1st Legislative Day

- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We ask the Members and guests in the gallery to turn off laptop computers, cell phones, and pagers. And we ask the guests in the gallery to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Wayne Padget, the Assistant Doorkeeper."
- Wayne Padget: "Let us pray. Dear Lord, we come before You today in sound body and mind praying that on this day You grant us wisdom and guidance. During these hard times of negotiations, we pray that everyone can come together on one common ground and resolve the issues for the people of Illinois. We pray for the men and women in our armed services, both here and abroad. Provide them with Your protection and give them the strength to make it through these tough times. Let us also pray for the men, women, and their families who have made the ultimate sacrifice to defend our country. These things we ask in Your Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Hamos."
- Hamos et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that the following Democrats are excused today: Representative

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Arroyo, Representative Berrios, Representative Collins, Representative Currie and Representative Yarbrough."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Cole, Lindner, Jerry Mitchell, Pihos, Sommer and Watson are excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 104 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Attention Members. The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Madigan: "On the Order of Supplemental Calendar #1...
  Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Rules Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on July 10, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor consideration' for Senate Bill 1130 which is to refer to Second Reading, as well as 'recommends be adopted' House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1130."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, take out of the record everything you just did. The House has been called to order and we've established a quorum. Mr. Clerk, we've received another proclamation from the Governor. Read the Governor's proclamation."

Clerk Bolin: "

1st Legislative Day

- WHEREAS, the Illinois Constitution requires the General Assembly, by law, to make appropriations for all expenditure of public funds for each fiscal year for the operations of State government, departments, authorities, and public agencies, among other things;
- WHEREAS, Article VIII, Section 2(b) of the Illinois Constitution of 1970 requires the General Assembly to pass a balanced budget in which appropriations for the fiscal year do not exceed funds estimated to be available during that year;
- WHEREAS, the General Assembly passed four appropriations bills for the expenditure of public funds for Fiscal Year 2009; and
- WHEREAS, the appropriations passed by the General Assembly for Fiscal Year 2009 exceed funds estimated to be available during that year and thus render the budget passed by the General Assembly unbalanced by approximately \$2 billion, in clear violation of Article VIII, Section 2(b) of the Illinois Constitution; and
- WHEREAS, one of the four appropriation bills passed by the General Assembly, House Bill 5701, contains a defect which prohibits the completion of a number of significant infrastructure projects currently under progress;
- WHEREAS, Article 48, Section 5 of House Bill 5701 provides that no funds are available to pay for work performed on capital development contracts entered into after August 31, 2007, thereby creating innumerable negative consequences; and
- WHEREAS, the Illinois Senate has passed several funding solutions, including a capital bill and a fund transfer

1st Legislative Day

- bill, among other things, that if enacted could support a balanced budget;
- WHEREAS, the capital bill which has overwhelmingly passed the Senate not only provides additional funding solutions to support a balanced budget, but also spurs the economy by creating approximately 600,000 jobs across Illinois; and
- WHEREAS, the leadership of the House of Representatives refused to present any of the funding solutions passed by the Illinois Senate to the House for a vote of the body prior to adjourning on May 31, 2008; and
- WHEREAS, during debate on the House floor on May 29, 2008, several representatives acknowledged that the spending measures the House was considering (and ultimately passed) lacked supporting revenues; and
- WHEREAS, on the day the appropriation bills were passed by the Illinois House of Representatives, numerous representatives questioned the constitutionality of knowingly passing a budget that was grossly unbalanced; and
- WHEREAS, on May 29, 2008, Representative Gary Hannig responded to concerns over the lack of supporting revenues by stating that the Governor would be responsible for balancing the budget passed by the House; and
- WHEREAS, it was emphatically noted on the House floor that intentionally passing an unbalanced budget under the premise that it would be balanced by the Governor did not comport with the General Assembly's constitutional duty to pass a balanced budget; and

1st Legislative Day

- WHEREAS, on June 24, 2008, I called upon the House of Representatives to pass the funding solutions already passed by the Illinois Senate by July 9, 2008, in order to bring the budget into balance; and
- WHEREAS, the leadership of the House of Representatives has refused to call the House into session to deal with the grossly unbalanced budget passed; and
- WHEREAS, according to the Comptroller, a budget must be in place prior to July 9, 2008, in order to prevent the interruption of the operations of State government; and
- THEREFORE, pursuant to Article IV, Section 5(b) of the Illinois Constitution of 1970, I hereby call and convene the 95th General Assembly, in duly constituted quorums capable of conducting business, in a special session to commence on July 10, 2008, at 10:00 a.m.; (a) to consider any measures, including but not limited to Senate Bill 790, House Bills 6339, 2651, 4723, 1496, and 5618, which would provide the necessary revenue to support the appropriations contained in House Bill 5701, and Senate Bills 1102, 1115, and 1129; and to further consider any corrective measures, including legislation, necessary to remedy the provisions of Article 48, Section 5 of House Bill 5701; and (c) to accept and immediately enter any veto, line-item veto, or reduction veto of any appropriation bills returned by the Governor. Signed by Rod R. Blagojevich, Governor. July, 2, 2008."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, are there introduction of Resolutions?"

1st Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Introduction of Resolutions, Spe… Twenty-second Special Session. House Resolutions 1 and 2, offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang, on the Resolutions."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the immediate consideration and suspension of applicable House Rules for the adoption of Twenty-second Special Session House Resolutions 1 and 2."
- Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Gentleman's Motion.

  Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted. The Chair recognizes Mr. Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you. Would the Clerk please read Twenty-second Special Session House Resolutions #1 and 2."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Twenty-second Special Session House Resolution #1.
  - RESOLVED, that the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-Fifth General Assembly be acep... be adopted as the Rules of this Twenty-Second Special Session, so far as the same may be applicable, and that the Committees of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-Fifth General Assembly, shall constitute the Committees of the House during this Twenty-Second Special Session.
    - Twenty-second Special Session House Resolution #2.
  - RESOLVED, that the Clerk inform the Senate that a majority of the House of Representatives has assembled, pursuant to the proclamation of the Governor, convening a Twenty-Second

1st Legislative Day

- Special Session of the General Assembly, and are now ready for the transaction of business."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Lang has moved for the adoption of the Twenty-second Special Session, Resolutions 1 and 2. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. Mr... Mr. Clerk, is there a Rules Report?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Rules Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on July 10, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: the first report provides for 'direct floor consideration' for Senate Bill 1130, which is referred to Second Reading. The second report provides for the 'recommendation of the adoption' of the House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1130."
- Speaker Madigan: "On Supplemental Calendar #1 of the Twentysecond Special Session, there appears Senate Bill 1130. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1130, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig, what's your pleasure relative to the Committee Amendment? Do you wish that to remain on the

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Bill? Mr. Hannig, on Amendment #2. Proceed. Amendment #2."

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This deals with the Capital Development Board and I would ask that we adopt the Amendment and then debate the Bill on Third Reading, if that would be acceptable to the Members of the House."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "State your inquiry."

Black: "If I'm reading this correctly, wasn't there a Committee

Amendment that... that shelled the Bill? Doesn't that have
to be disposed of or does the Floor Amendment simply become
the Bill without any further action?"

Speaker Madigan: "I'm advised that the Floor Amendment becomes the Bill."

Black: "Were you advised by Mr. Ellis?"

Speaker Madigan: "Yes."

Black: "Well, then... I have great respect for Mr. Ellis, so. So, the... the Amendment becomes the Bill, correct? All right. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "The Motion is to adopt 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 Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1130, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. When Hanniq: we adopted a budget for FY09 in May we intentionally inserted language into the reappropriation part of the capital Bill that would provide that only older projects could be reappropriated. In other words, our view is that doing you shouldn't be new projects out reappropriations. They exist solely for the purposes of existing projects. That caused some concern with the administration who suggested there are now are a number of projects in their view that could be impacted by the language in our legislation and so, in an effort to work with the administration and in good faith toward those contractors who have certainly provided services to the State of Illinois and clearly deserve to be paid, we're advancing this compromise which would provide that we would take those items, those projects, that the Governor's Office has given us that they believe could be in jeopardy and we would line them into the Bill, project by project for all to see and we would also, in an effort to try to anticipate that there could be emergencies in the State of Illinois, appropriate a lump sum that would be available only for emergency situations that might happen in FY09. So that's all that this Bill does and I think it would

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

correct... it would address any situation that... that the administration might view as a problem, language that we did not think was a problem, but in any case, it certainly clarifies in a way that I think that the Governor's Office would be satisfied. So, that's what the Bill does and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative Hannig, these are for, as I understand it, projects that were already underway. Correct?"

Hannig: "That's correct, Representative. Those projects were began in FY08."

Black: "So, it does not include any of the capital infrastructure Bills that many of us have been interested in for FY09. It doesn't include any of that. Correct?"

Hannig: "That's correct."

Black: "No transportation projects, building project, just this allows projects underway of... is it fair to say of an emergency nature..."

Hannig: "We..."

Black: "...of roof repair..."

Hannig: "Some of these are the..."

Black: "...like the Lincoln-Herndon Law Office."

Hannig: "Some of these were of the emergency nature. Perhaps some were... were more questionable, but nevertheless they've

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

begun and contractors have acted in good faith. And so I think we would say that we need to honor the state's commitment."

Black: "All right. So, I... I don't see on the list any money to fix the air-conditioning system at the Executive Mansion. Now, we all know the Executive Mansion is very heavily used and I certainly don't want the Governor to stay there, he's there so often, particularly in hot weather. I don't think it's fair to ask the Governor to stay in the Executive Mansion, his home away from home, unless the airconditioning works. Is there any money to fix the airconditioning in the mansion?"

Hannig: "We're in total agreement with you, Representative. We need to make the mansion in the top condition that we can have it. What we have done is we've set aside a lump sum that would be available in '09 for emergency projects. For those kind of breakdowns exactly like what we've had at the mansion with the airconditioning. So they would have an appropriation that they could draw on and fix that project."

Black: "Okay. Well, I... I did want to make sure it needed to be fixed and that somebody just forgot where the on switch was. So it has to be fixed, right? Okay. Now, if... if we take positive action on this does this have to go back to the Senate for concurrence?"

Hannig: "Yes."

Black: "Let me ask you one question. Under the additional projects that have requested by the Governor's Office of

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Management and Budget, there is a line item in here of... under CMS, all it says is 'statewide renovating state-owned space for office use', one million eight hundred and forty-seven thousand, three hundred and ten dollars. (\$1,847,310). That doesn't tell me what that's for. Is that to renovate a building that the state has just recently purchased to move the IDOT Traffic Safety Division out of Springfield to southern Illinois?"

Hannig: "We have not been advised by the Governor's Office that that's the purpose, Representative. So, that's... that's, you know, why we like to do specific lineitems in the budget, so we can all see what it is that the money's being spent on."

Black: "Well, I... I think in all due respect to you, if that almost two million dollars (\$2,000,000) is to be used to renovate the building that the state purchased, and I know why they purchased it, if they were going to lease it they'd have to go through the Procurement Board. But if we're going to spend two million dollars (\$2,000,000) to renovate office space in Harrisburg, Illinois, and I have nothing against Harrisburg, Illinois, but this move of a hundred and forty (140) people from Springfield to Harrisburg from the IDOT Traffic Safety Division was intended to save money. I... I would think Members on both sides of the aisle that we certainly ought to be able to get a description of what this money is for."

Hannig: "So, Representative, these are reappropriations. The idea is that these are projects that already begun. Now,

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

we did set aside some emergency money in case there's a tornado or a flood or things that we can't foresee. But for the most part, what we're trying to address is projects that have already begun where they believe that where the Governor's Office would say that... that they believe that they don't have the authority to make additional payments in '09. We... we would perhaps disagree, but rather than fight over this le... we thought let's just solve the problem."

Black: "And... and I understand that and I appreciate your remarks, Representative, but it just seems a little odd that it just simply says 'renovating state-owned space for office use'. If that project is already under way, where is it?"

Hannig: "It's sort of the boilerplate language that we... that we have and... and used every year. This started out at three...

3.8 million dollars (\$3,800,000), I think, last year and they've spent it down. But again, our intention is to say that these are reappropriations, not new projects. In fact that... Now if the Governor's Office wants to stretch the law, I suppose they could say that they would use this money, but our intention is that this is for reappropriations."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill before us. I... I realize these... the projects that are on this list for the most part are very clear, tell us what they're for, and they need to be done. Delayed maintenance

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

for example, failing to finish the new roof on the Lincoln-Herndon Law Office, would be penny-wise and dollar-foolish. That is a historic building. The number of people who come to visit Springfield now, to visit the museum and other Lincoln sites as we approach the bicentennial of Lincoln's birth it would be foolish to let that building deteriorate because of a lack of roof... the lack of roof repairs. However, and I want this to be on the record, I extreamly concerned that there is an item in here for CMS that says renovating state-owned space for office use, one million eight hundred and forty-seven thousand dollars (\$1,847,000), and it is not further identified. If that is to be used to renovate an office in Harrisburg, Illinois, to facilitate the transfer of IDOT Traffic Safety Division and the one hundred and forty (140) people who work there, without a clear explanation and before the committee even meets to discuss and debate the fiscal impact of that move, which is required by law. And yet, the Governor a few days ago in Harrisburg said it's my decision and I've already made it. Well, that's fine, Governor. But the law says it has to be reviewed as to its fiscal responsibility. this line item is for that, shame on those who put it in here without an explanation and shame on those who... who vote for it without knowing. I'll cast a vote because the good projects outweigh this one, but this is again another way of doing business that I object to on this House Floor day after day after day."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schmitz."

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Schmitz: "Representative Hannig, as we peruse through this list and we go through the language, we understand it's talking about reapprops, but is... is this language... 'cause we thought last time, as you stated a minute ago, that it was... you had a different interpretation than the Governor's Office. Is this language agreed to with the Governor's Office?"

Hannig: "Yes."

Schmitz: "And is this language..."

Hannig: "They gave us... they gave us the specific items and that's what... that's why we have a list now. Rather than a lump sum, they gave us these specific items."

Schmitz: "Is this language also agreed to with... with the Senate?"

Hannig: "I guess the best way I can answer that is that we've...
we've shared this information with the Senate. There was a
budgeteers meeting on this subject on Tuesday where all
four (4) caucuses were briefed and there certainly was no
objection from the Senate. So, I have not heard any
objections from either caucus on the Senate side and so
usually they will weigh in, in opposition if they object.
So we're sending this to the Senate with the assumption
that all is well."

Schmitz: "I'm just trying to make sure that with this Bill and with this vote that we're not going to walk down that road again and all of a sudden two (2) weeks later read a

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

headline or a press release that all of a sudden these projects are shut down due to some technical issue in the Bill that was just passed again for the second time on the reapprops. And if... with your assurances, would you also be willing to entertain an Amendment to this that would remove the lump sum to CMS for renovating state-owned space for office use since everything else seems to be very detailed and this seems to be a lump sum for a blanket project."

Hannig: "Okay. So what we'll do, Representative, is that we'll take this Bill out of the record for a few minutes. We'll get that Amendment drafted and then we'll come back to it. Okay?"

Schmitz: "Thank you, Representative. No further questions."

Hannig: "So, Mr. Speaker, let's take this out of the record, please."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill shall be taken out of the record.

On page 2 of the Calendar, on the Order of Concurrence, there appears House Bill 2651. Mr. Molaro."

Molaro: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to present a Motion to Concur on Amendment #3 to House Bill 2651."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Molaro."

Molaro: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 to House Bill 2651 is basically... it passed by the Senate. I think it had 20... 33 votes and it's really of all the Amendments this is the... the guts of the gaming Bill that left the Senate a couple days before we adjourned. Let me first start out by saying, I said this on the House Floor yesterday that I

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

thought it would be important and demand of mine that if the Illinois Senate and thirty-three (33) or thirty-two (32) or thirty-four (34) Senators voted on a gaming Bill, and as you well know any revenue enhancement is difficult to vote for, that they would vote for a gaming Bill that I think we owed them... owed it to those Senators and the Senate in general to call this Bill on the House Floor. Whether it gets 118 'yes' votes or whether it gets 118 'no' votes, we owed it to the Senators who put a lot of time a lot of effort and a lot of work into a gaming Bill to call the gaming Bill. So therefore, when I did talk to them and said I would do everything I can to call this Bill and the Speaker said he would call the Bill. We are keeping our word of calling this Bill. Let me first say by saying this and I'll open it up to questions. We all been working on this gaming Bill for a long, long time and whether the public policy in Illinois to expand gaming or not expand gaming, I'm assuming we're going to have a little bit of a debate on that as we move forward. So, let me tell you, in the last couple of days of last Session when we where told there was going to be a gaming Bill, I got very excited. Because the way we normally do this is that the Senate was going to pass a gaming Bill and myself and Chairman Lang, of gaming, were told that it was going to have almost all the provisions that we were looking for for the last two (2) or three (3) years. There idea was to take Speaker Madigan's Bill and all the things that he wanted, add to it and it was going to come over to the House. So I thought

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

this was wonderful. That it would come over to the House, we would look at it, make our corrections and changes and we'd have our gaming Bill. What I didn't know and it's not the fault of the Senate so I blame no one, that it came over here on a Motion to Concur. So let me point out to the Body just a few things and that is, there are literally about seven (7) or eight (8) changes to Speaker Madigan's Bill that were made to this Bill. And the problem is they may be better changes they may be worse changes, maybe they make the Bill better, but we haven't been able to discuss it and even if we want to make minor changes unfortunately this Motion we can't make any changes. It's a Motion to Concur. And I must point out that yesterday, even with proponents of the Bill that testified said that they were looking forward to changes to this Bill. So, we have a Bill here that we have to call cause Senators put 33 votes, but I must point out that there are about seven (7) or eight (8) or nine (9) changes that have been agreed to that should be made to the Bill. So, I'll answer any questions and then at the end I will tell you exactly how I'm voting and how I think we should move forward on this Bill. So, with that, if there are any questions as to this Motion, I would certainly try to answer them."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Eddy: "Thank you. Representative, just a few questions regarding this legislation. Was this the legislation that was tabled toward the end of Session?"

Molaro: "Yes."

Eddy: "And obviously, you have filed a Motion to reconsider then... that and now we're voting on the concurrence based on that revival."

Molaro: "Yeah. Basically, it's a renewable Motion..."

Eddy: "Right."

Molaro: "...I can make it every days."

Eddy: "Okay. Can you briefly describe the scope of this?

There are, as a result of this, three (3) additional casino licenses."

Molaro: "Yes. There'll be a new eleventh riverboat that'll be bid on like the other riverboat was. It'll be a Chicago... Chicago-owned license which is two (2), and then there's going to be another license that will be land based that could be state owned. In addition of that, of course, there are five (5) racetracks in Illinois and that will be casino licenses issued to those five (5) racetracks to operate slots at racetracks."

Eddy: "And recalling the committee hearing, the proponents of this legislation included the groups that represent the horse... horsemen and the horse owners and the tracks.

They're all in support of this?"

Molaro: "Some were and some weren't. The race... some of the racetrack owners aren't, most of the horse groups are.

They were invited to testify yesterday, they decided they

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

declined to testify 'cause there are some Amendments that are needed for the horseracing industry that did not make it in the Senate Bill that were promised to me personally would be in this Bill that are not. So, as we speak today, the racetracks are not in favor of this Bill without that Amendment. But I mean, they're very happy to have slots at racetracks, don't get me wrong. I mean, that's what they've been striving for and that's what's in this Bill, so they are ecstatic over that so it allows them to compete; however, there are Amendments that have to come in fifteen/twenty million here that are (\$15,000,000/\$20,000,000) worth of Amendments that were not drafted correctly and the Senate assured they'd be in but they're. They didn't make them in this version."

Eddy: "Okay. Those... those folks that are my constituents in that industry have indicated to me that because of the slots at the tracks and the need for the slots at the tracks and the real decline in that industry that was directly correlated and we can statistically show had to do with land bas... or excuse me, I called them land based mistakenly, but the docked riverboats affected that industry in..."

Molaro: "No question."

Eddy: "...an obviously negative way. So, they're... they're in favor of the fact that this could revitalize that."

Molaro: "Correct."

Eddy: "Okay."

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Molaro: "They've mostly been in favor of any Bill that has slots at racetracks."

Eddy: "Okay. The... the other question I have, generally speaking, this is... this is the funding... a funding mechanism for capital. The purpose of this is to fund capital. Okay."

Molaro: "Yes."

Eddy: "And... and if this Bill passes and other revenue source
Bills related to the capital Bill pass as well, the sole
purpose of the funds, the revenue generated from this Bill,
the sole purpose are for capital projects."

Molaro: "Yeah, there is that education piece. You know, we have the focus where 70 percent goes to capital, 30 percent would go for education."

Eddy: "Okay."

Molaro: "There is that part of the Bill."

Eddy: "Okay. But... but between those two (2) items, there's no amount of money generated by the gaming revenue in this Bill that would be without a specific purpose that's delineated in the Bill."

Eddy: "Oh, that's correct. Yeah, there's some depressed community things... things like that, but most of it has to be spent according to statute. It's somewhat self-contained. If that's the question."

Eddy: "So really the dollars generated have a specific purpose in this Bill. They don't go to General Revenue to be spent for the types of General Revenue items that aren't specific to a... a formula like the FOCUS Fund for Education."

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Molaro: "Right."

Eddy: "Specifically states how every single dollar generated by gaming is spent."

Molaro: "Right. That's correct, but you know, I must add that even within that 70 percent for construction, it must go for construction ca... We haven't agreed, though it's not in the Bill exactly where that money goes, but it does have to go for construction and capital. Correct."

Eddy: "Okay. So, someone who... who supports this Bill, supports revenue source that is meant to fund capital projects: roads, bridges, schools, infrastructure around the state that would create jobs, that would be meant for that specific purpose. People that support this are supporting revenue for that purpose, 70 percent of it, plus the other part of this is a specific purpose education related. So those who support this are supporting capital and education."

Molaro: "That would be a fair statement."

Eddy: "Okay. All right. Thank you. One final question. In regards to the… the Chicago… the City of Chicago, yesterday in their testimony they… they are… they are not at this time a proponent of this Bill."

Molaro: "That's correct."

Eddy: "And from yesterday, recalling the specific reason had to do with, there are probably some minor reasons, but a license fee. Is there a fee for the Chicago casino in this legislation?"

Molaro: "Yes."

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Eddy: "And that fee..."

Molaro: "Well, it's... I think it's like two hundred million (200,000,000) up front, then there's a second or third payment. It could be anywhere from four to eight hundred/nine hundred million (400,000,000 to 800,000,000/900,000,000) by the time we're done. You go back and redo... recalculations."

Eddy: "So, the City of Chicago's opposition to this Bill, as I
 recall, was they felt that they should not have to pay any
 money for that license."

Molaro: "I don't know about the word any money, but in Speaker Madigan's Bill it was... it was a lot less. It... it definitely... part of it was what they would have to pay for a license. That's correct. Okay. 'Cause they feel they were a taxing body municipality. The second reason was, that in the school portion, usually now when we give the 20 percent they have discretion within CPS where to spend it, how to build it, and you'll hear more of that from our school people. And in this Bill it says, that no they don't get to spend it without approval of either the state... State Board of Higher... state board or us, so that's a change in the law. And the third thing they where a little bit bothered by is this new piece about a lan... a new land based casino, other than Chicago. It doesn't say where that can go. So, ostensibly, the language says that this new twelve hundred (1,200) position land based casino, that could be owned by the state, could literally be built in

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

the City of Chicago and they're very concerned with that. They would like language drafted that clarifies that."

Eddy: "But that would have to be with the approval of the gaming board, I mean, there are some safeguards to the third one."

Molaro: "Well, there's not."

Eddy: "Someone would have to..."

Molaro: "Not in the Bill."

Eddy: "Not in the Bill, specifically."

Molaro: "As a matter of fact... Right."

Eddy: "Okay. Okay. So, the fact that the City of Chicago has to pay in this Bill two hundred million dollars (\$200,000,000) for a license for a casino that's valued at billions is... is part of the objection. So, if you believe that the City of Chicago to be able to have a land based casino should pay at least two hundred million dollars (\$200,000,000), that's a provision you could support in this Bill because it requires them to pay something that currently they're stating they should not have to pay."

Molaro: "Well, in our Bill, which the Senate told me they were taking. Right. In the Bill that Madigan, Lou Lang, and I drafted we... we negotiated. It was two hundred million dollars (\$200,000,000) that the city would have to pay and the city was okay with that. This Bill says it's going to be five hundred million (\$500,000,000) minimum and it could be up to seven or eight hundred (700,000,000 or 800,000,000) based on that. So that's the difference. We had an agreement that it would be two hundred million

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

(200,000,000). The Senate decided that it should be anywhere... a five hundred million dollar (\$500,000,000) minimum... anywhere from five to eight hundred (500,000,000 to 800,000,000). Now, Representative Eddy, what should be eight hundred million (800,000,000), two hundred million (200,000,000), we could debate that all day, but they agreed to two hundred million (200,000,000) and so did we."

Eddy: "Well, yesterday they didn't think two hundred million (200,000,000) was the exact number, but the bottom line is, if you believe that in a gaming Bill that includes a Chicago land based casino that the City of Chicago should pay at least five hundred million dollars (\$500,000,000) for a license that would literally provide them with a billion (1,000,000,000), billions of dollars in revenue for future, you would support that provision because you think they should have to pay for that. That's in this Bill."

Molaro: "Okay."

Eddy: "Well, I think any future version may or may not include that... that type of provision and I happen to think that it's a pretty good license and to add..."

Molaro: "Well, I have to tell you this..."

Eddy: "...some value to someone and to sit in the chair and tell us yesterday that they feel like there shouldn't be a... I think this provides everyone with an opportunity to vote for a gaming Bill that... that would... would at least provide the idea that they should have to pay that."

Molaro: "Well, to that I have to say that, yes. Could be more could be less. We don't know what the future's going to

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

bring. And I promised myself I wouldn't let you bring me into this debate, but I just have to take 30 seconds, even though it is getaway day and we want to get out of here. There was an argument, you're right. Is the City of Chicago getting something and they should be But by the same token, the City of Chicago is Maybe. giving us permission to open up a riverboat within their city. And we are going to be making millions and millions of more dollars to the State of Illinois because the city's letting us open up there. If we were to open up this riverboat somewhere else, we wouldn't get close to the revenue that we'd be getting because of the City of Chicago. So I want to thank the city. I don't want to go there and say, in addition we're going to beat you over the head and get as much as possible from the taxpayers of the City of Chicago. Remember, when you say Chicago you're not saying Mayor Daley, it's not coming out of his pocket. That was pointed out by the mayor of Waukegan. It comes out of the citizens of Chicago and the taxpayers that are paying for it."

Eddy: "Representative, I understand I... I just think there are folks here who believe that there should be a substantial fee involved for that license and this legislation includes a... at least a more substantial fee than we might see eventually and it's something for them to support. I appreciate the answers to your question. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an opportunity to support legislation that produces revenue for dedicated purposes

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

for two (2) things that many of you and myself support. One, is capital program throughout the state, one that we heard the dire need for yesterday in terms of jobs, in terms of school construction. We have schools on the list that have not received money in six (6) years, who were promised money. I received an e-mail from the school superintendent at Stewardson-Strasburg this morning who's distressed at the fact that after six (6) years of waiting for 2.4 million dollars (\$2,400,000) it was... it was a reduction of the line item the Governor made in his budget Veto. We have an opportunity to support those construction projects plus more with this Bill and we have opportunity to provide a revenue stream to education in this capital Bill. And I urge an 'aye' vote for those things that we say are important and it's time... it's time that our vote walks our talk."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "State your inquiry."

Bost: "Mr. Speaker, how many votes does this take to pass on this?"

Speaker Madigan: "Seventy-one (71)."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Representative, this is only one of three (3) Amend... or one of three (3) total Amendments that need to be passed on this Bill to make it... be sent to the Governor's desk, correct?"

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Molaro: "I think it's like one of five (5) or six (6)."

Bost: "One of... of five (5)."

Molaro: "Right."

Bost: "Okay. Is it your intention to call all today?"

Molaro: "Yeah. If we pass th... this is the big one..."

Bost: "Right. I understand this..."

Molaro: "...and if we pass this, I'll call the other ones."

Bost: "...is probably the hardest one. And if it passes it'll..."

Molaro: "Yes... yes."

Bost: "Okay. This... this Bill, as set up, and that... that would pretty well answers my other question, each part of it must pass... it is each Amendment we couldn't drop one Amendment and move on, each one is tied to the other. Correct?"

Molaro: "Well, you're talking about Amendment #5..."

Bost: "All the other Amendments... all the other Amendments."

Molaro: "If you put it all together, yes."

Bost: "It has to go."

Molaro: "Then there's about five (5) or six (6), I don't know the exact Bill numbers, but other... other Bills that have failed in committee would have to come back and pass for this to become law."

Bost: "Right. Okay. Would you... Just... just to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I think... I think the last speaker said it very well when he said that... that we need to look at this and understand that this is a jobs opportunity Bill for the State of Illinois. There are many people that... that have never supported gaming that are willing to support this for the specific reason of the need

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

of these jobs to move forward in the State of Illinois, whether it's roads, bridges. I know of a project in my area that is vitally important, which is the opportunity for SIU to have a facility that will be na... be noticed nationwide for its ability to train up people in the airline industry, airline mechanics, technicians, as well as auto technicians at the same location. It'll be one of the largest ones in the nation. The construction alone and the amount of jobs it will provide there, but the long-term of putting these... these things in place. Folks, it is my hope that each one of you weigh this out very closely and not play political games with it. I think it's been done long enough. I don't think we need to drag it into a fight between leaders around the state because... and try to paint it as something it's not. It is vitally important to the people of the State of Illinois that we put them back to work, that we have the opportunity to allow those people to work. I think it's time that we move forward and get away from those things... you know, the sad thing is I quess is that we number one in two areas that are... bothers me more than anything. I think we're number one in the number of jobs that have been lost in the nation. And I think we're also number one in the long-term indebtedness of the state. Folks, this is an opportunity to move forward to make sure two (2) things. One and that we're working now to work on these projects and two (2) that we are making sure our infrastructure is in place that we can encourage other business and opportunity growth throughout the State of

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Illinois. This truly is a jobs Bill and I believe a vote against it is just that, voting against jobs. I don't normally, as I said, support a Bill that would have gaming in it, but I think this is a... we're in a situation where we must move forward. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in very reluctant opposition to this Bill. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, it certainly comes as no shock to any of you that I've been one of the leading voices here to expand gaming in Illinois and it will come as no shock to any of you that I very much think we need to pass a gaming Bill to improve the lives of our citizens. When I first talking... started talking about gaming in Illinois I wasn't talking about it for purposes of capital, I was talking about it for purposes of economic development to expand our business base, to put more people to work, to create operating revenue for the State of Illinois. Over a period of time it's now evolved so that many who would not support gaming previously would support it if, and only if, the dollars go to capital. Sobeit. But Ladies and Gentlemen, just as I said yesterday that while we desperately need a capital Bill we should not vote for a bad and flawed capital Bill simply because we need a capital Bill. would also argue that we should not vote for a flawed gaming Bill simply because we need it as a revenue source for that flawed capital Bill. Much of this Bill was lifted from House Bill 4194, which is a Bill I support. It's a

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Bill the Speaker supports. It's a Bill Representative Molaro supports. And it's a Bill that came from much negotiation with the other side of the aisle. And it's a Bill that if it hit the House Floor, I'm sure those who are prepared to support this Bill on the other side of the aisle today will support that Bill as well at that time. This Bill has much good in it, but we cannot pass a Bill that has these kinds of flaws and these kinds of mistakes and these kinds of errors and this level of unfairness and this level of poor public policy simply because we want to pass a gaming Bill. No one in this chamber wants to pass a gaming Bill more than I do. Simply to get it off my plate, so I can move on to some other issue. Let's go into some these issues briefly. Relative to the provision regarding a land based casino in the City of Chicago, this is a provision I support. It's a provision that's good for the city. It's good for Illinois. It'll bring tourists It'll create a lot of revenue. It'll keep Illinoisans from traveling to Indiana every day to spend their hardearned money. We agreed as we negotiated House Bill 4194 to a fee for the city for two hundred million dollars This Bill has a fee of five hundred (\$200,000,000). million dollars (\$500,000,000). And you say, well, what's the difference? The difference is that the city must spend a lot of money. They must do their own bonding. do their own infrastructure. And at a five hundred million dollar (\$500,000,000) up-front fee, Ladies and Gentlemen, the mayor of the City of Chicago has indicated he simply

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

will not build this casino. Now, you can believe him or not, but if you take a look at the economics, you talk to those who have looked at the economics, they will tell you that at that kind of up-front dollars there's no reason for the city to move forward they simply won't do it. And even if they were to do it, there's a very strong reason to say let's take a look at the fairness of this. We're asking the City of Chicago, in this Bill, another government entity, the largest government entity in the state, aside form the state, to be our partners, to share all of the revenue that comes out of that casino equally with the taxpayers of the State of Illinois on a 50/50 basis, and yet we're saying to them, give us half a billion dollars (\$500,000,000) first or we won't let you do it. Imagine if you were going into business with another person and you said to them let's be 50/50 partners and they say great and you say but wait, I won't be your partner unless you give me half a billion dollars (\$500,000,000) first. What logic is that to say to your business partner you're going to put up half a billion dollars (\$500,000,000) and then we're going to share the profits equally? It's unfair. The Bill goes on to create a second land based casino, which doesn't bother me at all except that the Bill is very clear that that extra land based casino will end up being state owned, state owned. It's also very clear in the Bill that that state-owned second land based casino will end up in the City of Chicago. So this Bill creates an unfairness to the city where we want to ask our business partner, our equal

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

partner, to put up half a billion business dollars (\$500,000,000) and then we're going to say to them, but by the way we're going to create a second land based casino in your city that we're going to own. We won't have to regulate ourselves the way we regulate you. You may not be able to market it the same way and we're going to put a competition in the city with something we own. So, this is wrong in two (2) ways. First, the state should not be in the business that we regulate. We should not own a business that we regulate because we can put all of our competition out of business with the stroke of a pen. Second, it's unfair because we would create a competition for our own business partner in the City of Chicago. one can possibly think that that's a fair thing to do. Next, in House Bill 4194 we called for a 3 percent tax on all Cook County gaming revenue to ... to go to Cook County. This Bill reduces it to 1.5 percent. You say what's the big deal? It's a huge deal. Cook County will have huge infrastructure, law enforcement, and health care issues as a result of any gaming and that 3 percent figure was arrived at very carefully. This is unfair to the citizens of Cook County, as written. The only other... and there are many issues I can discuss, but let me discuss one more. I discussed it briefly yesterday. This Bill says that the capital money that would come out of gaming for the City of Chicago Public Schools would... would be controlled by the Governor of the State of Illinois. It creates a fivemember board that the Governor all... is allowed to appoint

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

without the advice and consent of the Senate, a five-member board appointed by the Governor without the advice and consent of the Senate to decided all issues as to where the City of Chicago Board of Education must spend their capital The Board of Education has nothing to say about where schools are built or remodeled or repaired in the City of Chicago under this Bill. Only the Governor of the State of Illinois gets to do that. Only the Governor of the State of Illinois. And I must then ask you, all of you people on the other side of the aisle who stand up day after day after day and talk about local control of your schools. State, stay out of our schools. We want to have local control. Let our people decide what we will teach, how we will teach it, what money we will raise. of our business. And yet, some of you are prepared to stand on this floor, maybe because it's the City of Chicago, you're prepared to stand on this floor today and say to the Chicago Board of Education, we will let the Governor, a man we despise, apparently on the House Floor, we're going to let the Governor decide what schools will be built in the City of Chicago. That cannot possibly, possibly, under any twisting of the facts, be the right thing to do. Ladies and Gentlemen, there are many issues in this Bill, I won't give you all of them. But again nobody on this floor's more interested in passing a gaming Bill than this Representative. This is not the right Bill. It's poorly drafted, poorly crafted and we must defeat this legislation today because if this legislation becomes law,

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

this will be not good for the City of Chicago, the county of Cook, the State of Illinois, or the future of this industry which is a vital and important industry for economic development in the State of Illinois. I urge your 'no' votes. And Mr. Speaker, should this Bill get the requisite number, I would request a verification."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schmitz."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Schmitz: "Representative Molaro, we touched on it a few minutes ago with Representative Bost regarding the Amendments. It says the Calendar says place on Order of Concurrence Senate Amendments 1 through 6 respectively and we're dealing with Amendment #3. If Amendment #3 passes, I believe you said a few minutes ago, that you would call the rest of the Amendments?"

Molaro: "...you repeat that?"

Schmitz: "The Calendar shows that we're going to be... the Concurrence Motion is for Amendments 1 through 6, but the board is showing that we're dealing with Amendment #3 right now. If Amendment 3 passes, it's your intention to call 1... the remaining Amendments?"

Molaro: "Well, Amendment 3... Yeah. You know, I want to look at the vote total and decide what we're going to do. But if you're asking me what I would do in the future, I would have to say more likely than not I'll call the Amendments. But I do want to see what the votes are and how we do it. If it fails, then obviously I'm not going to call it."

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Schmitz: "So then if... if we only end up occurring (sicconcurring) on Senate Amendment 3, then is this Bill prepared to go to the Governor if you don't like the Roll Call?"

Molaro: "Yeah."

Schmitz: "Now, in the Senate Amendment 3 is this... is a stand alone and not talking about the other Amendments, I'd like to make sure that we have a few things in this Amendment that are not in the other Amendments."

Molaro: "Yeah. Well, here let me... let me say this. If most... if this mo... and this is my recollection and I see the esteemable Mr. Ellis up there. The way I think it works is that we have a Motion to Concur on #3. If I don't call the other Amendments it has to go back to the Senate for them to recede for this Bill to become law. So, this doesn't go directly to the Governor where he could just sign Amendment #3, not without Senate action. Now, is that right, Mr. Ellis, unless we concur? Well, can we make an inquiry of the Chair? Because I want to make this clear. would be so the Speaker and Mr. Ellis could hear this... For this... for this to go to the Governor, for this House Bill 2651 which is the gaming Bill for this to go to the Governor, I would have to concur on all six (6) Amendments and those other Bills that are contained in Amendment #5 would all have to pass for this to become law. Now, if we called this I think everybody would agree with that and what I think though; however, is if your question is if this Amendment were to receive 71 votes and I

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

laryngitis and I don't call the rest of them, then this does not go to the Governor. This Bill then would have to go back to the Senate and they would have to recede from the other five (5) Amendments, then it would go to the Governor. So, in reality I'd have to call the other six (6) or other five (5) or this is going nowhere."

- Schmitz: "And I appreciate your explanation on that for myself and the Members of the House, which it does lead me to the next question. So, does this Amendment that we're dealing with now, and I want to make sure some of the provisions are in this Amendment, if you... if you'd indulge. Does this Amendment include the three-fifths vote to change the purpose of the funds? Create or changes in the revenues as we redirect the funds?"
- Molaro: "No. Oh, wait... wait. That part to redirect the funds.

  Yes, it does."
- Schmitz: "So, this Amendment creates that three-fifths provision to change the redirection of the fund allocations."
- Molaro: "Yes. Amendment #6 is something different. Threefifths for the nominating board, I think it is, right. The answer is yes to your question."
- Schmitz: "Does Amendment 3 transfer or contain the language to transfer 25 percent of new motor fuel revenue, the Common School Fund..."

Molaro: "Yes."

Schmitz: "...a hundred million (100,000,000) to Illinois Works debt service..."

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Molaro: "Yes."

Schmitz: "...and the remainder to GRF. Amendment 3 create the Illinois Works Debt Service Fund to pay principle interest on bonded indebtedness?"

Molaro: "I think it does. Yeah. The answer is yes, definitively."

Schmitz: "Will this Amendment 3 also create the Illinois Works

Fund which allocates 70 percent of the reoccurring gaming
revenues for capital projects?"

Molaro: "Yes."

Schmitz: "And lastly, will this allows for the 70/30 split for capital expenditures and education respectively?"

Molaro: "Yes."

Schmitz: "Okay. Thank you for your answers. I have nothing further, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Osterman."

Osterman: "Just a few questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Osterman: "The Sponsor yield? Representative Lang covered a lot of the territory regarding the potential for two (2) casinos in Chicago. I think that that's an open issue. More over, though, Representative Molaro, is kind of a process question. And I was not here at the tail end of Session. Were you and Representative Lang involved in this... in this Amendment?"

Molaro: "No. This particular Amendment, no."

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Osterman: "But we know overarching you two (2) have been kind of the point people on the House Democratic side and is this a lot of what you have worked on or..."

Molaro: "Yes."

Osterman: "...is this something that kind of came over?"

Molaro: "No. I have to be fair. The majority of it is contained also in our House Bill. You know, a lot of it is contained in the so-called Madigan Bill and Lou Lang's provisions in the past. A lot of it is, correct."

Osterman: "The issue with the depressed communities and the zip codes in Cook County is that something that the House had input in or is that something more directed by the Senate?"

Molaro: "No. That's... that's strictly a Senate provision.

That's a major change from our Bill. Again, in case

Senator Hendon's listening and Rickey, we love you in this

chamber. His idea may be better, I don't know. But what

I'm getting at, it is a major change that we did not..."

Osterman: "And the reason I ask is a... more of a process question, 'cause this is potentially final action and I think it's my... our... a lot of people's hope that... that we move forward to try to come up with a gaming proposal and one that's done in a bi-chamber fashion and I know that you tentatively have other plans down the road and, you know, potentially, this could get solved before you embark on future endeavors. But there's a lot of concerns brought forth about this legislation specifically, as it relates to Chicago and the size and scope and I guess it's my hope with you and Mr. Lang and others to try to, depending on

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

how this resolves itself today, try to see if we can work through this issue with the Senate and others."

Molaro: "Well put. I have great high hopes that we are going to have a gaming Bill somewhat soon. Maybe not this one but somewhat very soon. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Mr... Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Stephens: "Representative, I was off the floor. If this was handled before I apologize. But you mentioned that the... that the horsemen had language that they had requested, was in a previous draft and that that language that they think they had agreed to is not in this draft. Is that fair?"

Molaro: "Most... Well, let me be clear. Most of what the horsemen want is in... is in the Bill, one or two (2) minor things, but a lot of what the racetracks thought were going to be in the Bill are not in the Bill, so the industry is not for the Bill for that reason. But I, you know, I want to be sure that you understand there is three (3)... there is slots at racetracks, so for that, the industry both the tracks as well as the horsemen, are eternally grateful to the Senate and this Body for considering it, but they do need some Amendments that the Senate agreed would be in this Bill that did not make this Bill, for whatever reason."

Stephens: "Well, there has to be a reason. Is there something going on here and I'm absolutely..."

Molaro: "No. You're..."

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Stephens: "...honestly, I just want to know if there's something we need to know. Believing..."

Molaro: "No. Here, I'll be as honest as I can and open."

Stephens: "I understand."

Molaro: "I had a meeting two (2) days... a day before the Bill. Senator Hendon, Senator Clayborne in a room and they assured me that they would put in the language that we thought was agreed to. When the Bill came out and they voted for it, it wasn't there. And when I went to them and say, you know, I'm not going to use the word that gave your word, not that, just that they said it would be in there and they said the problem was the drafters with the late day could not draft the Amendment, because it was about seven (7) or eight (8) point, in time to get it on the Bill. I believed them. I believe they tried and they couldn't do it. By the way, they told me they totally agree that it should be in this Bill. It just didn't make it because of drafting problems."

Stephens: "Well, so we've identified a problem. I... I want to support this Bill. We have to have this. We also don't want to start out with the horsemen unhappy that just... that's just ludicrous to me. Will... can we make a commitment that... that complicated formula that they were negotiating on, that they apparently came to an agreement about the distribution of funds that we could have a trailer Bill or can we commit today that when the real Bill gets to the floor we can..."

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Molaro: "Well, Mr. Stephens, let me tell you this. Me and you could commit to anything. I don't know what good that does us. But... but let me just say this, that's the problem that I'm having here, where are I'm having a problem the last two (2) nights not sleeping. I mean, this has a lot of what I want, but the problem is you're right, you identified another problem that's not in the Bill. I think that if we bring our House Bill forward and we, 'cause there is no way I'm voting for a Bill in this House, that's a House Bill that doesn't have what the horsemen and the tracks want. That's what I stood for, for the last seventeen (17) years down here. I will commit to you that I'm not voting for a House Bill, the House Bill that'll eventually come when Leader Cross and Leader Madigan eventually sit down, wherever that may be. But... and I will tell you that the horsemen, as well as the tracks, will get up in that committee when Lou Lang calls that Bill and will be 100 percent in agreement that they will be for that Bill? I can give you that commitment. Now, a commitment on a trailer Bill. We can't pass anything that has to do with minor gaming in this chamber that isn't on a big Bill. It'd just be to hard. That's why I'm a little nervous about this Bill."

Stephens: "I just... I just want to get it right and what you're suggesting to me that... First of all, are you going to vote for your Bill?"

Molaro: "This one here?"

Stephens: "Yeah."

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Molaro: "I... as I said earlier, I'll make closing comments on that. I want to listen to the debate. You might say something that could change my mind, pro or con."

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, why don't we take the Bill out of the record? Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Black: Gentlemen of the House. To the Motion before us to concur in Senate Amendment #3. My... my good friend and the right honorable Gentleman, Representative Molaro, has been, I think, somewhat vaque as to whether or not he intends to call Amendment 4, 5, and 6. Most of you realize that Senate Amendment #5 says that this whole package must pass or there is no capital jobs and infrastructure Bill and that would mean the Illinois lottery lease would have to pass, that's already failed. It's already been defeated in House committee. We're now on gaming expansion. The bond authorization Bill would have to pass. The spending authorization Bill would have to pass and then there is the hospital capital investment program. Representative Lang made some very good points. The City of Chicago... well, if I might... if the right honorable Gentleman would yield... let me ask you a question if I might, Representative Molaro. As embodied in Senate Amendment #3, is the City of Chicago in favor of the language embodied in this Amendment?"

Molaro: "Well, they were on record..."

Black: "It's my understanding that they are not."

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Molaro: "Yeah. That's what they said yesterday."

Black: "So, Mayor Daley has said he doesn't like the way this is worded and he would like to see changes, correct?"

Molaro: "Correct."

Black: "The last time I checked Mayor Daley is a... not an inconsequential political figure in... in Illinois. Would that be a fair statement?"

Molaro: "He... he's pretty big."

Black: "Yes. I think he is as well."

Molaro: "He's big."

Black: "Well, thank you very much and I have great respect for... for the Sponsor of... of the Amendment before us. And Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I intend to vote for this, but we have a five-legged stool that we have to construct if we're to actually have a jobs and infrastructure Bill. Now, my fear is, and I see people in the gallery who obviously are in favor of and know better than I the need... the need for a jobs and infrastructure Bill. My district is in desperate need of highway and bridge repair, water and sewer projects, and putting people back to work. district has an unemployment rate higher than the state average and unfortunately, we seem to be in that position more frequently than... than not. But Ladies and Gentlemen something tells me, after having been here awhile, that this Motion before us is not really on the up and up. it will get a fair hearing and then the Bill will be hung. And I don't know what that gets us. We're running out of time. This is July the 10th. We don't have six (6) months

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

of construction weather ahead of us. We'll soon be into fall and then winter. We need to get started now. is a serious attempt, and I hope it is, I intend to vote There's not everything in this Bill that I like, but it's the only thing that seems to have a chance of passing, a chance to put together a jobs and infrastructure Bill that this state, after ten (10) years of delaying and deferring maintenance, needs to take place. We need to have it. We need to fix the crumbling infrastructure. longer we wait the more it costs. What are we going to do here? Are we going to wait until a bridge collapses as it did in Minneapolis a year ago. Why do we put ourselves in this position? And yet, I... I can't help but think that this leg of the five-legged stool that we need to put together to pass a jobs and infrastructure Bill does not appear to be in sync with the other legs that we need and a stool whose legs are a little wobbly isn't going to hold up. If this is all we're given a chance to vote on, then I... I intend to vote 'yes', because I'm tired of talking. I'm tired of saying, now you say good, but those of you who say good on that side of the aisle, you're the ones talking and not doing anything. We're here because you won't vote for a capital Bill. You stall. You make excuses. say, well, there's no trust. There's no agreement. We don't like the Governor. The Governor doesn't like us. Fine, get it worked out, that's your problem. going to vote for a capital jobs infrastructure Bill even though I think this is flawed and we could do better. I

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

intend to put my vote where many of your mouths have been for the last year. I intend to vote 'aye'. I want to put people in my district to work. I want to fix our roads. I want to fix our bridges. I want to fix our water systems, our sewer systems. Enough is enough. How many times are we going to tell a hundred and twenty (120) school districts in the State of Illinois, who we promised money to almost five (5) years ago, and it was vetoed out again yesterday by the Governor. We owe those people this money. This is the way we're going to have to do it to pay the contractors and pay the school districts who were promised that money. It's time to stop talking, time to start voting. Vote for jobs. Vote for infrastructure needs. Bring Illinois into the 21st century. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A few questions just to the Bill that's... or the Amendment that's before us on here. Can you explain the structure of the fund the... or does it contain the inner city development fund within the Amendment?"

Molaro: "Yeah. It's called... well, it's not called inner city.

It's call Depressed Community Economic Development Fund.

What do you mean by explain it? You mean what it does?"

Mautino: "Yeah. Tell me the structure on how that works."

Molaro: "Well, what it does is it takes 1 percent... It may be the first boat in Cook County, I got to read it, or any boat in Cook County, first boat. And it takes 1 percent off the top of that particular license and then it's...

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

there's grants given to these depressed communities in Cook County. The DCEO makes recommendations and it has to be depressed community within the area of Cook County where the property rate is 3 percent of the state rate or located within a bunch of zip codes."

Mautino: "I had thought that was kind of interesting. I hadn't seen a Bill laid out where a billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) could be spent only within certain zip codes, in the past, in the structure of the Bill. Was that one of your provisions?"

Molaro: "No. That was brought by the Senate. Like I said, case anybody's listening over there on the other side, it may be a great idea, but you're right, there needs to be explanation for where these zip codes come from. I really don't know, Sen... Representative."

Mautino: "Well, I know when the City of Chicago was interested in putting together the package for the World's Fair, there was a negotiation structure which created the Parks and Conservation Fund, basically dollars to be spent to do exactly what the Bill proposes to do in the city. And I... I find no fault in a structure where money generated within the city will help those communities, but downstate there is also a concern where we have cities that would be interested in having a program and had we had some rational negotiations with these, I think an accord could have been made. City of Chicago was here yesterday and, you know, for future references, I think that in... in an overall policy which will probably last for twenty (20) to thirty

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

(30) years creating a monopoly. And that's what we're talking about. We deal with gambling once ever three (3) decades, on here. Some of these things need to be... need to be considered as well. Another question that comes to mind here, in the... in the Bill itself is the payment for the licensing structure. As far as the language of the Bill, the City of Chicago, I know Paul Volpe was here and he mentioned one dollar (\$1) was too much for the city to pay for a license. Did you catch that part of the debate?"

Molaro: "Yeah. I think he said that before."

Mautino: "Okay. Now, as you and I know, in talking with Boyd Gaming and some of the other companies the... the dollar value of a Chicago casino with four thousand (4,000) slots would be... should be the second largest casino in the country after Foxmoor. I think, has marketing rights that are incalculable and a value of the license in the... for a twenty/thirty-year monopoly in the two... in the one and a half to two billion dollar (\$1,500,000,000 to \$2,000,000,000) range. Was that your understanding from some of the... from the hearings I think we've had over the last three (3) years?"

Molaro: "If the point was, it'll be a valuable license, the answer's yes."

Mautino: "Okay."

Molaro: "How valuable nobody really knows."

Mautino: "Well, I think it was Mirage that offered five hundred (500)... or six hundred and fifty million (650,000,000) or

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

five hundred million (500,000,000) for the vacant tenth license, which is twelve hundred (1200) spots."

Molaro: "Yeah. In 1999. Correct."

Mautino: "Yeah. Correct. Yeah. So, I know a lot of things changed and the economy changes..."

Molaro: "A few things have changed."

Mautino: "There are some good things in the Bill, but there are concerns. Mine has always been that if we're going to create a policy to last two (2) or three (3) decades that downstate, if we're going to create a revitalization fund, which we should, I think some of the Members of downstate who were not over in the Senate when they did the negotiations on this, would have a concern that going forward we would look at a fund where a city could go in and replace a hundred-year-old infrastructure just like the great City of Chicago's looking to do."

Molaro: "I... I agree, there's... if your point is there could be some changes made minor changes rather quickly, so we could get this right, I would have to be in agreement. Just one point about Paul Volpe. He's an honorable man, but he works for the City of Chicago. So, I think he... he would be doing service to the taxpayers and his mayor when you ask him what he thinks he should pay... I mean they really believe that by going into the City of Chicago we're going to make so much more money as a state. So, if you ask him, he'll say zero. Will he accept two (2), three (3), four hundred (400)? Yeah, I'm sure they will. But if you ask him, he's got to say zero. What will they accept? They've

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

already agreed to the Speaker's Bill that's two hundred million (200,000,000). So maybe we could work something in between that."

Mautino: "Plus three hundred million (300,000,000) or some amount over the..."

Molaro: "But that's what this Bill says."

Mautino: "...for the franchise agreement."

Molaro: "That's what this Bill says."

Mautino: "And that franchise agreement the day after the license's granted would be worth potentially two/three billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000,000,000,000)."

Molaro: "Well, see that's... that's the open question,

Representative."

Mautino: "Right."

Molaro: "I... I'd love to give that to you, but I can't because we don't know what people are going to bid, we don't know if they buil... You know, they've got to spend two/three billion (2,000,000,000/3,000,000,000) building this thing. They can't build some ugly structure. You start spending two/three billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000/\$3,000,000,000) competing with Indiana of that spending... We really don't know what the license is worth. Is it worth something? Of course. What it is we don't know."

Mautino: "Thank you. I appreciate your... your answers to the...
to the question and look forward to following the debate."

Molaro: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoffman."

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Hoffman: To some of the previous comments, I would just like to... to talk about history, where we are, why we're here, what we're trying to accomplish. And the history of this Bill, everyone knows it, I think, but I want to reiterate The history of this Bill is simple. It's to create jobs and economic development throughout Illinois. and economic development throughout Illinois. This isn't the Governor's Bill. The Governor supports it. the Senate President's Bill. The Senate President supports This isn't the Minority Leader of the Senate's Bill, it. although Senator Watson supports it. And it isn't Minority Leader Tom Cross's Bill, although he supports it and it isn't my Bill, although I certainly do support it. This is a Bill put together at the request of the Legislative Leaders by former Speaker Hastert and former Congressman It's a Bill that's going to create over seven hundred thousand (700,000) jobs throughout Illinois. hundred thousand (700,000) jobs... seven hundred thousand (700,000) jobs throughout Illinois. Yet, we stand here today and what are we voting on? We're not even voting on the entire package. You know where the spending portion of this Bill is? It's still in the Rules Committee, although I filed a Motion to Concur. You know where the other funding portion of this Bill is, the lottery lease? still in Rules Committee. You know where the bonding portion of the Bill is? It's still in Rules Committee. Do you know where the Urban Revitalization Bill is? One

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) for the poorest areas in our state, it's still in Rules Committee. So, why are we just voting on this? The history of this Bill is on May 31, we did the same thing. We just did it on a procedural I don't know what the Leadership is scared of. Put the capital Bill for a vote. Put the jobs Bill for a vote. Now, this is the plan. It passed the Senate with bipartisan support. It's the second time a capital Bill passed the Senate with bipartisan support. The first one passed last September and we were told at that time if we negotiate, if we work hard, if we come to the table, we'll get a capital Bill by Christmas. Christmas came and went. Recession came and people are still out of work in Illinois there's no jobs Bill. We were told vote for the CTA bailout... vote for the CTA bailout in February, the trains in Chicago got to keep running. I agree. Vote for that, we'll get a capital Bill for all of Illinois because we care about you downstaters, we want to create jobs for you, we care about you, we'll be with you, we'll stand with you Stand with me today. Create jobs throughout Illinois. Do it today. That happened in February. are you today? Where's the Bills? Why aren't we voting on Why are we just voting on a gaming Bill that's going to help fund it? Where are the jobs? Where's the economic development? Where's the roads? Where's the bridges? Where's the schools? Where's the hospitals? Where's the airports? We don't see it because they know we pass it and they want to kill jobs in Illinois for whatever pur...

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

political reason they want to do it. I don't know. don't understand. For me, I'm sick of it. We got to create jobs, economic development. I don't see any other plan. I don't see any other plan. Show me one. there's gaming Bills out there. Are there other spending plans? Are there other plans to give five billion dollars (\$5,000,000,000) to the CTA? Are there other plans to give over ten billion dollars (\$10,000,000,000) to roads throughout Illinois? Are there other plans to give over four billion dollars (\$4,000,000,000) to our elementary schools? Are there other plans out there to make sure we revitalize the poorest areas of our state? Are there other plans to make sure that we provide money for airports, community college, private universities, universities? there other plans to make sure that we can go to our districts and put people to work and address infrastructure needs that we want to? No. You know, I went home... I went home May 31, dejected because a parliamentary procedure was used to kill these Bills. is no different. This is no different. Don't be fooled. Don't be fooled by a wolf in sheep's clothing. way to kill the capital Bill. Don't be fooled. Don't be fooled. We can vote for this. Let's vote for this. we all know what the agenda here is today. The agenda here today is to not provide jobs and economic development. there is another plan, House Democrats, if there's another plan, come forward, I'm waiting. It's been forty (40) days and forty (40) nights... forty (40) days and forty (40)

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

nights since we killed this on May 31. Is there another plan? Every day, for forty (40) days I go to my mailbox. Well, maybe today I'll get the plan. Maybe today the jobs plan from the House Democrats is going to come. plan. Still no plan. I go to my office all excited, I'm excited today because today maybe the plan will be delivered, still no House Democratic jobs plan. what? Guess what? I went to Oswego... Oswego, Representative Cross's district. Representative Cross, did you receive our plan? Do you have our jobs plan? You don't have it either. Still no plan. You know what I think happened to our plan? I got little Willie at home, he's a dog, he's a Maltese. Willie ate the House Democrat jobs plan. It has to have happened, 'cause it's missing. When are we going to see what's happening in this state? I'm making a promise today. We think if this goes down, it's dead. It's not dead. It's not dead. The fight's just beginning. The fight is just beginning today to create jobs and economic development. So, the members of organized labor, who are here, I stand with you. I stand with you to fight to get you jobs, get you back to work. The people throughout this state, we stand with you, who are unemployed, get you back to work. The people who are paying \$4.15 a gallon a gas, who are in the throes of recession we have to stand with them and we have to understand we got to create jobs. To the children in our state, who are in substandard schools, we got to give them a place that they can learn. This would do that. For

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

seniors, for people who can't get access to health care because there's no clinic... there's no clinic for them to go to in rural areas and urban areas. We stand with you This is not dead. The fight is just beginning. How can we, in good conscience, sit here today look at this pristine chamber twenty-one million dollars (\$21,000,000)... twenty-one million dollars (\$21,000,000) was spent It's beautiful. It's right to keep the around us. historical significance of this chamber. Urinals that cost a thousand bucks (\$1,000). How much did our seats cost? But we can't provide jobs and economic development and put people to work because we want to continue to finger point, continue the politics, the petty politics. We stand with you today. We will win and we will create jobs. Help us." Speaker Madigan: "Mr. John Bradley."

Bradley, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. When the Governor proposed to fund something that's very dear to all of us, which is a construction plan, with the largest gambling expansion, not only in the history of this state but maybe any state, he knew when he did that, that he didn't have John Bradley's vote. But yet they proposed that anyway. And the indications were we know we don't have your vote, Bradley, because we know that you're absolutely opposed to legalized gambling. You're absolutely opposed to the largest expansion of gambling in the history of the state. You had a Bill three (3) years ago that 67 Members of this austere Body voted in support of to completely abolish riverboat gambling. So, despite

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

the fact that 67 people in this chamber, less than three (3) years ago voted to completely eliminate the riverboats, we get Senate proposals that completely hinges upon the largest expansion of riverboat gambling in the history of not only this state, but perhaps any state. turn the State of Illinois into a larger gambling state than the State of New Jersey. But what's even more concerning to me, even beyond that, is that it has been forty (40) days. It's been forty (40) days. Have any of the concerns that I and others have expressed been addressed? Has anyone put forth any line items of where this money is going? Has anyone accounted for the 75 percent of discretionary funds that the Governor has? not just put the stuff in the Bill and go on down the road? Has anyone built in additional accountability procedures to make sure that the Governor doesn't fail to release our money? It's not like we just dreamt this up out of the wild blue. This happens all the time. Carterville School got 1.1 million dollars (\$1,100,000) yesterday after being promised that over two (2) years ago. And yet, we're supposed to turn the administration loose with thirty-four billion dollars (\$34,000,000,000). My friend, the president of Southern Illinois University, is not the one writing the checks. My friend, the president of Southern Illinois University, is not the one administering the government agencies that are going to dole out the money if it's in lump sums. What's so hard about showing the taxpayers and the people where their money's going?

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

that asking too much? I've tried to work in good faith to try to find out to get the answers answered. I asked for memorandums of understanding four (4) weeks ago. Legislators in this Body and the other chamber have filed and signed memorandums of understanding with the Governor. Have you seen those? Have the taxpayers seen those? What's the problem with showing those? I'm told I can get them. Have I seen them? Have you seen them? Do we know where these commitments are? Do we know that they'll actually be honored? Aren't there examples time and time again of memorandums of understanding that have been executed and not honored and yet rather than make it statutory, rather than make it part of the law, rather than insure that your districts are going to get the projects that they need, we're going to rely on the word of the Governor and his secret side deal. Now, come on. crazy. We did have a solution in this House. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 42, that Representative It had two (2) Smith proposed. It got 52 votes. proponents. The groups that are banging on us now were not proponents of that Bill. If this is capital at any cost, where were they on the Joint Resolution? Where was the It was a permanent continuing capital Bill that would have gone on forever. I stuck my neck out and voted for it and 51 others did. Where was the help then? this is capital at any cost, then why did they veto a hundred and fifty million dollars (\$150,000,000) for school construction out of the operating budget? If this is

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

capital at any cost, then why did he not release the hundred and fifty million dollars (\$150,000,000) for school construction in supplemental appropriation '07? If this is capital at any cost, why's he wait two (2) years to give poor Carterville School District their money? We're going to turn this state into the State of New Jersey, larger than the State of New Jersey and we're going to give all that money to Governor Blagojevich and then we're going to be stuck with that for the next twenty (20) or thirty (30) vears. That is bad policy. Do a capital Bill. Do it right. The question is not whether we need a capital Bill, the question is do we need this capital Bill? Do we need it in this form? The question is not whether or not we should put seven hundred thousand (700,000) people to work, the question is what seven hundred thousand (700,000) people are going to work? Where are they going to work at? The question is not whether or not this state needs to build its roads and schools, the question is what roads and schools are we going to build because the school districts, the State Board of Education can't give us a list telling us what schools they're going to build? They tell me that they're not going to give us a list until they get the They're not going to give us a list until they get They can't tell us six hundred and eighty-three the money. million dollars (\$683,000,000), what schools they're going to build. They just pick six hundred and eighty-three million dollars (\$683,000,000) out of the air and then they run around this state and say John Bradley pulled

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

procedural tricks. John Bradley pulled parliamentary maneuvers. John Bradley isn't for working men and women because I want to make sure the working men and women I represent get their fair share. Well, you're not having a parliamentary trick here today. You can call one Bill at a time, the Bill is on the board. You're getting your up and down vote. Don't accuse me of pulling a parliamentary trick. You said if you got a vote you could pass it. You're getting your vote today. Let's see."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Franks. Mr. Franks."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Franks: appreciated the spirited debate on this. And I want to follow up on some of the things my colleagues have talked about. It's amazing to me that the Governor has had forty (40) days and forty (40) nights to come up with any new ideas or any new compromises to bring this to a successful But unfortunately, all we have are the same conclusion. Bills that had failed before, but now just require more It doesn't seem to be a serious attempt to try to correct this situation. Like the Governor, all of us here want to have a capital Bill, but unfortunately the Governor still refuses to line item what would be contained in a capital Bill. What he's asked us to do essentially is to give him a blank check for thirty-four billion dollars (\$34,000,000,000) and ask him to trust him to do the right Now only a few weeks ago he stated that he definitely needed to have the pension obligation bonds in order to fill the 2.1 billion dollar (\$2,100,000,000) hole

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

that he... that he decided was that large. But just last week he decided that we didn't need the pension obligation and we'd leave a four hundred million dollar (\$400,000,000) hole in the budget. Inexplicably, he didn't show how his figures had changed. Now he says the hole doesn't matter. Previously said he was going to cut out funding for 4-H, but after some Senators voted against the recall provision, miraculously that money was put back in to the budget. He said he's a strong proponent of CeaseFire, yet he vetoed all of those moneys. Importantly, when we're down here talking about a thirty-four billion dollar (\$34,000,000,000) capital budget, the Governor said that he is going to veto the prohibition on the Governor receiving campaign contributions from those selling... same people who would get these contracts. That's very troubling. This is not a capital Bill which we're debating right now. This is a gambling Bill. Each Bill must stand on its own and I'm going to give you one reason why none of us should vote for this Bill. It's a small paragraph in the Bill, but it's one that really should get your attention. If you look, you'll see that the Chicago Public Schools Capital Needs Board will be appointed. There'll be five (5) members appointed by the Governor. And they will have... they will not be subject to review. And these are the individuals who are going to decided how the hundreds of millions of dollars will be spent on private contracts. Now this is the same Governor who appointed the members of the pension board who have pled quilty to bribery.

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

the same Governor who... who put the people on the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Board who have pled quilty to bribery. Remember, this is the same Governor who said he won't sign the ethics Bill what will prohibit pay to play. That reason alone is why we should not vote for this Bill. We have a Governor's Office who's looking more and more like the Nixon White House. The Governor attacks personally those who disagreed with his policy and continues to pathetically deny that he is Public Official A, even though he's already been labeled so by a federal judge; to continue to deny that he is the subject of an investigation, even though he has meet with federal... the Federal Government on multiple occasions and has had his personal records subpoenaed makes one question his grasp on reality and his ability to continue to govern. When the Governor flew down today on the state jet, costing the taxpayers close to ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) he may have been picked up by one of the agency director's drivers, who are making eighty thousand dollars (\$80,000) a year, and on the way he might have doled out another million dollars (\$1,000,000) to a nonexistent school with no faculty and no assets, who then went and purchased a condominium from a mall in the Tony Rezko trial. private slush fund that the Governor's used with forty-one million dollars (\$41,000,000) that he gives these funds out. So, perhaps if the Governor is serious about getting a balanced budget, he should start with his own agencies and end the incompetence and the waste that is rampant.

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

And sadly I believe, unfortunately, that this Session will end like all the others, in an abject failure of the Governor to get what we need accomplished. work together and came up with a compromise we would be no problem getting this Bill passed, getting a jobs Bill passed, what we need to do, but that's not happening here because I believe it's a paranoid state of governance will continue unabated and will be treated to more Keystone Koptype pronouncements from this increasingly Nixon like administration. We have trouble taking what the Governor says seriously because he's always flip-flopping unfortunately, it's the citizens of this state that are paying for this ridiculous sideshow. We need to get this done. We know we need to get this done. We can get this done if there are line items in the capital Bill so we can feel protected. We need to make sure that we're treated fairly. The memorandums of understanding are not worth the paper they're written on. It's fool's gold. So, for those of you that are furiously negotiating with the Governor, understand that those memorandums of understanding cannot be enforced, it is not transparent government, it is wrong to do memorandums of understanding behind closed doors. Let's put everything in the budget, and while we're at it, why don't we have all the negotiations here on the House Floor with all those involved. Let's invite the public for the galleries. Let's have the press here. Let's take away these backroom deals where they're horsetrading our future. Let's put it here on the House Floor where it ought to be.

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Open it up to the citizens of the State of Illinois. Let's come back next week. Let's get what we need, done. But let's hold people accountable and let's change this cycle and the corruption that's happened here in Springfield. We can do this together. But don't vote for this Bill for the one reason we talked about. We cannot allow to happen what's happened before, with those state boards, to happen again."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative Molaro, is there any money in this Bill for problem and compulsive gambling treatment?"

Molaro: "Yes. Five... I think it's five million (5,000,000),

Representative."

Mulligan: "Is it five million (5,000,000) straight up or is it a percentage of the take?"

Molaro: "I think it's five million (5,000,000) straight up."

Mulligan: "Well, quite frankly, I wanted a percentage. I put a
Bill in that would have given you a percentage and made the
boats pay for it as far as not taking the five million
(5,000,000). Is there a separate stand-alone Bill that
portrays the Speaker's ethics package for gaming anywhere?"

Molaro: "It's part of the Bill and it's part of what the Speaker's ethic pack... they did not take everything that the Speaker wanted, they changed the nominating panel a little bit."

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Mulligan: "Well, quite frankly... I'm not sure exactly. Is

Amendment 3 the only one that came out of the Senate?"

Molaro: "No. There where six (6) Amendments, but Amendment 3 is the actual underlying gaming Bill that the Senate would like to have. The other five (5)... other Amendments were talked about other subjects somewhat technical in nature. Well, I'll give you an example. Amendment #5 is the Amendment that says this only becomes law if... I think it's the lottery, capital assessments, POPs, you know, that... I don't know about POPs, but it's the one that say if the other parts of the package don't become law, this doesn't become law. That's what Amendment 5... It has nothing to do with gaming. That's why we're calling them separate."

Mulligan: "All right. So, if this Bill were to pass that provision, which many people think is in this Bill, is not there."

Molaro: "What provision? About the eig..."

Mulligan: "The provision that says the only way this Bill would go forward is if there... the other provisions that all..."

Molaro: "Yeah."

Mulligan: "...go to capital would be part of it."

Molaro: "Well..."

Mulligan: "So, if this passes..."

Molaro: "Two (2) answers I have to st..."

Mulligan: "...you have a stand-alone gaming Bill?"

Molaro: "Yeah. Two (2) things I have to tell you. It's not in this Amendment. Correct. And if... it's part of the Bill, but not this Amendment and as I said, 'cause I do want to

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

make this clear maybe people... I want to make this real clear, Representative Mulligan, that if we were to pass this... if this were to get 71 votes, even if I don't call the other ones it doesn't become law. It must go back to the Senate and they would have to de... decide whether they want to recede from their Amendment that says this only becomes law if those other items become law. I'm not trying to trick anybody. I said that at the beginning. So, everybody knows what they're voting for here."

Mulligan: "I think that's the problem. I don't think everybody does know what they're voting for and so that makes it a difficult Bill. I'm going to talk to the Bill. There's a couple of things that I definintely have a problem with and most people will know because of what I've done in my years in the General Assembly that I'm not... I don't look at public policy of raising state revenues by gaming as a good public policy. I wasn't here when the original gaming passed. I was here in '99. I didn't vote for that. I've done a lot of the work that portrays, you know, we should put money in treatment. Other states put a lot of money into treatment. They acknowledge the fact that if you're going to raise revenue this way you are causing a problem. The ethics package I certainly commend the Speaker for and unfortunately, I think part of it was a stall on this whole thing, because I'd like to see the ethics package as a stand-alone Bill. We have gaming now. So, if this expansion doesn't go forward, the ethics package should still go forward because we have gaming in Illinois and we

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

need to regulate it better than what we've been doing. I would hope that that would move forward on its own. fact that we put a pittance into problem and compulsive gambling, mainly I think, because we don't want acknowledge that this form or raising revenue problems. So, you think if you sweep it under the table, it goes away and we can go ahead and continue to use this. Actually, if you want to really talk about it, and in there's some distinction, somewhere between 23 percent of people are open to being addicted to gaming and the more you have the more likely they are out there being exposed to it. I'm not morally opposed to gaming, but in my family and in other people that I've known over the years, this is a problem for people and a problem that Illinois does not address. So, in order to raise revenue and do capital we have to go forward with something that causes additional problems and costs us money. I think one of the presenters yesterday has put out a report that says it's quaranteed that for every dollar (\$1) you raise with revenue this way, you're costing the state three dollars (\$3) in social problems. That certainly isn't what we want to do. And the fact of the matter that gaming is down around the county leads me to believe that at least some people are smart enough to know we shouldn't be spending our money this way, if we've got to put more gas in the tank, we're not going to go to Starbucks we're going to make the coffee ourself and maybe we won't go to the boats and maybe we'll get a little smart about it. So, I don't

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

see this Bill as actually a viable Bill in passing, unfortunately, because I do support capital. I did support the capital Bill in '99 I did put my vote on that. what's happened here is really unfortunate. happened in this Governor's administration, in the last number of years, that this state has grown so dysfunctional in the way that we govern in amongst ourselves, because he's a hard guy to work with and that is an understatement. You know, I can't say that I can object to the Leaders that work with him being put off to the point where they start trying to get back at him, but there are a lot of smart people here that I govern with. There's a lot of smart Leaders, that they could figure out how to get around this some way. I mean, I actually had one of the Democrats say to me yesterday, hey, I backed Paul Vallas. It's kind of like our bumper sticker that says, I voted for Judy, it's not my fault. But what we have now is dysfunctional government, which makes it very hard to pass anything. makes it ha... very hard for us who want a capital Bill, we haven't had one for a long time, who want to protect the people around the state and you add on to it this year the bad winter and the floods, we absolutely need capital. And a lot of us are willing to put ourselves on the line on other ways of raising it if government was dysfunctional in Illinois. It is so dysfunctional that we cannot go to people in our districts and say we could raise revenue by this fee or that fee, because they already think, particularly in Cook County where we have Todd

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Stroger, that if you raise sales tax, you're hiring your relatives or that you have government here who is going to be indicted and we're not spending our money correctly. have created such a dysfunctional situation here that it makes it hard for a Legislator, who legitimately wants to work and govern and figure out how to do a capital Bill, to go back to the public and sell it because they don't trust The infighting the way we do the budget, us anymore. everything has gotten so dysfunctional here that we cannot sell anything to the public and why should they buy it. Why should they listen to us when we can't govern well and I'm not going to take responsibility for that because I'm not the one that's backing this Governor. I didn't back him for a second term. I don't have to put up with this stuff. I'm more than willing to go in and negotiate with I've been in Sessions with the Speaker where he's intelligent. He's got intelligent people on his staff. There are intelligent colleagues on both sides of the aisle that could come up with better ideas. We're not doing it. So, now because of the greed that surrounds a multiple casino Bill we are being told that's the only way we can fund capital. We have gentlemen upstairs, women upstairs who are looking for help with their jobs that are willing to come down here and cheer for us to do something because they're fighting for their families. They're fighting for their livelihood. They're fighting to not make Illinois the fiftieth class state that we're making it because we are not functioning. How can you not say after the last

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

four (4) or five (5) years that we cannot come up with some way better to do capital than a Bill that expands us to the largest gaming state in the country. Where we don't have a We're not funding problem and good ethics Bill on it. compulsive gaming. We're looking to take advantage of the people that we represent by telling them to spend their money where they receive no service back and yet you want us to accept the fact that this is the only way we can do it. I really feel sorry for the Members who have only been here under this administration. They do not know how, at least in some parts, we used to be able to function once in awhile, to come together and actually negotiate something with some intelligence that would allow us to move forward and now we have people who are so desperate to help the people that they represent that they have to be sold a Bill of goods on this is the only way we can do it. accept that. I don't accept that this is the only way we I think we're buying into a faulty premise can do it. here. I think we can do better. I think the Leaders here can do better. I'm totally upset with how dysfunctional government is here that we can't come up with something better than how to do this, this way. This is really a sad state of affairs. For us to vote for this is really a What we're doing is we're looking at bad public problem. policy... does not function well. In my district where I've done a survey, people don't want their taxes raised but they still don't want to accept gaming as a way to fund the things that we need in our state. My surveys show it's not

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

because they're morally opposed to gaming, it's because they're smart enough to realize this is not good public policy. If we can't figure out a better way to govern, perhaps we all ought to be replaced. This is not a way to govern. This is not a way to let somebody get your goat so much, and I agree I'm the quickest temper here, probably. I agree that it's hard to deal with someone who does not treat you reasonably, but the fact of the matter is this is not a reason to do something that is morally and ethically questionable on where it's going to take us and where the future of our state lies. We can do better. believe that we can't not have a capital Bill. I think the people of Illinois need this in the worst way. The economy dictates that people are losing their jobs. We have to figure out how to do this, but I don't buy this is the only way to do it and I also don't buy that all of a sudden now we have Special Sessions. What the heck were we doing from January until the end of May that we couldn't come together and force this issue to be dealt with in a better way? don't feel bad in my caucus with talking to my Leader. Why don't you not feel bad in your caucus about talking to your Why don't we push this issue to the fact that we need something better in order to push a capital Bill, because we haven't had one for a good long time and our state is buckling in. When something happens like this huge flood, we have a bad winter where you can't even drive down the streets in your town without the cars falling into the potholes. We have no way to mend buildings, to go back

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

and pay off the community college people that need their improvements, the school people that have already put up buildings that need money and this is the only way to do This does not speak well to what's happening here. you want to stop being dysfunctional then get together and stand up for something and don't continue to put up with the stuff that people are trying to shove down your throat about how to do this. Demand that people act like adults, have some fiduciary responsibility and take what they're doing as far as governing seriously. I don't support this I do support capital. I can think we can do a better way of doing this and if we can't sell it to the people, that's the problem of running a dysfunctional government. So, why don't you get it together and stop being so dysfunctional and come up with an alternative. You basically know this isn't going to pass and if it does, it's kind of haphazard in sending it over to the Senate. And why should we accept the fact that the Senate's got to have five million (5,000,000) casinos when we could have gotten by with one tenth license and done a limited Bill and floated Illinois for a little while longer. We could have done it that way. There was no problem with doing it that way and a lot of people that won't support this would have supported that. You didn't even need a vote on You could have done it without a vote and you gaming. could have moved it forward, but it's been totally ignored. I think we ought to decide where you're going to stand and how you feel about the people you govern,

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

direction of Illinois should be and that we're sick of this dysfunctional way of funding everything that we do and how we're not doing what we're supposed to be doing to protect the people that we represent. Get real and demand a better way of doing government than what's happening here now."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flider. "

Flider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. And I just would like to share some perspective. We have many people here who have traveled long distances in support of this gaming Bill. Many who believe that this is the only solution the only answer. And, you know, other speakers have indicated that if this Bill is rejected or if that if one votes against this Bill that... that person must be against jobs or must be against economic development or must be against, you know, helping our communities and I reject that notion. Every... I am certain that every person in this chamber wants to see jobs created, but it's a question of how those jobs will be created and how we fund those jobs and... and some perspective and some history is necessary. And you know, oftentimes people throughout the state, whether it's editorial boards or whether it's people within our own Party, definitely the other side of the aisle wants to look at one Leader as if he's the guy who's created the situation that we can't have a capital Bill. The fact of the matter is there is a history. And we've just been chided by the other side of the aisle for being responsible for not having a capital Bill, for not having a revenue source. How unfortunate that is 'cause the fact of

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

the matter is there's a huge elephant in the room. And if you look at the history of what's been happening, at least during my time in the Legislature, we've had eight (8) capital-related types of Bills that have been proposed on this floor. And who's done the heavy lifting? of the aisle's done the heavy lifting. The other side of the aisle has opposed those Bills time after time after And the times that they have supported them, the time. Governor's rejected them, except last budget year, of course, when the Governor rejected our items that we had in our budget, he left the Republican's in there. So, we see an alliance with the other side of the aisle with the Governor's Office. Now, let's take that a step further. My colleague, Representative Bradley, brought up the House Joint Res... Resolution Constitutional Amendment 42 that was proposed by Representative Smith. That Resolution, if adopted and eventually put on the ballot, would have done something very, very significant for the State of Illinois. And I'm going to obviously remind everybody that every Republican voted against that Constitutional Amendment, every one. But what that would have done would have created a billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) every year for would have created a billion Ιt (\$1,000,000,000) every year for education. It would have eight hundred and fifty million (\$850,000,000) in tax relief for citizens of the State of Illinois. The Republican side of the aisle rejected that. Now, we have to look and say what would one billion dollars

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

(\$1,000,000,000) a year have done for the State It would have created an ongoing capital program. Now, a billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) would pay about ten billion (10,000,000,000) or so in bonds every So, think about ten billion (\$10,000,000,000) in projects every year that we could have in the State of Illinois and that Amendment was rejected. And it was rejected largely on a partisan Roll Call. Needed 71 votes, just like this Bill. So, you know, we have a situation where we're saying, oh, there's no solution, you know, you're the problem Democrats. Well, the fact of the matter is we've had solutions. We've had them on the table. At some point you have to say, what's happening here. Well, you've backed yourself into a corner over there and now we're all backed into a corner with the alliance with the Governor's Office. We could have done better. We could have an ongoing capital program and we don't. On April 10, 2008, that Resolution was voted down. We blew it and now we're stuck with a Bill like this. We're stuck with the biggest expansion of gambling in Illinois and saying, oh, if we don't do this we're not for jobs. We know that's not true. You know that's not true. We can do better. And one last thing. There was a... there's was a project in Illinois... in Decatur, Illinois, it's a coal gasification plant called Secure Energy. administration, the Governor's Office, promised million dollars (\$14,100,000) for that project. friends in labor, our business community knows that that's

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

a good project. Promises were made, the Governor himself promised he would forward that fourteen million dollars (\$14,000,000) so that that program could begin... that project could begin. It's not arrived. That's hundreds of jobs for trades, labor in our community in Decatur, Illinois and that's not moving forward. That's a capital program that needs to move forward. Governor, we're still waiting for that money. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. You know, I voted against tabling this Bill on a procedural vote on May 31, about maybe 9:00 at night, because I thought this Bill had a chance to be heard, but today I'm prepared to vote against this. And it's not, certainly, because I don't believe in... that we need a capital program immediately and it's not because I'm against gaming and it's not because we haven't reconciled some of these issues that people have been talking about, where does the money go and what are the... what's the rest of the capital plan. But here's my concern, you know, this Bill has some opposition that we heard yesterday. It was very clear to me what the opposition was. The mayor's person, the CFO came before us and basically told us about three (3) issues that the mayor the City of Chicago has with this Bill. Now, the city's casino is a linchpin of this Bill. Having a casino in the city is key to developing a capital plan that's going to yield some dol... that the casino's going to yield some dollars and yet, the mayor of the City of Chicago is

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

against this plan on the day that we're calling it, because he has three (3) issues. The casino industry came before us yesterday and told us that they had some very specific issues why they're against this plan. It seems to me, that these are the issues that could have and should have been worked out and for anybody who is serious about putting together a capital plan and to have us vote for it, they can easily count noses, as I have been doing the last day, and recognize that there's a whole Chicago delegation that is off this Bill today, as I am, because right now the mayor has not been worked with to bring him into this This is in management terms what they call getting to yes. It's a negotiation. It's a compromise. It's using pe... it's working with people and bringing them into this process. It's hearing their issues and concerns. It's resolving them. We are not doing enough of that in the... in the General Assembly. That is what is needed to move our big agendas forward. It seems to me we could have done that with this Bill. We should have and that is the reason why I'm voting against it and why I'm going to urge a 'no' vote because we can work this out in a way that really satisfies the key people who need to be part of making this capital plan work."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. I don't have the energy or incentive to have some of the emotion or maybe the eloquence that some of the previous speakers have said, but I just want to point out a few things and, you know,

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

after twelve (12) years I've gotten to the point where, you know, I no longer say that I've seen it all down here because there's always something new that happens. issues, as a Chicago Legislator, are not the mayor's opinion on the gaming Bill. I'm not going to sit here, like other people have done, and pander to labor. I'll let my record of voting in standing firmly by labor speak for As somebody said previously this is not an itself. argument about a capital Bill. It's about a gaming Bill and it's about using a gaming Bill as a means of getting to a jobs Bill, that we all want to see, and a capital Bill, that we all want and need. This is not a contest about who wants a capital Bill more than the other or a fingerpointing exercise or a blame game. Ladies and Gentlemen, I've listened over the years to a number of people on both sides of the aisle, a number of the more conservative Members decry expanded gaming, decry the potential of a casino in Chicago. I've opposed a casino in Chicago. may be one of the only Chicago Members that do. don't think it's the right policy, but it's interesting when I've listened to the opponents of gaming now say that this has to be done. We need the jobs and we need roads and bridges built. Well, I guess for a number of people the price on integrity is thirty-four billion dollars (\$34,000,000,000). Not every end justifies any means to get there. You talk about putting people back to work. What about the people that you were going to put out of their homes with a gaming Bill? What about study after

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

study, example after example of the impact that gaming has on communities and on society and the costs? Ladies and Gentlemen, I do not have a moral objection to gaming. Those of you that know me well, know that very well. have an objection to us using gaming as an excuse to not make hard decisions. The Governor has the audacity to talk about expenditures and budgets that are out of whack. Where was that audacity when he wanted to disregard JCAR for a hundred mil... multi-hundred million dollar expansion of health care that we didn't have issues with substantively, but we said we don't have the money for it. He didn't care that we didn't have the money for it. didn't care about the process. He didn't care about the Legislature. But now, when he wants his money he's... he... you know, he's very intent on a way to get it. I'm tired of six (6) years of trying to legislate with a gun to our I'm tired of year after year having it be said that it's going to be his way or no way and then try to demonize Whether it was GRT, it was going to be his way or no way and we're the bad guys. Whether it was going to be expansion of hi... health care. His way or no way we're the Ladies and Gentlemen, I listened last year and bad quys. you all listened last year to a Governor that said he would not and could not raise taxes on the working men and women of the State of Illinois so he had his gross receipts tax proposal. He would not and could not tax the working men and women of Illinois. He's against an income increase. He would not and could not tax the working men

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

and women of Illinois. There is no more regressive tax than gaming revenues. There is no more targeted tax than lottery revenues coming from poor and minority communities. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Governor that would not and could not tax the working men and women of Illinois is prepared to build roads and bridges and schools throughout this state, but he wants to pave them on the backs of the people that can least afford it. Let's go back to the table. Let's have a responsible way of doing this. We all want a capital Bill, but we're not ready to take one that's going to be shoved down our throats. This is not a time to sacrifice principles. Your... your voters, your constituents will understand that you were not ready to sell out your principles. You were not ready to sell out our society to simply get to the end game. We're better than that. We're smarter than that. Our voters deserve better. We are not going to do this on the backs of the poorest in Illinois and the people that can least afford this. This is not a means to govern. This is not a means of leadership. This is not the right means to the end. I request a 'no' vote. And Speaker, should this get somehow the requiste votes I request a verification."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pretty amazing world.

I've listened to about an hour and a half, two (2) hours of excuse after excuse after excuse on why we shouldn't do this, but on the same breath every person in this chamber says we need to do a capital Bill. So, what are we going

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

We're going to talk about it and complain about it and blame people and point fingers and we still don't have Well, we ought to sit down, we ought to talk. Yeah, we ought to sit down. We ought to talk. have done that in January. We should have done it in February, March, April, May and June and we tried. those of you on the other side of the aisle, almost everyone of you, didn't want to participate. You didn't want to come up with a better idea and a better plan. this the perfect plan? I don't think it's the perfect plan. I don't like everything in this capital Bill. I think you know this, if I haven't said it on the floor, I have struggles with the gaming side myself. I have a father who's a Methodist minister of the Methodist church. Can't stand gaming and they have reasons for their position. This isn't perfect, but you haven't come up with any alternative. And all of a sudden today, to look for an excuse on why you're not for it. Oh well, we did a Constitutional Amendment that if the voters voted for it ... We're not for an income tax hike. Let's make sure that we're all clear about that. If you're for an income tax hike and that's how you want to fund it then go ahead and do it but we're not for an income tax hike to do it. are other ways to do this, but you have to come to the table and present those. We all get in a room. about them. It's called give and take. I didn't like that idea. I don't like that idea. I'll talk to my caucus, maybe they like this maybe they don't like that.

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

what we do around here. At least that's what we used to do. We talked. We communicated. But now all we do is point fingers except on a few issues. And I think one issue that's amazing to me and I think it speaks volumes about why we have problems, is the absolute arrogance and brazen attitude of the Majority Party and how they handled this budget. I love the complaining about the Vetoes. I love the talk about backroom deals. The House, House Bill 1102... Senate Bill 1102 left this chamber with 64 'yes' votes by the Democrats. In that Bill... contained in that Bill was a 3.8 percent pay raise for Members of the General Assembly. We are in one of the worst economic times in this country's history and in this state's history. People are losing their jobs. People when they want a raise, go to their boss in times like this, which is understandable, and their boss says, you know what we're really hurting right now. We can't do that. Maybe a boss says, you know what, your work has been superior. You've done an excellent job. I'm going to find a little money to reward you for that behavior. What would you think would happen if you went up to somebody on the street in the State of Illinois today and said, you know what, what do you think of the work of the Illinois General Assembly? we're due a raise? What do you think the people of your district would say? You know what they'd say. They'd say a raise, a raise? A 3.8 percent raise? You can't provide gas tax relief. You can't provide property tax relief. You can't pass a capital Bill. You can't do a balanced

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

budget and you want a pay raise? Yeah, we want a pay raise. But we don't ask people. We've got a big strong Majority Party. We control everything. We're just going to dump in this budget a 3.8 percent pay raise, 'cause we think we're entitled to it. We think we're entitled to more money. We don't care about anybody else in this state. That type of arrogance and that type of attitude and that type of brazen approach to governing is why we don't have a capital Bill. Because you think you know what's best for everybody else and when you think it's time for a capital Bill, then I guess, we'll get a capital Bill. But right now you haven't decided it's time for a capital Bill and you'll decide when it's time for capital Bill. The rest of you folks in the Senate and the House Republicans and Democrats, you just wait over to the side and when we tell you here in the Democrat side of the House when it's time, we'll let you know. But it's not time. And so, today is an exercise to get that monkey off your back. 'Cause, oh, we're all for capital. All those union folks, all those engineers, all those architects, all those school people, all those workers, we're telling them we for capital. They come to our office and they're mad and they're angry and I don't blame them for being mad and angry, 'cause they're not working. They're not working. You know, what it's like not to have a job? Do you know what it's like when you can't make your mortgage payment, when gas has doubled? And we have an opportunity, we have an opportunity to come together and pass a capital Bill.

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

But the arrogance of this institution right now, the Leadership of it, refuses to come together 'cause they don't think it's time, 'cause they don't like somebody. And so, what do you say to that person on the street? We're going to give ourselves a raise, but we're not going to create... a Bill that creates or pass a Bill that creates seven hundred thousand (700,000) new jobs, seven hundred thousand (700,000) new jobs in the State of Illinois. Imagine that. Someone could actually go to work, have a job, a good paying... a good paying job, for real good causes. Fixing roads because people are in gridlock. should... it takes you two (2) hours to get to places, but we're not ready to solve that problem yet. It's not time. Bridges not safe, schools too small, hospitals need improvements need new technology, sewers need to be expanded, water towers need to be built, good paying jobs. We can give ourselves almost a 4 percent pay increase, but we can't even give people an opportunity to work. deserve a pay raise? Come on. It started here in the House. You guys did it. You can't say I didn't know about it. You can't say, well, it was a backroom deal, you voted for it. Sixty-four (64) of you voted to give yourselves a pay raise. All the Members of the General Assembly, a pay raise... a pay raise, but we can't even do a capital Bill? Come on. If you're really serious about a capital Bill, then come to those of us that want to work with you and present us a capital Bill. Not the approach that we've had over the last year or two (2) that this is going to be our

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

plan, take it or leave it, but a real plan with some ideas and some options that we can consider. I can remember a few weeks... a few months ago on redistricting, came up with a good idea. We had some suggestions. Nope, this is the only way it's going to be. That's not the capital Bill idea I'm talking about. I'm talking about one where there's give and take. Maybe this isn't the perfect plan. Maybe it needs some work. I'm willing to look at that or look at other alternatives, when you show up with some better ideas or even just some ideas. I'm just not going to participate because I don't like somebody, come on. owe the people of this state better. We owe'em better than just giving us... to ourselves a pay raise. It's unbelievable. Now, I suspect now that I've brought this up, next week we're going to be here, somebody's going to file a Bill to repeal it. We'll go through that charades, won't we? Oh, I voted to take away that pay raise, Mr. and Mrs. Constituent. It'll die over in the Senate. That's the game you play. You've teased the public with recall. You've teased the public with ethics reform. You've teased the public with gas tax relief. You've teased the public with capital. What it says is you don't have understanding of what people in this state are going through. It's a type of arrogance that causes problems for people. And it's not the type of arrogance, it's not the type of government any of us should be proud of. We see in other places in this state. We've seen it with the Cook County Board, raising taxes to a level highest in the

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

county, from an economic standpoint, one of the worst things you could do. Heaven forbid, we think about not spending money we don't have or cutting back. We are ready and willing at any time at any location at any place to talk to you about capital, when you're serious. The monkey's not leaving, the monkey's staying right Too many people need us to pass a capital Bill. haven't even talked about the needs. We haven't even talked about the federal money, but just on the jobs alone we need to do this. We don't ... I suspect we know what's ... we all know what's going to happen today. We were going through I said this charade, we're going to kill it here, but we can't let it die. The CTA bailout, I think it failed twice, we came back and did it. Needed to happen. This needs to happen. So, Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak. To those of you on the other side of the aisle, I hope that your comments about wanting capital are sincere. I hope your ideas get presented. I don't know how you want to do it. Glenn Poshard and Denny Hastert spent a lot of time on this. I've spend a lot of time on it, others have and some on your side. So, the people are there, ready to work. There are only so many ideas out there that people can come up with, but the result is what we need. And I'm hopeful that because we're back here next week, because we couldn't get or couldn't get your act together on a budget, then maybe next week... maybe next week, we can work on a capital Bill.

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

Maybe the week after. 'Cause it can't go away and it won't get away... go away. Thank you."

- Speaker Madigan: "The... the Chair will recognize Mr. Froehlich.

  Mr. Molaro to close. Mr. Froehlich will be the last speaker before Mr. Molaro."
- Froehlich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen John Fritchey and John Bradley aren't the only ones opposed to expansion of casinos. Why, right into 2008 the Illinois State Republican Party Platform on page 4, it states the following: 'We call on the Governor and the General Assembly to balance the state budget and provide for a responsible capital program without resorting to the expansion of gambling, which harms Illinois families and our state's business climate and presents costly challenges for both law enforcement and social service agencies.' Now, I happen to agree with that sentiment. serious social cost that we really haven't addressed in this debate today. But I can't help notice that, many if not most of my Republican colleagues, don't support this unequivocal plank in their own Party platform that they adopted just last month in Decatur and I just thought it was worth pointing out this disappointing discrepancy."
- Speaker Madigan: "Now, for all of us who have been waiting for Mr. Molaro to state his position on the Bill, the Chair recognizes Mr. Molaro."
- Molaro: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, listening to this debate I certainly am going to miss this place as I move on. You know... you know, these... certainly, when you get

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

frustration things happen that shouldn't happen. I call my children's names sometimes when I shouldn't. I even say things to my wife I'm very sorry for and unfortunately, we usually don't have that kind of discourse Springfield, but it kind have turned into that. So, what happens is everybody's trying to figure out well, you know, is the Governor crazy, is Madigan out of his mind, what the heck is Cross wanting to govern, is he screwy? You know, Emil's nuts when... I don't know. So, it reminds you of a quick story. Reminds you of a quick story. Or maybe we're nuts. So, here's the story. There was this kingdom... of this king a long time ago and it was a wonderful kingdom, wonderful. They loved their king. Loved him and this guy ruled with an iron fist but they loved him because he was such a great king. Loved him. Well, what happened was, this wicked witch... this rotten, wicked witch they were all... this whole kingdom would drink from this one well, so they got all that water. So, this wicked witch came and she put a spell on the well and said any... it's like 6 a.m., everybody's sleeping... anybody who drinks from this well today will go madly insane. Well, everybody gets up. Everybody in the kingdom drinks from the well except the king 'cause he was sick. He didn't drink the whole day. The next morning everybody in the kingdom gets up. madly insane except the king. They all get in the town square and say what's happened to the king? He's lost his mind. Well, even he got thirsty and that day he drank and the next morning he woke up madly insane and in the square

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

they said rejoice, rejoice, because the king had regained his sanity. Now, the point of that story is who... there is a point. The point of the story is there are a hundred (100) ways to do something here. Just because somebody for or against the Bill, you've got to question motives, call them nuts, call them insane, that's really not the way to get this done. It really isn't. You know, shouldn't be capital, noncapital, maybe the bait everybody's for capital. How are we going to do it? don't know. We'll figure something out. Should it be sooner rather than later? Of course. Okay. Mavbe the bigger debate like John Bradley and Mulligan talked about is maybe we should actually have the debate of what it should be. What is the public policy of this state? Are we going to do it with gaming or are we not? Well, I stand for gaming. Everybody knows that. I think we have to do gaming because we have no choice. Every other state's doing it. To say we won't do gaming, we're going to fall so far behind it's... it's terrible. We can't stop it. It's a freight train that's coming. Now, we've always had this type of expansion but what I've tried to tell Leader Cross here many times is that what we should do is don't do it the way we've always done it. It can't work. frustrated. Some people drank the water. Some people didn't. Five (5) people can't get in the room, we have to accept that. So, maybe a better way to do it, which I've always said is, let's see what the House of Representatives stands for. What do we stand for? You're right.

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

our gaming Bill? We don't have one. Let's get one. We filed one. Speaker stands for one. There was a point where I know the Leader over there maybe said, yeah, but we don't know where the money's going, so I can't put votes on Well, what I'm hoping happens today is, we all know this is... this is a very good try at trying to get this Bill It's not right. We have to change some things. Everybody knows that. We cannot responsibly send this to So, I intend on voting 'no' or the Governor's desk. 'present'. We got to ... however ... however, we cannot wait ... we cannot wait more than a few days or a few weeks. So, I'm calling for the Speaker, you're right there, and I'm hoping that he releases his Bill next weeks, or in a few week where what we could do what we should be doing. We'll vote on a House version of the gaming Bill that'll be clean and clear with what Tom wants, what you fellas and ladies want, what we want then we do what we're suppose to do. Send it over to the Senate and then we sit down and figure out what changes we need and then we come back with a gaming for capital Bill. That's the way to do it. To come with a gaming for capital Bill on a Motion to Concur that has nineteen (19) things that no one agreed to is not the way to do a gaming for capital Bill. We all know that. I'm hoping that by voting 'present' or 'no', that we come back within the next week or two (2) or three (3) or four (4) weeks and we get the gaming for capital Bill. Because everything everybody else said, I do agree with. that, I'll close and say I thank the Senate for coming back

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

And and doing this. as I want to make clear, Representative Mulligan talked about it all Amendments, I want to make clear that, you know, pertuant (sic-pursuant) to 72(a) me and Representative Lang are calling for this to be separately voted on and this is where we're going to move to and I think this is the way to do it and hope that even if this Bill doesn't pass within the next few weeks, sooner rather than later, the House has its own gaming Bill so we can move forward with gaming for capital. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "There are requests from Mr. Black and Mr. Stephens for recognition. Now, both of you Gentlemen spoke in debate. Both of you Gentlemen spoke in debate. Mr. Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I just... I just want you to know and I want Hans Christian Molaro to know that, that fairy tale moved me and I would just like to know that when my grandchildren come to visit if Hans Christian Molaro... Representative Hans Christian Molaro would come to my house and read fairy tales to my grandchildren because I'm not sure I got the point, but I'm sure my seven- and eight-year-old grandchildren would and if you could get them to go to bed earlier with your fairy tales, Sir, I would appreciate if you'd come visit."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, I... I would like to make the following offer. I hate to see Representative Molaro vote against a Bill that he's the Chief Sponsor and I wonder with his

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

cooperation if I could take the Bill over and just for this one vote and that way you'll be... you won't have the embarrassment of having to vote against your own Bill."

- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2651?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 47 voting 'yes' and 55 voting 'no'. And the Motion fails. On Supplemental Calendar #1 there appears Senate Bill 1130. Mr. Clerk, do you have any... anything to say about this, Mr. Clerk, anything to tell us."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on July 10, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor consideration' for Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1130. Senate Bill 1130 is currently on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "All right. Mr. Clerk, put this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. The Chair recognizes Mr. Hannig. Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

  Floor Amendment #4 deals with the controversial provision
  that Representative Black alluded to earlier when we were
  talking about the Bill on Third Reading. What... what the
  Amendment does is it breaks out the projects. So, that

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

there's no longer just lump sum, but the projects are… are broken out and it's my understanding that the Republican side of the aisle is now okay with the Amendment and I think with the Bill. So, I'd offer the Amendment and ask for its adoption."

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig 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 Bolin: "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 Bolin: "Senate Bill 1130, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig, on the Bill."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. With this change, I think that we've addressed the concerns that where raised by this Bill earlier. We've thoroughly debated it earlier in the day and so I would happy... be happy to answer any questions but I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the... for the passage of the Bill and the Chair recognizes Mr. Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I simply want to thank Representative Hannig and Members on your side of the aisle. Floor Amendment #4, I think, eliminates any concern that we had that this might have been a premature attempt

1st Legislative Day

7/10/2008

to repair a building that perhaps IDOT will move to in Harrisburg, perhaps not. But it was, I think, an indication of how we can work together on occasion and how we have worked together in the past, but I think this certainly eliminates some of the confusion and some of the concern that we had and I thank you very much, Sir, for your kindness."

"The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Speaker Madigan: Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mulligan. The Chair shall take the record. On this question, there are 104 people voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Supermajority... Super Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Lang moves that the House... that the Twenty-second Special Session stand adiourned Perfunctory Session on Monday, July 14, at 12 noon, providing perfunctory time for the Clerk. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Twenty-second Special Session stands adjourned to a Perfunctory Session on Monday, July 14, at 12 noon. Twentieth Special Session is hereby called to order. there leave for the quorum Roll Call? Leave is granted. Mr. Lang moves that the Twentieth Special Session stand adjourned to a Perfunctory Session on Monday, July 14, providing perfunctory time for the Clerk. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.