carry on into the next General Assembly, the question is, if the work of this committee and anything that were to come out of this committee that might considered by the Senate, if that is not concluded by the end of this General Assembly, then it would be our thought that whatever work had been done to date could be approved... could be adopted by the next General Assembly, so that one would not have to start from scratch. But any actions would have to be taken anew in a new General Assembly."

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

- Bellock: "I just have one other clarification. Was it that this committee itself can subpoena or just the Speaker of the House can subpoena?"
- Currie: "The committee can vote by majority vote to offer a subpoena for documents or for witness and that subpoena would have to be signed by the Speaker of the House."
- Bellock: "Oh, so it would have to be signed for the Speaker of the House. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Majority Leader Currie is recognized to close."
- Currie: "I hope the House will approve adoption of House Resolution 1650."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 1650 be adopted?' This requires a Roll Call vote. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Representative Schmitz, for what reason do you rise?"
- Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Hannig: "State your point."
- Schmitz: "Actually, I do have an inquiry. Has the Elections Committee been canceled for tonight?"
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Nekritz, there's been an inquiry about the Elections Committee. As chairman, could you advise us of the status? Mr. Clerk, could you advise us? What is the status of the Elections

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

- Committee? So, I'm advised that no Bills were posted to the committee, Representative. A further inquiry?"
- Schmitz: "Mr. Speaker, on our computer, it says here it's posted 3:30 for subject matter hearing, is the only committee I saw posted on the Calendar today. Are we going to be discussing special elections?"
- Speaker Hannig: "I think... I'm advised that no Bills were posted. Perhaps... I'm advised that no Bills were posted to the committee and so consequently it's up to the committee chairman."
- Schmitz: "I... I understand no Bill was posted to the hearing, but we do have a hearing scheduled with subject matter.

 And my question is, is the Elections Committee canceled for today?"
- Speaker Hannig: "I'm advised that it is canceled, Representative."
- Schmitz: "Okay. The committee is canceled, then?"
- Speaker Hannig: "That's correct."
- Schmitz: "Okay. Speaker, I would ask that the Chair read into the record House Bill 6733."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is this a new Bill, Representative? Is that what you're saying? It's for a First Reading."
- Schmitz: "Yes, it's a new Bill. We would like it read into the record for a First Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Well, Mr. Clerk, have you found the Bill in question? And why don't we accommodate the Representative.

 Why don't you read it for the first time?"

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6733, offered by Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. First Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, Representative Black."

Black: "Is House Bill 6733 now residing in the House Rules Committee?"

Speaker Hannig: "That would be correct, Representative."

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Under House Rule 18(g), I move for the discharge of House Bill 6733 from the House Rules Committee. Under House Rule 54(a) subsection 2, all Motions are assigned Standard Debate status and I wish to debate my Motion."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I object."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, the chairman of the Rules Committee has objected and it's the ruling of the Chair that your Motion fails."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, if I might. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 6733 is a Bill that would allow for a special election to be held to replace the President-elect Obama in the Senate seat that he vacated about one month ago today. That's why we were called here. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was in Charlotte, North Carolina, Saturday preparing to fly to Phoenix, Arizona, to visit my ninety-year-old father. I received a call that we would be taking up a special

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

election Bill on Monday and Tuesday and that my attendance would be desirable in Springfield. I canceled that flight and returned to the Indianapolis Airport and drove home. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, my father is ninety (90) years old and not in good health. I resent being called back for a purpose that you will not let us address. 6733 simply calls for an election to replace Presidentelect Obama in his now vacant Senate seat. That's all it That's why we were called here. And you object to that? I again ask you, have you no shame? Many of us canceled plans, left our families, spent considerable amount of time and if you came down this morning, some inherent danger because of the weather. So, we get here and you tell us, no, we are not going to take up the legislation that you were called here to do. We could have election piggybacked on the a special consolidated municipal election. That primary I believe is February 24, the General Election would be April 7 and there is also language in that Bill that would render any appointment made by the Governor as null and void as soon as that election would be certified. Members on your side of the aisle called for a special election. The number two Democrat in the United States Senate, Richard Durbin, called for a special election. Lieutenant Governor Pat Quinn called for a special election and then he changed his Now, he's changed his mind again. mind. understand this. You object to a Bill you most likely have not read, you object to a Bill that you called us to Springfield ten (10) days before Christmas to take up and

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

then you tell us, well, our caucus is in disarray, our caucus is undecided. So, we'll wait a while. And you haven't been able to answer our questions as to what constitutes a while. Mr. Speaker, I am at an age and have a family situation that I find discouraging... no, scratch that... I find it disgusting that I am here today missing some time with my father and then I get here and you won't even follow through on the reason you called us here in the first place. Haven't you learned anything from the last six (6) days? Why do you want to perpetuate the laughing stock that Illinois has become? Are we a representative democracy or not? Will we fill the seat by election or will we wait for you to appoint someone to that Senate seat? Mr. Speaker, in all due respect, under House Rule 57(a) I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair and that there be a recorded vote on the Motion to overrule the Chair on a simple matter of following through with the reason we were called here in the first place."

Speaker Hannig: "Well, we've had Representative Black made a Motion to overrule the Chair. The rule will provide for one speaker on each side. So, Representative Lang, you're recognized."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I think, at best, the people on this floor would recognize that the issue of whether we have a special election or keep the process the same is a close call. I don't think anybody thinks that it's all one way or all the other. You can make arguments on both sides of this issue. But I'd like to remind the Body that there's quite a few people on this

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

floor who were actually appointed to their first position in the General Assembly. I, myself, was appointed to my first term. Who was appointed to their terms on the... in the House? Quite a few, no one's listening, but quite a few. So, then them there's nothing inherently wrong with the appointment process. We do have a Governor today who we would like to make sure does not make this appointment. The United States Senate, themselves, the final arbiter of who gets to sit in that chamber, has already told us they're not going to sit anybody that Governor Blagojevich chooses. Let me also suggest that we have responsibilities here to do the right thing, not to rush to judgment. have a situation today that's unfortunate and I would tell you that my first reaction to the comments by Senator Durbin who made them first, that we should have a special election, were that we ought to. But in the cold light of day analyzing it, I have to go back to where I was on the issue of whether we should have recall in our Constitution for the Governor of the State of Illinois. I voted 'no' on that even though I think the Governor's not a very good Governor, not doing his job well, and I think the reason is that you don't change the law of the State of Illinois because of one person you don't like or one incompetent public official or one person who you don't believe or It's the same here. We should not change the scheme that has worked very well for many of us in this chamber and many across the rotunda simply because we have a problem with Governor Blagojevich. Since we're assured by the United States Senate that no appointment by him will

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

reach the United States Senate and since this system has worked well and since we can trust ourselves to do the right thing, let's do the right thing and not rush to judgment on this. The appropriate thing to do to keep the law exactly the way it is, the Chair ought to be sustained on its ruling simply because of the rules of the House, but going beyond that, that Representative Currie in her objection to this Motion was right on the button in her comments. I would suggest that there be 'aye' votes to sustain the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "So, the rule provides for one speaker on each side. Representative Black has spoken on the one side, Representative Lang on the other. And Representative Black, you're recognized to close. Does someone else wish to close? Representative Reis, would you like to close on behalf or your side? Representative Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, a lot of us said we can't believe what happened last week. How could the Governor do these things when he knew that he was under investigation? But yet, here we are six (6) days later, doing the exact same thing. The entire world is watching what we do. And now we're saying, we don't care what you say, we're going to go ahead and do what we want, we're going to go ahead and do what we want, we're going to go ahead and quite frankly, we're in the situation we are today because of your leadership. And now, we just had a Governor hauled off to jail. Over 66 percent of the people say they want to have a say in the next appointed U.S. Senator. Many of your people on your

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

side, including Senator Durbin has said this, but now, because of what's happened the last six (6) years and the predicament you're in, you're afraid of losing a seat. That's what this all comes down to. You're afraid of losing a seat. You're afraid of letting the people say, we don't like what's been going on the last six (6) years. We definitely don't like what's been going on in the last month and the last week. If you're so proud of your accomplishments, roll the dice. Let's have the elections. We can do this at minimal cost to the people of this state, but let's give them what they want, a chance in this election. I do have a question for the Sponsor..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, you're actually recognized to close."

Reis: "We don't have anybody on that side. I have a question for the Speaker. Can you answer a question?"

Speaker Hannig: "If it's an inquiry of the Chair, I will."

Reis: "We're hearing that the Senate may call this Bill tomorrow and pass it. Will we have a commitment from this chamber that we will come back and vote on it, if they pass it?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, it's the intention of the... of the Chair after this debate to adjourn and we'll..."

Reis: "No."

Speaker Hannig: "...come back at a later time at the call of the Speaker."

Reis: "Will you give us your commitment that we can have this passed and sent to the Governor's desk before January 1, which is the deadline to include these two (2) elections,

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

the Primary and the General, in the upcoming elections for next year?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, the Chair will adjourn after we pass this Bill..."

Reis: "So, that's no commitment."

Speaker Hannig: "...'til January 12 or to the call of the Chair."

Reis: "Just a final... More of the same. I hope that... just as important as the Bill that we just passed, the Resolution, creating the impeachment committee. I hope the media reports what's going on right now that the Democrat Party in the chamber... in this chamber is stifling the peoples' vote. They're not going to let them vote for who they want to represent them in Washington. I hope that message gets out to my... in the papers. It's shameful. The people are sickened at what happened last week. They want to have a say in this and now, we're taking it away from them."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes' and 47 voting 'no'. And the Chair is sustained. Representative Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I wish you had recognized me before the vote. I had to leave the chamber for a moment. It was my intention that you allow me to close. It's my understanding that you called on someone else, which is certainly your right, the power of the Chair."

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, we simply wanted to ensure that someone had an ability to close on your side and..."

Black: "Well, and I appreciate that, but it was really your intention to adjourn and get out of here so you don't have to answer anymore questions. But I just want to again say, on behalf of many Members of this chamber who have given up family time, who came here during an ice storm, who made various decisions based on what you told us we were going to do and then you refuse... refuse to let us do that. you take out of here however... whatever you want to take You can quote the Majority Leader of the United States Senate Harry Reid, you can find a copy of a letter that supposedly all of the Democrat Senators sent that we can't get a copy. What you have just done ... what you have just done in the face of overwhelming and embarrassing evidence is to permit this Governor, who is still the Governor of this state... what you have done today and done in the last 90 seconds, you have allowed this Governor the power to appoint a United States Senator. With all of the chicanery and blot on our record, I don't know who would accept his nomination. But we had an opportunity to limit that power and you refused to do it because your caucus wasn't ready to take a position. I always thought, silly me, I always thought that's what a Majority vote from the House Floor was. And I thank you, Mr. Speaker. you for not letting me not visit with my father. I thank you for putting some of our Members at personal risk to drive here during a ice storm and an even greater personal risk for those of you headed north in what is a snowstorm.

295th Legislative Day

12/15/2008

When will I be proud of this chamber again, Mr. Speaker? What we've done today does nothing to restore my faith in the democrat process. I had high hopes that we would begin to reverse this cancer that has spread across the State of Illinois and it culminates in one cause and one cause only. One-Party rule is wrong. You had a chance to correct I might... You got a chance to correct my perception today and you didn't do it. Shame on you, but I still wish you the very best of the season."

Speaker Hannig: "We've concluded our business for today. And Representative Currie moves, that in accordance with House Joint Resolution 145 that the House stand adjourned until January 12, 2009 or subject to the call of the Speaker, leaving time for Perfunctory Session. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. And the House stands adjourned."