141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- Speaker Lang: "The House shall be in order. We shall led... be led in pray today by Pastor Norris Flannigan who is with the Ephesians Baptist Church in Rockford, Illinois. Pastor Flannigan is the guest of Representative Jefferson. Members and guests are ask to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and pagers and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Flannigan"
- Pastor Flannigan: "Dear God, our Father, it is before thee we come now with thanksgiving in our heart. Lord, God, we ask now Your blessings be upon the House of Representatives, upon each and every individual. God, we pray that Your wisdom, Your knowledge, Your love, and Your justice will prevail in this place. Touch each heart and mind. integrity of each individual reach out to touch the hearts and minds of others. Lord, You said in Your word let everything be done decent and in order. So we request of thee today that thou would make this available to this thy people. Lord, God, use Your people for Your glory, let peace be well here on earth. Thank You, our God, for all that You have done and for all that You will do. Bless the Leaders of our state and our communities. Thank You, God. And it is in Your matchless name we humbly ask it all, Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "We will be led in the Pledge today by Representative Reboletti."
- Reboletti 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."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- Speaker Lang: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I have no excused absences among House Democrats to report today."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Jerry Mitchell is excused on the Republican side of the aisle today."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk.

 There are 117 Members 'present' and a quorum is 'present'.

 Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Representative Osterman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor reports following committee action taken on May 25, 2010: recommends be adopted is House Resolution Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriation Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2010: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur on Senate Amendment #1... correction... Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2270. Representative Holbrook, Chairperson from Committee on Environment & Energy reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2010: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 1174. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on 25, 2010: Mav recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #6, Amendment #10, Floor Amendment #12, and Floor Amendment #14 to Senate Bill 3514; Floor Amendment #12, 14, and 17, and

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

18 to Senate Bill 3660; and Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Bill 3662. Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 25, recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4711. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Elections & Campaign Reform reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2010: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill Representative McAuliffe, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2010: recommends adopted is a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5823. Representative Berrios, Chairperson from the Committee on Bio-Technology reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2010: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 1240. Representative Osterman, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2010: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 1211. Representative Turner, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken 25, on Mav recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill and Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill Representative McCarthy, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2010: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3537. Representative Reitz,

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Chairperson from the Committee on Electric Generation & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2010: recommends be adopted is House Resolution Representative Currie, Chairperson from Committee on Rules reports the following action taken on May 25, 2010: on the Order of Concurrence a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution approved for floor consideration Amendment recommends be adopted to Senate Bill 1211. Additional reports for the House Rules Committee. For floor consideration, reported on May 24, 2010: Amendment recommends be adopted to Senate Bill 377. Amendments 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 13 recommends be adopted to Senate Bill 3514; recommends be adopted Amendments 9 and 10 to Senate Bill On the Order of Concurrence, a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 991. Referred to the House Committee on Rules is House Resolution 1277, House Resolution 1282, and House Resolution 1286."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please tell us the status of Senate Bill 3514."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 3514 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Postpone Consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Please move that to the Order of the Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. And the Chair recognizes Representative Currie on Senate Bill 3514."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to offer Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 3514. This Amendment is technical only and I would appreciate your support."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment.

There being no discussion, those in favor say 'yes';

opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have

it. And the Amendment is adopted Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #5."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This makes a correction to the pension borrowing program which was the subject of Amendment #3. It specifies that the Governor must sell the bonds by September 30 and it also deals with the question that might arise if the bonds either do... bring in more than is needed by the pension systems, or don't bring in enough. I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor shall vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Franks. Mr. Mathias. Please take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no'. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #6 has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This Amendment takes the 35 million in Coal Development Bonds that are currently available and expands their purposes so as to include power plants that are using synthetic natural gas for generating power. I would appreciate your support for the Amendment."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Eddy."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Eddy: "Leader Currie, is this particular Amendment contained in legislation that has been acted upon by the General Assembly?"

Currie: "No."

Eddy: "Would you review, again, very quickly what this particular Amendment does then?"

Currie: "Right now there are \$35 million in bonds available for the development of coal markets. This Amendment would add to the purposes for which those bonds can be used the power plants that are using... using coal to turn into synthetic natural gas. So, they are, in fact, generating stations in Springfield and Washington County, Illinois that would under this Amendment qualify for bond proceeds."

Eddy: "Okay. So, this is, in effect, a... an incentive type

Amendment for a couple of purposes that do... deal with

synthetic... syn gas type coal production and one in

Springfield for a specific project."

Currie: "Exactly."

Eddy: "So would it be wrong to characterize this as an attempt to garner support for borrowing to make payments to the pension system by offering directly an incentive to those who might be interested in that particular type of incentive program."

Currie: "Representative, this is an Amendment that stands on its own two feet. Either you are for the idea of supporting power plants that are turning coal into natural gas or you aren't. So, I would ask you to vote accordingly."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Eddy: "Representative, I appreciate that. It's an interesting time for such an Amendment to a Bill that has to do specifically with an issue related to borrowing, and it appears on surface at least to attempt to provide individuals with specific reasons to vote rather than to vote for the theory of the underlining Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment. I think the intent of this is to try to help a couple of Clean Coal projects: one in Springfield, one in Washington County; actually three, one in Representative Phelps District. But they are the leading edge technology in Illinois for Clean Coal Technology and I think this... these... this Amendment will help them and allow them to burn coal cleaner and help move us forward in providing reliable clean electricity for people in Illinois. And we appreciate your help."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Bost: "Representative... Leader, isn't possible that with this Bill... could probably stand on its own, we wouldn't actually have to put it with this Bill?"

Currie: "This is all... the whole Bill is about borrowing to meet important obligations..."

Bost: "Yeah, that's not what I asked Representative."

Currie: "...and responsibilities of the Legislature."

Bost: "I asked if this Bill, by itself, could not have been brought out by itself so that it could have stood so the people that do really support Illinois coal and really do

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

want to see this pass and pass in the right way and not balance baby on some borrowing on the back of our children. Wouldn't it have been possible to bring it out by itself?"

Currie: "This is an Amendment that stands on its own two feet.

If you're for the development of Illinois coal, if you think using coal to create synthetic natural gas is a good thing, I urge you to vote 'yes' on this Amendment."

Bost: "Madam... Madam... to the Amendment. I just wanted to let you know that this Bill has already been filed. It could have been carried on its own. I... I will support the Amendment. That being said, what it will do, I'm afraid is, actually hurt Illinois Coal and the fact that once we put it together like this to try to actually get it passed out of this House. And it's a shame that we have to play with people's jobs to this level once again. Once again, it shows how you on your side of the aisle don't understand how to lead, how to step forward, how to do what's right by the people. Instead, what you want to do is play games like this. Clog up a Bill, weigh it down then take and go out there and say here, make a choice. You can either go out and say in a campaigned brochure, oh, you're not for clean coal and you're not for these issues, but by golly, we're going to ask you to go ahead and put your kids deeper in debt. Shame on you, shame on the whole place."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment shall vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Dugan, Feigenholtz, May. Please take the record.

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

On this question, there are 71 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no'. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #7 has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Number 7 is withdrawn, Representative? Number 7 withdrawn is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #8."

Speaker Lang: "And #8 is also withdrawn. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #9."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you very much, Speaker and Members of the House. This is an Amendment that would permit universities borrowing. As we know the state has not been able, in fact, to pay the universities what they are owed and they are teetering on the brink of disaster. So I would urge your support for this measure to make sure that the universities have the opportunity to go to market, to establish a line of credit so that they can, in fact, meet their fiscal... fiscal year '10 expenses. So I would appreciate your support for this Amendment, as I have appreciated your support for the others."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair wishes to announce that we will be using the two-minute timer. And the Chair recognizes Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield."

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Eddy: "Representative Currie... Leader, this, I believe, is identical to Senate Bill 642 Amendment #8 that passed out

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

of this Body and the Senate and is sitting on the Governor's desk."

Currie: "That is correct, but of course if we were to incorporate its provisions in this Bill... I would consider it an insurance policy so that, for example, if the Governor were to decide not to sign Senate Bill 642, he would have the opportunity to sign this Bill instead."

"Representative... and very quickly to the Amendment. Eddy: Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not sure that in the time I've been in the Assembly for eight years, we've stooped quite this low to directly, directly hold Bills that have passed the General Assembly with overwhelming Majorities in order... in order for a piece of public policy promoted by the Governor's Office to receive votes it would not otherwise receive. I don't know... I don't know how, in good conscious, with a Bill sitting on the Governor's desk that does exactly what this Amendment does. You can call this anything else except attempting to trade... to use the power of the Governor's Office directly to influence a vote in the General Assembly on a different issue. For that reason alone, we should reject this Amendment and force the Governor to act on a Bill that's on his desk."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost for two minutes."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know what I can add to what Representative Eddy just said. This is a ridiculous game, Ladies and Gentlemen. Bills that have been passed that now have been put on the Governor's desk and then we're going to put this Amendment as part of this Bill to try to weigh to get votes. I'd advise the Governor to sign

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

the one on his desk and come back and talk to us on other issues."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Speaker and Members of the House, let me just point out that this is not a game. This is the farthest thing from a game that could ever happen on this House Floor. We are in a desperate fiscal times and the Governor himself has put out a statement that says, I believe... this is a quote, 'I believe that it is in the best interest of Illinois taxpayers to include state university borrowing in the comprehensive borrowing Bill now before the Illinois General Assembly.' I hope you will vote with the Governor and with me and adopt Amendment 9 to Senate Bill 3514."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Black Pritchard. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no'. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment 10, offered by Representative Currie, has also been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you very much, Speaker and Members of the House. This is an Amendment that would expand the purposes for the School Construction Bond Program. As you know, many school districts have gone to market... gone ahead and done their... their rehabilitation, have built their schools but under the current purposes of the bond authorization, they cannot be reimbursed. This proposal would add approximately \$240

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

million to the School Construction Program so that those schools districts will be entitled to reimbursement for the work they have already done and those schools that are waiting for help from the state to begin new projects would also be able to start putting the spades in the ground and getting the job done. I'd appreciate your support for adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Eddy for two minutes."

Eddy: "Thank you. Representative Currie, does this effect..."

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Eddy: "I'm sorry. Would the Lady yield? My apologies. Representative Currie, does this affect the funding for the 23 schools districts that have been waiting for seven or eight years now to receive their school construction grants?"

Currie: "Not the '02 list. Representative, I believe that money is already available, but this would affect those that were... that were started or completed in 2003."

Eddy: "So..."

Currie: "And... there're in fact, a much larger number then 23 on the list that I have seen."

Eddy: "So we pass legislation prior to this with a funding source in order to fund that school construction program."

Currie: "But we did not... we did not provide in that funding that districts could be reimbursed for work they had already done. That was Build Illinois bonding and that really covered... Build America bonding sorry, and that covers new projects not reimbursement for past work. So, this would

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- provide that they get reimbursed as well as get money to begin a new project."
- Eddy: "So schools districts that were on the '03 list, for example, who had already completed their work when the bonding took place previously, that they thought might reimburse them DCEO or someone has determined that they would not be eligible because that work had already been done?"
- Currie: "Because under the Build America Bonds you have to be new construct... going forward rather than looking back. So, this would fix that error so they would be able to get reimbursed."
- Eddy: "How much of this is specifically for that type of additional funding for those schools?"
- Currie: "It doesn't say specifically in the Amendment, but we could use this money, since it's not Build America bonding, we could use it for reimbursement but we also could use it for new construction."

Eddy: "Okay."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Eddy, please bring your remarks to a close, Sir."
- Eddy: "Thank you. I'll be as brief as possible. I want to make sure we understand. This appropriation for bonding then would be increased by an amount that... that would only cover the insurance that those schools districts that had built on the '03 list would be able to rightfully claim through the Build America Bond program that amount and that's all this would do. Is there other..."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Currie: "No, it would also cover new construction projects going forward."

Eddy: "That also qualify under the Build America Bond Act though?"

Currie: "Right."

Eddy: "That money that we are using from the federal."

Currie: "Right."

Eddy: "The pull down. Okay. And that's what this is intended. Is there… is there separate legislation for this or has there been separate legislation introduced ever to fix this problem that you are aware of, in a different Bill?"

Currie: "Yes. It's really how they issue the bonds. So, there has not, as far as I know, been another Bill on the same topic."

Eddy: "All right. My time is up. I want to respect the clock.

Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Mr. Reis for two minutes."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield my time to Representative Eddy."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Eddy for two minutes."

Eddy: "Thank you, Speaker. Just... this is an important issue that I think needs clarification because there are a number of school districts who are concerned that construction that has already taken place may or may not qualify for funding. And specifically, a determination was made that because they're Build America Bonds that those school districts would not... would not receive that funding."

Currie: "Correct."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- Eddy: "This only fixes that for those schools on the '03 list and those going forward that are going to be prioritized."
- Currie: "Right."
- Eddy: "I think that's an important deter... distinction to make about what this Amendment is trying to do."
- Currie: "Right. But what it does it takes care of those that are hoping to get reimbursed and can't be because of the use of Build America Bonds, but it also makes money available for the priority list still to come."
- Eddy: "Okay. Thank you, Representative, for the clarification."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black for two minutes."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor Yield."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."
- Black: "Thank you. Majority Leader Currie, is there a list of these schools that is available for..."
- Currie: "I believe that your staff has been given the list we have. Now, I have to tell you that the state board could not give us total dollar amounts for those school districts that are waiting for reimbursement and those school districts that are priorities for construction projects going forward."
- Black: "How... how many districts are we talking about in both categories those waiting for reimbursement, those waiting for approval to begin?"
- Currie: "I believe the list of the reimbursement districts is shorter but both lists are fairly hefty."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- Black: "So, there's... other than staff, there's nothing on the system, nothing in a Bill file that would show us where these districts are then, correct?
- Currie: "I believe your staff has as much information on this topic as I have."
- Black: "Well, then, we may be all in trouble."
- Currie: "And I would say that the… the districts that have completed are waiting for reimbursement it looks to me the number may be 50, something like that and then there are more that's… that 65 or 70 that are prioritized for new activity."
- Black: "All right. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie to close."
- Currie: "Thank you much, Speaker. I... we've had a good debate, on this issue. If you want to help those school districts that are still waiting for their reimbursement when they went ahead and completed their building projects, this is the way to go. I urge your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Black, Bost, May, Wait. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 78 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no'. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Amen... Floor Amendment #12 had been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a Amendment that is in a pending Bill form not a Bill that has already been adopted, but it would give the school

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

district in Cahokia the opportunity to build a high school and at the same time, would allow them to do as we've let other local school districts do and the state itself does, extend the life of a bond not just to 20 years but to 25. I would appreciate your support for the measure."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Eddy for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Eddy: "Leader Currie, this is something I think in this Body we do from time to time for a school district that gets into a situation where either their authority to bond has been capped because of the statute that limits that authority or some other set of circumstances come up. I guess we've already dealt with a number of these types of situations this year and you mention that there's already a Bill that... that is filed that would take care of this. My question is why not allow that Bill to come to the House Floors so that we can vote on that on its own merit and not attach it to a Bill that's highly controversial for some people. They would like to vote for this because they... they've helped other school districts take care of problems related to bonding limits. Why can't we do it that way?"

Currie: "First of all, I would say that there really should be nothing controversial in his Bill. This Bill is all about borrowing in order to treat the taxpayers fairly, in order to make sure we are not putting the taxpayers on the hook for billions of dollars when we otherwise could make sure the taxpayers are not so exposed. So, I don't think that anybody in this chamber should think there's anything

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

controversial in this Bill. And I would, again, renew my Motion to adopt Amendment 12 to Senate Bill 3514."

Eddy: "Representative, with all due respect, I think if that's the case and the underlying Bill can stand on its own merit, and we don't need to, in anyway, involve the school children of the Cahokia Community Unit School District in our inability to determine a public policy related to borrowing, I think they should be two separate things. I think the Bill for Cahokia should come out and we should treat those kids the same way we treat other students in the state and not hold them hostage on a pension bonding Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Amendment. I close my eyes and I think I'm back in the house about 20 years ago when a then Governor was very adept at creating a Christmas tree. Something under it for everybody. What do you want? I have Don't worry about it. You're forgetting one thing, it. that Governor had money, we don't. You're taking an issue that could have perhaps stood on its own two feet, that being the very critical and difficult issue of borrowing money to pay the pension, and you're putting all kinds of nonrelated materials in here calling it some kind of general, community, state, borrowing plan. How much are you going to borrow? What's the total amount? I can't find it anywhere in here. Is it 10 billion, 20 billion, billion? Now, you're dealing with an individual school district and tucking that into a pension borrowing Bill. I

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

think, quite frankly, you're taking a Bill that could have passed on its own either Cahokia or the pension bonding and you're endangering both. This isn't the way to do it. I would have thought we'd have learned our lesson 20 years ago and I know many of you... most of you weren't here 20 years ago. The Christmas tree concept is gone. I don't know if it will come back in my life time. You don't need all these Amendments. You are simply clouding the issue. You're making it difficult for some of us who want to reach out and help you to not be able to do so. And I think, Mr. Eddy... Representative Eddy said it eloquently. The school children of Cahokia and the school board of Cahokia have no part in the underlying Bill. It can say... it can stand alone and that's what we should be doing."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you. Actually, Speaker, what I would like to suggest is everybody is so anxious to vote on the pension borrowing bill on its own because it's a good sound measure, I would be happy to offer to withdraw Amendments 6, 9, 10, and 12 from this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "I think probably the better course is to ask to table

Amendment 6 and we can do all of them on one Motion if

that's acceptable to the Body."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair will accept the Motion to do tabling of these Amendments on one Roll Call. Which Amendments do you want table, Representative?"

Currie: "6, 9, 10 and 12."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Speaker Lang: "Is there leave of the Body to allow those four Amendments to be tabled? Chair recognizes Representative Black."

Black: "Just a quick inquiry of the Chair. I think the Chair can answer it really quickly."

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Black: "Is the Motion to Table need to go to Rules, or is in order?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black... Mr. Black, an answer to your inquiry.

Since these were Floor Amendments, we do not have to go to
Rules, Sir."

Black: "All right. Was the Motion… was the Motion filed in writing? I believe it has to be."

Speaker Lang: "The Motion was not filed in writing, but if you insist, Representative Currie will do that."

Black: "I don't insist; it's your rules that insist."

Speaker Lang: "The question was, is there leave of the Body to take these on one Roll Call and to proceed. Do you object, Sir?"

Black: "No, not at all."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Stephens."

Black: "As long as it's in writing."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, we were asked to come down here yesterday, today, and tomorrow. We've for the most part, stood around for most of the day doing little or nothing and I would ask the Speaker, what the hell's going on here? Does anybody know what you're doing? You... obviously, you've been game planning all day, not worrying about doing what's

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

right or what's good public policy but what's going to preserve our Majority. It's clear that the only way you can see this is through the eyes of a cynical politician. One who only wants to get reelected. Not follow what is the heart of the people that you're supposed to represent, but what can I do to maintain my power? You know what, America is disgusted, disgusted with you and disgusted with the way we're doing business. Representative Black said it very well. We're following your rules, Mr. Speaker. I would question whether the Motion was in writing."

Speaker Lang: "The Clerk is now in possession of a written Motion from Representative Currie to lay Amendment 6, 9, and 10 on the table. Without objections, we'll take these in one Roll Call. And on this Motion, the Chair recognizes Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, what's the status of Amendment #6?"

Speaker Lang: "It's been adopted, Sir."

Stephens: "And under your rules, can you table a Motion that's been adopted?"

Speaker Lang: "Yes, Sir."

Stephens: "And under your rules, can you table a Motion that has not been dealt with?"

Speaker Lang: "There's no need to. If the Amendment hasn't been dealt with, then it's not of record. It's not part of this Bill."

Stephens: "I'm just trying to clarify if we're following the rules and if you understand the rules and..."

Speaker Lang: "You can count on the fact that I'm going to the follow the rules, Sir."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- Stephens: "I have never doubted that. I certainly never doubted your personal character. I do doubt sometimes whether what your marching orders are. So, with that we'll proceed."
- Speaker Lang: "There being no further debate, those in favor of Representative Currie's Motion shall vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Motion is adopted. The Chair recognizes Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Speaker. Point of inquiry."

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry."

Eddy: "With all that action, could the Clerk give us the status of the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please tell us what Amendments are now on the Bill?"

- Clerk Mahoney: "On Senate Bill 3514 Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee. Floor Amendment #2 lost. Floor Amendment #3 was adopted to the Bill. Floor Amendment 4 and 5 are both adopted to the Bill. Floor Amendment #6 has been tabled. Floor Amendments 7 and 8 were withdrawn. Floor Amendment 9 was tabled. Floor Amendment #10 was tabled. Floor Amendment 11s referred to Rules Committee. Floor Amendment #12 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie, you're withdrawing the rest of the Amendments filed for this Bill? Mr. Clerk, would you..."

Currie: "Yes, please."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Speaker Lang: "...would you announce what Amendments those are and withdraw them please?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendments 12, 13, and 14."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you and very briefly, to the Bill and what's the underlying Amendments that remain. Representative Currie, it now is a Bill that authorizes the issuance of \$3.8 billion in..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Eddy, this would be an appropriate question for Third Reading. We're not there yet, Sir."

Eddy: "Nothing to adopt, so nothing to debate."

Speaker Lang: "There is nothing before you at the moment, Sir."

Eddy: "Thank you. I appreciate that."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With apologies to the Chair, I'm not trying to be dilatory. It's just sometimes hard to hear in here. If I heard correctly, then Amendments... House Floor Amendment #12, 13, and 14 have been withdrawn."

Speaker Lang: "That is correct, Sir."

Black: "Leaving only House Floor Amendments #3, #4, and #5 on the Bill, correct?"

Speaker Lang: "That is also correct, Sir."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk. The... Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Motions have been filed."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 3514 a Bill for an Act concerning finance."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. measure is... amended by Amendment 4 and 5, would propose that the state could borrow up to \$4 billion to meet our obligation to the pension systems during fiscal year 2011. The reason for this effort to borrow is because first of all we were not able to raise revenues that would enable us to make the pension payment. As you know, we had a vote on this House Floor one year ago, a vote that would have increased the income tax, a vote that received only 42 votes, needing 60 to pass. There does not seem to be the appetite among the Members of this chamber to raise the resources it would take to meet our obligations in this coming fiscal year to the state pension systems. Another option, of course, would be to cut our way to \$4 billion, cut \$4 billion in spending, so that we could then go ahead and meet the obligation. Well, we've seen that effort on this House Floor as well. As recently as early May, the Speaker of the House introduced an Amendment that would cut the budget by almost the \$4 billion that is at stake here and that Amendment got 99 'no' votes. So, we haven't the appetite to find the resources; we haven't the appetite to cut deeply into state spending. Our options then are two: we can borrow the money to pay the pension systems what they need and what our responsibilities tell us they are owed, or we can walk away from the debt. We can walk away from those responsibilities. And let me tell you, this let's borrow the measure says money. Anybody who understands finance, anybody that understands the

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

operations of State Government will understand borrowing is far cheaper for the taxpayers than is walking away from the obligation. We can borrow the money at a cost over... for eight years, of about \$1 billion. If instead we walk out on our responsibilities to the pension systems, the total cost to the taxpayers over the life of the... of this obligation would be \$20 billion. Minimally \$20 billion because the system might be forced to sell assets and in this market, you wouldn't want to be selling assets. The total could be well more than \$20 billion. I would say to the Members of this chamber, if you have any respect for the taxpayers, if you have any respect for the obligations of future Illinoisans, the only responsible vote on this measure is 'yes'. The only responsible way to meet our obligations to the pension systems is not by taking a hike, not by taking a walk, but by borrowing the money we need in order to pay the systems, which we can do at low cost to the taxpayers. Any other action hangs the taxpayers out to dry. I would urge your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passages of Bill. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Eddy for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Eddy: "Representative, then we're talking about bonding 4.096 billion in general obligation bonds for the purpose of paying the certified amount to the state's pension systems.

I think then Floor Amendment #4 was technical in nature.

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Could you explain briefly the technical nature of that Floor Amendment?"

Currie: "Actually, it was totally technical. It was Amendment 5 that says that should it turn out that the certified amount is less than the money that could be borrowed under this proposal, then the overage will go to General Revenue and if it is not adequate to meet the certified amount then there will still be a claim from the pension systems on the General Revenue Fund."

Eddy: "Okay. Now, this is similar to borrowing that was authorized last year..."

Currie: "Yes."

Eddy: "...and do you recall when the Governor took advantage last year of the borrowing authority that we provided him?"

Currie: "Quite late in the day, which is why, under Amendment 5, the Governor would only have until September 30 to go to market for this bond issuance."

Eddy: "Now, I also remember a year ago as we debated this and struggled with this we were guaranteed that the Governor's Office was going to perform some cuts. About \$1.2 billion in cuts were going to be necessary. Kind of in exchange for going out on a limb with the… some of us to support borrowing and… and you can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that that is a promise not fulfilled."

Currie: "I believe that last year's budget was significantly under... underfunded compared to the previous budget, so I think that promise was fulfilled."

Eddy: "Representative, I would beg to differ with that based on the understanding we had that there were going to be cuts

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

of 1.2 billion. Very quickly, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's been outlined here there are a couple of options. The option is either not to make the payment to the pension system, or to borrow the payment to the pension system. There is another option. The option is to make..."

Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Eddy: "Thank you... the option is to make the payment to the pension system. We've been down this road before. This kicks the can down the road. Unless and until we take a strategy that doesn't simply depend on borrowing, additional revenue, throwing money into a hole that has no bottom, we're not going to solve the issues that face this state. We need to work together on solving those issues. Door number one and number three are not the only two doors. Just because you don't vote for pension obligation bonds doesn't mean you're going to vote not to make the payment. That's not the either/or that you have here. The option of making the payment exists."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Winters for two minutes."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We are asked today to borrow more money to bank our pension payments. And the argument has been made that if we don't we have to charge ourselves eight and a half percent interest. That is a projection that are investments will earn that. Well, if we invest a lot of our pension bonds money into the stock market. The last 30 days the stock market has gone down 12 percent, 12 percent in one month. Now, what happens if we had borrowed this \$4 billion and put it in the stock market and we count on having that kind of return, instead we're

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

losing money on it. Instead... no, we want to go out and borrow at three and a half percent. Oh, it's so much cheaper, but when we invest it in a market that is probably not going to return eight and a half percent, we're not any better ahead. Instead what we've done is mortgage our children's future and the future of the state budget for the next 8 or 10 years as we, again, face the same question we had last year. We borrowed three and a half billion dollars last year. When we owe 800 million this year, we don't have the money to pay that. We don't have the three and a half million to invest in our pensions because we overspend. Over the last 8 years, our state debt is up at least \$60 billion. Common logic tells you if we owe 60 billion more than we did 8 years ago we have been overspending every year by approximately \$7 billion. When are we going to wake up and realize that we cannot afford the size of the State Government that we have developed, that we have to cut it. We have to grow jobs in the state to work our way out of a hole instead of keep digging it. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks for two minutes."

Franks: "Mr. Speaker, our bu... our pension fund is \$80 billion short of what we promised to pay in. To put that in perspective that represents unfunded liability in excess of \$17 thousand per Illinoisan residents. Our budget is \$13 billion short or to put that in perspective, about 50 percent short of our general revenue funding. Only California's bonds are posing a higher default risk than that of Illinois. This same Bill failed two weeks ago and

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

nothing has changed since. None of the options that are being presented at this time will solve the budget problem. We're supposed to be back here in Springfield to solve our budget crisis, but we have not addressed the \$13 billion deficit. Nothing we actually plan to discuss, debate, or vote on this week deals on how to fix this. It is not insurmountable problem, but it's a crisis that we continue to allow the snowball and we continue to ignore it. All we're debating right now is whether we're going to borrow or whether we're going to defer the \$4 billion that we owe to our pension system. Both are bad and irresponsible options. Instead of employing delaying tactics, we should be facing spending cuts head-on. In addition to the \$4 billion we're focused on, there's another \$9 billion problem, some of which is \$6 billion owed for unpaid bills from this fiscal year which we're ignoring and all we're going to do is carry forward. We have not worked to developed any plan to pay these bills or any plan to lessen the \$9 billion on top of this 4 billion. And why? We're being asked to talk about borrowing versus deferring to distract us from the underlying problem. Now, whether we defer or borrow, we are going to owe billions more down the road. We're talking about putting a Band-Aid on a gunshot wound."

Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to the close, Sir."

Franks: "I shall. We should be talking about realistic options and begin making cuts now. We can save billions of dollars in interest. We owe it to the people that elected us, to our children and our children's children to start making

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

real efforts to solve this problem. I encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady will yield."

Reis: "Majority Leader Currie, do you know what our pension payment will be for next year, for fiscal '12?"

Currie: "I don't know. I do know that the expectation is that the certification will be under \$4 billion in fiscal '11.

We think in the neighborhood of 3.7, 3.8 billion."

Reis: "I bring this up because we keep borrowing to make payments. And I go back to 2003 when you borrowed money to make the pension payment. Those annual payments now are 540 million on top of our scheduled payment. Then we had the pension raid which only brought up the unfunded liabilities of the pensions. Last year we borrowed 90 percent of our payment, 3.6 billion. That annual payment for next year is about a billion dollars, and then we add other 3.7 billion on. Our payments are more than our annual growth of revenue, that doesn't count our next schedule payments. How many of you can go to a bank and borrow your home payment or your car payment? You just keep piling it on and piling it on, but any banker would ask you what did you change? Did you cut your expenses; did you do other things? Things that we have been advocating for and I... my question to you now, Majority Leader, is why are we discussing this now as opposed to after we know what other Bills and Amendments are going to pass at the end of the day? Maybe you're going to come to us and say, David, we want to change

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

workmen's comp. Maybe you're going to come to us and say we want to make meaningful changes to the cost of Medicaid, but we're doing this first. Why don't we do this at the end of Session when we find out what else is passed?"

Currie: "This is the end of Session Representative."

Reis: "We have a lot more stuff to talk about."

Currie: "This is the end of session and I would remind you we have offered cuts we have offered significant cuts."

Reis: "The wrong cuts."

Currie: "\$4 billion more of cuts."

Reis: "Why won't you consider our cuts."

Currie: "And this chamber overwhelming rejected the opportunity to cut that kind of dollar amount from the state budget, 99 people voted 'no'. You need 60 people to vote 'yes' to pass cuts of that magnitude and they are not in this chamber. We live in a real world, Representative not a fantasy world. It's time for us to wake up and figure it out."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman's time has expired. Do you wish to complete your comments, Sir? Please do."

Reis: "To the Bill. This is fantasyland, Representative. Nobody in their right mind in a business world would do things the way we're doing them here. We have good ideas to help bring this budget into check. It's going to take some time and we know that, but why our ideas aren't considered? This is going to go down just like the cuts in education. You didn't make meaningful cuts that other people wanted. You cut education to the point where it didn't even make sense. Of course, that's going to fail. You said this isn't a game; it's a circus today. We were

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

brought back here to discuss lots of ideas, everyone's ideas we represent over five million people. Why don't we get our ideas on the floor? I think that all of us collectively could come together with the budget proposal, but no we're going to continue the circus charades, go home and point to the Republicans. Well, just remember, when you point to us you got three fingers pointed back at yourself. You're in charge. You have been for eight years and this is the grand culmination of it all. Mr. Speaker, should this measure receive the requisite number of vote, I would request a verification of the vote."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged, Sir. Representative Senger for two minutes."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. There is a third door and it's a simple answer to this whole problem and we're not talking about it, because we have to look at ourselves first. Right now, if each one of our five systems, those who are currently in the system, not retired, paid two percent more per year. Yes, that's out of our pocket not the taxpayer pocket. I would guess, except for where we shorted the pension fund, we would come very close to closing that gap. And that is something I would like to see. I'll... take... I'll do that challenge right that myself I will pay that money. I don't want the taxpayers to pay for the fact that we have a system that, yes, we are overestimating right now what the cost is going to be. They should not be paying for my retirement I should be paying for my retirement; every one of us in the system... in five systems need to pay for their own retirement. The guy next

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

door to me doesn't have that luxury. So, I would say 'no' for this Bill and we should all be paying two percent more per year."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hoffman for two minutes."

Mr. Speaker, I would just... to some of the Hoffman: "Yes. comments from the Gentleman from Danville. I just wanted to say, I don't necessarily agree with the comments that we wouldn't want to try and put some Amendments forward that would help create jobs for the Illinois Jobs Now program or build new schools or ensure that some of the coal-fired clean energy coal plants were open. I would like to do that too but this now is... is what you... you would ask for. And the Gentleman from Danville, it's been an honor and a privilege to have served with you for so many years and... talking about vou're 20 years ago. Fortunately, unfortunately, we've been here for 20 years. And I recall a vote on a... on a Bill... a Bill maybe 18 years ago when we were asking the voters to change the Constitution to make sure that we in Illinois or we in the General Assembly provide the majority of money for education funding and you stood up at that time, almost got in a fight on the House Floor. It's been an honor for me to serve with you all these years. And I think if you step back and if we all step back, both sides of the aisle, look at what we're facing. We do have three choices. We can cut \$3.8 billion from the budget. We do have to make cuts. We have to make across the boards cuts, that'll be coming. We could do what the Lady is proposing. We could borrow, which many of us... a lot us on this House Floor, we all voted for last year or

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

we can skip it. Now here's the truth; the truth is the \$3.8 billion worth of cuts did not come forward when the Speaker had asked for Amendments. That's the truth. The truth is if we were to do what the Lady is proposing it would cost us a billion dollars in interest over 8 years, and the truth is if we skip by not passing this it's going to cost us about \$20 billion over the next 35 years. That's the…"

Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Hoffman: "...that's the facts. That's the facts we can get up and we can give all the speeches we want about partisanship, about the motives, but that's the facts. And the people are looking at us now and seeing if we can put all of that aside and we can come up with some reasonable solution, not necessarily the best solution but something that we can agree upon. To me this is a no-brainer. Is it... are we going to cost the taxpayers a billion dollars or are we going to cost them \$20 billion? It's that simple. I think we should put all this stuff aside, I know I sometimes get exorcised and say things, but let's do what's right. Let's be states men, and states person, and states women and let's just vote for this and move it along."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, if we don't make this vote of 71 votes of borrowing \$3.8 billion, exactly, in short-order what organizations... what agencies will be impacted?"

Currie: "Well, the impact would be felt by the... the five state pension systems, but they're reaction to having no money

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

that they were supposed to have under the continuing appropriation, will be that they will... may have to go to market to sell assets in order to meet the checks... the reasonability to pay the checks to current retirees. Well, I wouldn't want to go to market today and sell valuable assets given how the market is tanking. So my estimate of \$20 billion over this 35 year period may, in fact, be very low. It may turn out that it's rather a \$30 billion problem than a \$20 billion problem and there is no question that under this Bill the cost of the taxpayers over 8 years will be one billion, not 20 billion, not 30 billion, but one billion. So that's the point of this proposal is to see to it that the pensions have the money they need to meet their payroll and at the same time not stick it to the taxpayers."

Dunkin: "Has there been any other proposed solution in this short-order that we're looking at in the next several days?

I mean, have we heard any other comprehensive approached other than cutting or not borrowing money?"

Currie: "The options that I said in the beginning; we could raise revenues, we chose not to. We could make deep cuts in state spending; we tried that. The measure was on the board; it got 99 'no' votes. Everybody in this chamber was invited to come up with their own ideas for \$4 billion in cuts and we haven't seen anybody rise to the challenge. So, people can talk all they like. They can talk all day long about how, gee, we can make the cuts. But I haven't seen the backbone in the Members of this Assembly exactly to go forward and do that."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Speaker Lang: "Mr..."

Currie: "So, those are your options, borrow the money or walk, take a hike, walk on your responsibility to meet the payment."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin, please bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Representative. I, too, agree Representative Currie and all of us really being in this situation together. This is not a Democrat or Republican response. This is one of the very few options that we have especially right now, where our state's economy is at an all-time low when it comes to economic activity. This is the first time in history... the history of our state where we have... where we're experiencing this level of financial setbacks. And unless a Member here or caucus here or Party here have a solution to help deal with this short-term issue that we can correct in over a relativity short time and far less than 8 years, I would say put up or shut up and let's do the right thing as it relates to citizens here in this state who could care less about our political ambitions or our elections coming up and let's be responsible, do the right thing for the families in the State of Illinois and support this short-term borrowing measure. I would encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Minority Leader Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think anybody on this side of the aisle takes this issue lightly. We, much to the chagrin of many, supported a pension borrowing Bill under our former Governor, his name escapes me at the

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

moment, but we participated in that process to help him in his first term try to address some issues. Many would say it was a mistake. We then saw your side of the aisle completely take away a pension payment back in 2005, you just didn't make it. You just suspended totally the payment to the pension system. And then last year, we have a new Governor and we said we want to work with you. want to do the right thing. We want to be part of a solution and we want to take care of the pension system. We know not making it, a payment, can be very problematic financially. We get that. So, we worked with Governor Blagojevich and we worked with Governor Quinn. But we said to Governor Quinn, Governor Quinn, we'll do this, but life has got to change around the State of Illinois, at least in this building. It has to change. We can't keep borrowing, we can't keep spending... we've got to do something about job growth and job retention. We've got to reform and look at a variety of areas like Medicaid, to name one. We've got to cut. We need to stop increasing the spending. We need to fundamentally change the way we run government in Illinois and we will work with you to borrow money, last year. And we did. We get it. And we get this year the downside of not making a payment. And we are not saying don't make a payment. We're saying we want fundamentally change the way we run government in Illinois. It's ironic that you're saying to all of us today that we have to pass this 'cause we have to have a payment ready to go on June 1, when you file a Bill several weeks ago that said we would suspend the payment until January of next

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

year. The fallacy is we don't have to make a payment in June, or July or August. The systems are going to have to sell assets anyway. We can make the payment next spring, like we did this year. We understand we need to make the payment. We understand that. Now, what we don't approve of and what we don't like is the fact that you have done absolutely nothing in the area of job growth or retention. Name one thing that this General Assembly has done under the current Governor that has helped retention and job growth. Unemployment is at 12 percent in the State of Illinois, 12 percent. For every percentage point we drop unemployment, it means 300 to 400 hundred million dollars to the resid... to the budget of the State of Illinois, 300 to 400 million dollars more in a conservative manner. We've done nothing. What have we done in the area of stopping spending? This budget that we're talking about increases spending. What have we done in the area of cuts? Nothing. What have we done in the area of Medicaid reform? Nothing. We have not done a thing in changing the way we operate this state. Some of you have said how about zerobased budgeting? Have we talked about that? No. Some of you have said why don't we get the chance to see the budget for seven days before we vote on it? Haven't changed the law to do that. Senator Radogno and I sent a letter to Governor Quinn back on March 9, where we talked about job growth and we listed a handful of things that we think should happen. None of them have happened. We listed I think, let's see, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12 things to the Governor about controlling spending. None of those

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

have happened. We said, Governor, why don't you take some of the recommendations of the Taxpayer Action Board, your own action board and implement some of those before we do the budget. None of that happened. I could go on and on. I could talk about the things we'd like to see in the world of Medicaid reform that haven't happened, the work comp reform, the TORT reform, you name it. None of them have happened. The bottom line is we cannot continue to borrow our way out of this mess. Nothing has changed and we sit here and say the status quo is okay and you have to do the right thing and you have to borrow another \$3.7 billion, \$3.7 billion. Anybody got a plan of how we're going to pay that back? We borrowed 3.7 last year. We haven't paid that back. We have short-term borrowing, we haven't paid that back. And now you come along and say let's do the right thing and borrow another 3.7, but how are we going to do that? How are we going to do that? \$3.7 billion. This is very real. This is very problematic. The system needs the money. The state is in financial trouble. I used to think that we had a great opportunity 'cause we we're going to transform Illinois government and fundamentally change the way we do things. We are now in survival mode. This is beyond transformation. We have real problems and yet nothing changes, Nothing changes. And we just go along our merry way and say its Illinois, it's just the way we do things, it's the Chicago way, or it's this way. It's all okay, don't worry about it. It's not okay. It's not okay. And so, I hope that no one on the other side of the aisle is suggesting that we don't get it. We get it.

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

troubled. We're concerned. We're ready to change. We're ready to look at things in a different way. But let's not forget what transpired this spring. Not only did nothing happen in a different way, we have a budget that anybody being honest would tell you it's like a... it's like a jigsaw puzzle with all the pieces just thrown out there, not put together. It doesn't mesh. It's put together by the Speaker and the President of the Senate in a backroom somewhere, I don't know where, everybody's desk and said take it or leave it. We've gone through a few exercises today, political stunts that mean nothing to appease a few people. At the end of the day we have the same product put together by two guys that are going to tell us what's right and how we're going to do things and who have resisted change all along and all along the way the last year, and the last two years, and the last three years, and the last four years, the last five years, to the point that we have ourselves a real mess. So, yes, we understand the problem, we want to help solve the problem. We know we need to make a pension payment, but we have got to say someday in this state enough is enough. We're going to fundamentally change Illinois State Government, fundamentally change State Government. Everybody in this state who sits around their kitchen table, struggling with their own budget, doing their taxes, paying their bills has changed. The mom and dad saying I got cut back at work, lost a few hours, we just can't keep doing what we've been doing, sweetheart. The small company, we just can't keep running our business the way

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

we've run it for the last 10 years. Times have changed. The big company, we've got to make changes. Everybody gets it except the people in this building. Everybody knows it's broken. So, when you're ready to fundamentally change Illinois, when you're ready to say enough is enough, when you're ready to say we are going to look at all the components that need to be discussed to fundamentally change government, we'll work with you, but you haven't done it. You're not even close. And that is the real tragedy today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair would like to recognize the presence of the Governor of State of Illinois, Pat Quinn. Representative Fritchey for two minutes."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the Body. When you get past all of the rhetoric, very little is changed since we were here a couple weeks ago and very little is going to change unless people wake up to the reality. The choices are simple. We have certain ways that we can get out of this whether you like them or not. And I don't think there is any way that anybody is going to say we feel good about what we did. A number of people have said that, you know, we're in a time when we have to pick, you know, the best of the worst options. And for whatever reasons they may be, that's where we find ourselves. We don't need to go and dig into the history books and look back 20 years or 8 years or 8 months. How we got here is history, we're here. And to go forward from here we borrow, we defer, we cut, we hike, in some type of combination. But to say that you are not going to do any of those, doesn't change the equation today

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

as it did not change the equation weeks ago as it won't change the equation in June, July, August, or September. It's not the time for politics; it's not the time for grand-standing. It's a time to make tough votes. Where we were last year, Members on the other side of the aisle said with a flurry and bluster that they were going to file Amendment after Amendment that was going to cut our way out of this. None of those Amendments were filed. given carte blanche. People on this side of the aisle filed Amendments and the Speaker actually let them be heard. The process worked the way it was supposed to work; they were heard in committee, some went forward most didn't, but the Members got to cho... choice to weigh in and the chance to weigh in. Folks on the other side of the aisle said that they were going to do the same thing. Not one Amendment got filed, yet we had to listen to how you got cut out of the process. At the end of the day, the reality is simple. You are going to take the choice here, the fiscally prudent sound way you do this or were you going to make tougher more expensive choices for the taxpayers and the people of Illinois. We need to handle where we are now. We need to move forward. It's not the time for political speeches. It's not the time to set up yourself for your mail pieces that are going to go to your constituents. It's a time to realize where you are. Realize why you were elected to this office. Do what needs to be done, make the tough decision, and let's move forward. Thank you."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black, you spoke in debate. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Black: "When did I speak in debate?"

Speaker Lang: "Perhaps I was thinking of a different Bill.

Please proceed for two minutes, Sir."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have some Ginko Biloba that I'll share with you at the appropriate time. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the measure before us, and I didn't want speak. My Leader, as always is very eloquent. I do wish your side of the aisle would give him the respect that we give the Speaker but there are some of you in back that I guess don't... don't get that. courtesy of the House used to be absolute; the two Leaders were given that courtesy. Let me just say that the previous speaker is the one who got me up, and he's a friend of mine; and I will miss him a great deal. Our side of the aisle, our side of the aisle, our side of the aisle. You know, this isn't ... this doesn't belong to either side of the aisle. This is a joint mess that we have put ourselves in. I've been here long enough to remember, how many pension emoluments have we voted for? How many alternative pension formula people have we put in? How many early retirements did we give? All of that put a strain on the pension system. We've all had a role in it. And Leader Cross is right; we are going to have to make some fundamental changes. I wish I would be here to work on those with you. But at the end of the day I... I'm faced with two very unpleasant situations. I'm asked to borrow more money, or I'm asked to let the pension system go 20 billion more

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

dollars in unfunded liability. I can't do that. And I don't want to do this. But I don't have any answers. You have to make a pension payment. It's a continuing appropriation we passed when we were in the Majority. I don't think you have \$3.7 billion to make the pension payment. I've tried to find it, I can't find it. My wife and I took out a second mortgage when our kids were in college. I've taken out a home equity loan. I've managed my credit. Illinois, through a succession of Governors, has not done as well. But the bottom line is this. And with all due respect to my colleagues on this side of the aisle, I've been in this position three times in the almost 26 years that I've been here. I take no satisfaction in it whatsoever. But I came down here to do what I thought was right, and I came down here to represent my district to the best of my ability. And I came down here to represent the people of the State of Illinois to the best of my ability. An unfunded pension system of \$100 billion does no one any good. You must address that or it will be the doom of this state. I will cast my vote for borrowing. I think it is the only reasonable vote I can make at this late hour. I didn't think we should've gone home on May 7, and I don't think it's any accident that we come back with only four or five days left in the Session. Been here a long time, I know most of the tricks. I begged you from the beginning of Session in February, check the tapes. When are we going to talk about the budget? When are we going to talk about the budget? When are we going to talk about the budget? We didn't even mention the budget on this floor until May 7.

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

We're going to have to change the way we do things, but for now I cannot go home and let the pension system grow to an unfunded liability that all of us, I won't live long enough to see that paid down my children might, hopefully my grandchildren will. It has to be paid down, it cannot be allowed to grow. Let's start the process tonight. Vote your conscious I intend to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan for two minutes."

Mulligan: "People can really vote however they really want; that's not the issue here. The issue here is I've been down here since 1993 and I've worked on budget almost from the very beginning. There are a great number of people on this House Floor that have been here during Blagojevich that don't even know how we ever worked on a budget. They haven't seen us do it because that's been how long it's been since we've done a real budget here. We don't sit down together in a collegial fashion, we don't sit down with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we don't sit down with staff and we don't sit down early enough. We give less answers and less people from our advocates to come before us and speak on the budget. We are rude to them; we don't let them come before us. I'm saying we but I don't think it's we because I don't feel that I have done that. And I don't feel that there's Members on the other side that I've worked with for years that have done that. The fact of the matter is, we knew this was going to be a bad year. There have been months when we could have been working on this. The problems have over the grown Blagojevich years and I don't think, with all due respect

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

to some Members on the other side of the aisle, that they expected the economy to turn back as bad as it did. But what you have now is a situation where you should have been talking about this in February. You should have included our Leader. This is the least amount of time that the Leaders on both sides have ever gotten together. This has been rude. This has been the worst way we have ever done a budget when we have the biggest fiscal crisis now and then to have someone on the other side of the aisle stand up and say, all of a sudden at the last minute, we should be doing it this way when there were better collegial ways of doing this. When there are ways we have done it in the past that are reasonable is ridiculous. If you find yourself in this situation, you brought it upon yourself. So, how do you like it? Working for you now?"

Speaker Lang: "Representative Stephens for two minutes."

Stephens: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The... first of all I just want to kind of clarify how we got where we are. We didn't get in this pension problem by passing a few benefits here or adding a few Members there. That's not how we got there everyone knows that. We got there by doing the same sort of tricks and smoke and mirrors that we're trying to do now. We're borrowing a little bit less money, but let's face the facts, in the last 10 years by not doing the fiscally responsible things that a pension fund calls for, by not making payments, by changing the historic '95 legislation where a real leader Jim Edgar led us to the path that would have put us in a fiscally responsible position. We would have already made the maximum payment I

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

believe in 2006 or 2007 and we would be on the downward trend and we would have a sound system now. We didn't get there by adding a few Members, so I take exceptions to those remarks. I also take exception to the fact that we've only got two choices either borrow another billion dollars and be farther in debt on short-term loans or don't make the payment and be stuck with a 30 billion or put some... put some number call it a trillion if you want. A trillion dollars in debt those are not the choices. There's one choice vote 'no' on the two pieces of legislation that count today. Vote 'no' on this one and no on changing the automatic payment and what do we have, the pension payment will be made. It's a continuing appropriation. change that law. Don't change it. And we'll have to make some tough choices. You're darn right we will. But isn't that the real responsible thing to do. If you're ending your career and you want go out a hero, why don't you do the really right thing and stand up to the real issue, we spent our way into this oblivion. We spent our way here and the only way to stop is to stop the spending. We've got to do it. Is it tough, you're darn right? Is it right? Yes, it is and isn't it about time that Illinois got from us that which they deserve the right decisions, not for our election, Ladies and Gentlemen, for the next thing, vote 'no' generation. Do the right on irresponsible legislation."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. This is the end of May, this is the end of Session. We have a very

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

clear choice. We can borrow for the pension payment and the taxpayers will be on the hook for \$1 billion in interest over 8 years, or we can take a hike. If we take a hike, the taxpayers, not just of today but of tomorrow, are on the hook at least \$20 billion. One billion or twenty billion, it's up to you. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Lady's moved for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bassi, Careen Gordon, Pritchard. Please take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. And the Bill fails."

Speaker Lang: "The House shall be in order. Mr. Clerk, are you in receipt of a Motion?"

Clerk Mahoney: "A Motion to reconsider the vote on Senate Bill 3514 has been filed."

Speaker Lang: "Who's filed the Motion, Sir?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Miller."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Miller on the Motion."

Miller: "I'd like to move to reconsider the vote on Senate Bill 3514."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman's moved to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 3514 failed. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Reis for two minutes. Gentleman does not wish to speak. Chair recognizes Representative Osmond for two minutes."

Osmond: "The Republicans wish to caucus in Room 118."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Speaker Lang: "Can you tell the Chair how long that caucus will last Representative? Representative Osmond?"

Osmond: "One hour."

Speaker Lang: "Please... please bear with the Chair. The Republicans will go to Caucus. The House Democrats will be at ease and the House will be in recess until the hour of 6:00. And the Chair... before we depart, the Chair recognizes Representative Black."

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

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Black: "Do you have any Motions before you at this time?"

Speaker Lang: "Well, as you know, Mr. Black, there's a Motion pending and we'll deal with that Motion and any other Motions before we adjourn so rest easy, Sir."

Black: "Wait, I'm resting very easy. I just wondered if we could get to my Motion now?"

Speaker Lang: "First, there's another Motion pending. If you'd like me to get to that one before your caucus, I can do that, Sir."

Black: "I think my Motion was prior to the other one. I just thought we could get to my Motion to Discharge. I assume that we're not going to do that."

Speaker Lang: "We will get to your Motion in due course, Sir."

Black: "That's what I'm afraid of."

Speaker Lang: "The House is at ease until 6:00 pm."

Black: "Yes, that's what I am afraid of."

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Mr. Clerk, can you put the Bill back up on the board, Sir? When the Republicans went to caucus, we were debating or beginning

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

to debate a Motion to reconsider filed by Representative Miller on Senate Bill 3514. Is there any debate? On this question, the Chair recognize Representative Rose for two minutes."

Rose: "Will the sponsor Yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Rose: "Representative, I'm just wondering. Since you voted against the first time, I'm wondering why you changed your mind here."

Miller: "I move for a Motion for this. That's my explanation right now."

Rose: "Well, Representative, I guess, let me ask you a quick question. Do you know under the current State Law the pension payments require to be made on a continued basis and the Comptroller has to make that payment anyway, is that correct?"

Miller: "I believe we're debating the Motion, Representative."

Rose: "Okay. Well, the answer is yes. The Comptroller has to make the payment anyway. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Reis: "Will this be a Roll Call vote for just the Motion to reconsider and then we'll actually reconsider the Bill?"

Speaker Lang: "It will be a Roll Call vote. If the vote is successful, there will be a Roll Call vote on the Bill."

Reis: "So, you'll allow... you'll allow further discussion on the main Bill."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- Speaker Lang: "There will be no further debate on the main Bill. We've already thoroughly debated it, Sir."
- Reis: "I resume my request then, if... should the Bill receive the required number of votes, I would call for a verification of votes."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis, the Bill is not before us now, but if you'll renew that request when the Bill is on the board, I will not forget it, Sir."
- Reis: "That's fine, but you said there would be no further debate so."
- Speaker Lang: "Well, I understand, but the Sponsor's going to be able to explain the Bill..."
- Reis: "Very good. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "...and you'll have your opportunity.

 Representative Fortner."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Motion. The… one of the things that came out in the earlier debate on the Bill was this notion that there was a difference between perhaps a \$1 billion interest charge and a \$20 billion interest charge depending on whether or not this Bill woul… were to be approved. I would suggest to the Membership that if we look at the type of borrowing and say it's something like four and a half percent interest that that would give you 1 billion then not paying or deferring that pension payment, which nominally would be at eight and a half percent interest could hardly come up with 20 billion. The only way we get to 20 billion is you assume that somehow it's not to be paid at all. Now, this chamber's had before us legislation passed over by the Senate, I know it's been

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

considered in committee, that this would allow the Governor to defer until such time as he could pay the pensions. Even last year when we did bonding, at that point those bonds as we saw we're wait... they waited six months, after we acted, before they were paid. At that time, the Comptroller was not paying those vouchers because the bonds hadn't gone out. I would contend that that didn't cost us 20 billion last year and it would not cost us 20 billion this year. So, I think that the numbers there are certainly inflated compared with our experience last year. And I would urge a 'no' vote on the reconsideration Motion."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Eddy for two minutes."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in oppositions to the Motion. This is, first of all, very premature. There are a couple of Bills pending that make a lot more sense to discuss before we discuss borrowing. We haven't heard any budget Bills. So, until we hear that, I would think that any Motion to reconsider a vote on borrowing, before we hear about budgets, doesn't make a whole lot of sense. Second thing is this... this Motion should fail because there's... there's some argument that's been made that somehow voting against borrowing is synonymous with voting to skip a pension payment. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, those are two entirely different things. Voting against borrowing necessarily mean you have to skip a pension payment. There's a separate vote on that Bill and we haven't taken that vote yet either. Think about the order of this. We voted on this Bill. There's no need to vote on the Bill

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

again. I would urge a 'no' vote on the Motion to reconsider."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rose, I see you're trying to get recognition. Did you already speak in debate, Sir?"

Rose: "This is a point of... a parliamentary inquire, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Please state your inquiry."

Rose: "Mr. Speaker, under House Rule 56, specifically 56(a) there was Motion made for a recorded Roll Call on the Motion to reconsider and 56(a) reads, 'after any record vote.' So, I think the Gentleman's Motion was in order."

Speaker Lang: "Sir, the Gent... you're talking about Mr. Reis?"

Rose: "Yes... yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis was asking for a opportunity to verify the vote when we get back to the original Bill. He was not making any Motion on this Bill, Sir. On this... on this Motion."

Rose: "Well, then I would make a Motion for a recorded Roll Call on this."

Speaker Lang: "It is required under the rules, Sir."

Rose: "The ver... through a verification of the Roll Call,"

Speaker Lang: "And we will acknowledge that, Sir."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Miller to close."

Miller: "I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Mr. Miller has closed on his Motion to reconsider. I see Representative Mulligan with her light on. The Gentleman's already closed,

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- Representative. Are you... can you tell me why you're rising to speak?"
- Mulligan: "Well, first of all, I wanted to find out how fast you could count, which obviously you did. And secondly, I wanted to raise... rise to a point of order. Under House Rule 54(a)5, I move to Table the Motion to reconsider the vote filed on Senate Bill 3514. And we filed the proper paperwork."
- Speaker Lang: "The Lady's Motion is in order. The Lady has moved to table Mr. Miller's Motion. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Mulligan to debate her Motion."
- Mulligan: "Upon the conclusion of debate of the last Bill, there was a very quick call and then we went to caucus. When we came back, we were ready to vote. Obviously you weren't because you moved it ahead and then we stood here and waited for quite some time. I think we... as a person that was the Sponsor of the Bill and as you have said from the Chair, Mr. Speaker, there's no longer any need to debate the original Bill. I think all the pros and cons of that have been debated. But I'm sure there other people that will speak to the issue of why we should not vote on this Motion, and that we should move ahead with the business of the Body instead of playing this game all evening. So, I move for us to lay this on the table."
- Speaker Lang: "There being no one wishing to debate, those in favor the Lady's Motion shall vote 'yes'; those opposed shall vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Black, Mr. Eddy.

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Please take the record. On this Motion, there we are 47 voting 'yes', and 70 voting 'no'. And the Lady's Motion is defeated. Mr. Miller has moved to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 3514 failed. And those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion shall vote 'yes'; those opposed shall vote 'no'. The voting is open. This Motion takes 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Schmitz. Please take the record. On this question, there are 71 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no'. And the Gentleman's Motion prevails and Senate Bill 3514 is reconsidered. Representative Currie."

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. We've discussed this measure at some length this afternoon. I think we all know what the issue is. We have not been able to cut our way to find \$3.8 billion. We've not been able to raise the revenue."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative... Representative Currie. Representative Rose, I know why you're rising. You did ask to verify that. It did get 71 votes requiring 60. I apologize for forgetting your verification. Do you persist, Sir?"

Rose: "Yes."

- Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie will suspend. The Clerk will read the affirmative vote... on the Motion to reconsider."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Voting in the affirmative are Representatives Acevedo; Arroyo; Beiser; Berrios; Biggins; Black; Boland; John Brady; Burke; Burns; Carberry; Chapa LaVia; Collins; Colvin; Crespo; Currie; D'Amico; Monique Davis; William

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Davis; DeLuca; Dugan; Dunkin; Farnham; Feigenholtz; Flider; Flowers; Ford; Fritchey; Froehlich; Gable; Golar; Careen Gordon; Jehan Gordon; Hannig; Harris; Hernandez; Hoffman; Holbrook; Howard; Jackson; Jakobsson; Jefferson; Joyce; Lang; Lily; Lyons; Mautino; May; McAsey; McCarthy; McGuire; Mell; Mendoza; Miller; Nekritz; Osterman; Phelps; Reitz; Riley; Rita; Sente; Smith; Soto; Thapedi; Turner; Verschoore; Walker; Washington; Yarbrough; Zalewski; and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Before we proceed to Mr. Rose's verification, the Chair recognizes Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "This may be a bit premature, but Speaker, you said earlier there'd be no debate on it, if we get to this reconsideration. I just want to know, since you stated earlier we are going to follow the Rules, 52(c) states not withstanding any other provision of the rules to the contrary, the debate status of any legislative measure may be changed only by the Speaker, as defined item (27) of Rule 102, by filing a notice with the Clerk, or by the Rules Committee by Motion approved by a majority of those appointed, if either one of those two actions taken place."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin, I think the Chair has been very accommodating trying to follow the rules. We had full debate on that Bill, previously and I do believe, in the interest of the economy of this chamber, it would be appropriate to dispense with further debate on that Bill. However, if you would insist or any group of Members would insist on redebating Senate Bill 3514, the Chair will not argue the point."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Durkin: "I guess the point is there are a few Members who still would like to add some comments to the Bill, if we get to that point."

Speaker Lang: "Well, then, what I am going to do is suggest, if we get that point that only Members who have not spoken speak in debate the next time around. The Chair recognizes Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Well, that's very creative and we appreciate your creativity; however, a lot has changed in the last hour. And I believe that we... any Member of this Body that wishes to speak to a new issue which is... which is a new vote and all of a sudden, I want to know, I'd like to change the rules just slightly also, a little creativity from Bond County. I'd like the Governor to stand up here and talk about whether he made any deals while we were down in caucus. I'd like to jump the Governor's chief of staff to swear on a stack of Bibles that nothing was said to influence any Member in an untoward way."

Speaker Lang: "As I said, Mr. Stephens, if Members insist on debating further..."

Stephens: "We insist."

Speaker Lang: "...we will."

Stephens: "We insist."

Speaker Lang: "And the Chair now recognizes Representative Rose for his verification."

Rose: "Mr. Speaker I think Representative Franks is not here.

But where is he? Where is he? I withdraw."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman withdraws his request. The Members... the Members will show some decorum so we could try

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

to leave here sometime tonight. The Gentleman withdraws his request for verification, the Bill is reconsidered and Members have asked for debate. Representative Currie, if you wish to explain your Bill again please do so. The Members will show some peace and quiet."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. extensively; debated this quite the issue straightforward. We owe the pension systems somewhere between 3.7 and 3.8 billion dollars in fiscal year '11. We have shown that we are not able to raise revenues to find resources to make the payment. We have shown that we are not able to cut 3.7 or 3.8 billion dollars in expenses. are left with two choices. We can borrow the money, or we can take a hike on our responsibility. The issue is simple and straightforward, to stick the taxpayers with billion if we do not borrow or to require repayment of about a billion in interest over eight years if we take this route. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard for two minutes."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I voted with the losing side on the last Bill because, like many of you, over the last month or so I've grown extremely frustrated with the process. This morning I was very encouraged when we started the day with a bipartisan group talking about Members getting together to look at solutions to the fiscal problems that have plagued are state for way too long. It seems that are Leaders haven't been getting together so maybe we as Members need to take charge. I listened to the debate that

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

was going on and I was moved by the points that we can't defer this pension payment. We must come up with some way to pay it. I don't think the three choices we were given are all the choices that are out there. Certainly, there may need to be some borrowing when we get done. But why don't we ask our Leaders to get together in the next few weeks to talk about some of the bipartisan ideas that have been kicked around and yes, Leader Currie, have been tied up in Rules Committee and not been debated on this House Floor. I would ask for that kind of discussion in a bipartisan fashion. We need to move beyond just the ideas that we have before us. If you look at the way that we paid our bonding... or our pension Bill last year, we didn't actually borrow the money for several months, maybe into the sixth or seventh month, so there's time to come up with other solutions. We don't need \$3.7 billion the first day of the new fiscal year. There is time to come up with a bipartisan solution. I would appeal to our Leaders to get together and to start talking about some of the ideas that have been presented. There are lots of ideas here. In the diversity of this chamber, perhaps those ideas will come forward to help reduce the amount of borrowing that needs to be made. So, that's the point I would make and I intend to vote as a 'present' vote this next time hoping that we will get that kind of Leadership bipartisanship."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner for two minutes."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. Again, we've heard this discussion of one billion versus 20 billion as I spoke earlier on the Motion to reconsider. Consider the fact that

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

if a borrowing plan over the next few years, as is proposed by this Bill, would cost us one billion, then simply deferring a payment by six months would not be 20 billion. Take just last year, as a perfect example, where we did approve bonds, but since they were not sold until January of this year, six months went by. A six-month deferral did not cost the plan 20 billion. The number is much less if we're talking about a deferral which again that is the discussion that has been put forward for what might be done for the pensions. We saw how that worked last year. It's not the best of all worlds, but it's certainly not a \$20 billion charge to the pension."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "To the Bill. I'm trying to figure out what the credit limit is for the State of Illinois. Is it billion or maybe it's \$15 billion and we could borrow ourselves into prosperity. This is like taking Discover Card out this year to pay off last year's Visa. And at some point that merry-go-round has to stop. Look at the ramp ups as we pay a billion dollars just for interest payments in year seven and eight. But I'm sure at that point we can borrow some more because at that point I'm sure that we will have eclipsed California and Greece as the... with our value of our bonds will be. The time to change is now. Enough is enough of the same failed policies. We need to cut before we talk about borrowing, before we talk about I'm still looking for the \$2.1 billion revenue. Governor said he was going to cut in his budget address that has been AWOL. We still haven't seen any other major

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

cuts in talking about line item by line item, budget item by budget item, employee by employee, pay raise by pay raise. I think the time is now to get this done right. When each Illinoisan owes the state of Illinois about \$10 thousand, that includes my eight-year-old son, well just continue to borrow on to that. So before he goes off into the workforce, maybe it will be \$20 thousand or \$40 thousand on top of the federal deficit. We got in a big rush to get back here on Monday to do nothing. We're back here on Tuesday. We can maybe rush home or we could stay down here and get the job done right. Like we... we're supposed to like we were in February. Enough is enough, Mr. Speaker, the time to stop taking credit cards out is today."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Tryon: "You know, every Illinoisan has to ask them self this one question. How do you get \$13 billion in debt when you have a balanced budget Amendment in the Constitution? We should not be in this position. We are \$7 billion of a structural deficit. We're \$6 billion of unpaid bills, and what we are proposing to do here is borrow more money and create another half of billion payments for next year. And instead of being \$13.6 billion in debt next year, we're going to be 14.6, 15 billion in debt, and we're going raise our bonded debt all the way to the point where we're at \$50 billion when you consider the \$30 billion that we have for capital that we've approved for bonds to be let and the \$22 billion

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

that we'd already bonded out prior to that happening. This isn't fiscal responsibility. I, as a citizen, have a constitutional right to guarantee a balanced budget. If I own a business here, I shouldn't have to worry about being paid because my Constitution guarantees me a balanced budget. We have to reform the part that's creating the deficit before we start raising taxes and borrowing money. This is not a financial act of responsibility. This is a financial act of irresponsibility and I would hope we would go to the table and make the reforms we need before we put this state in more debt. And I hope you vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Reis for two minutes."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just reiterate my call, should this Bill receive the requisite number of votes that I would call for a verification. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "That will be acknowledged, Sir. Representative Watson for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Watson: "Leader Currie, last year when we passed and we did a similar Motion, how long did it take before the bonds were sold?"

Currie: "It took some time, but under this Legislation, the Governor would have to sell these bonds by September 30, 2010."

Watson: "And we did not have such a clause in last year's languages?"

Currie: "We did not, but we do in this year's language."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Watson: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Washington for two minutes."

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I just want to add my little two cents to this conversation. As we talk about the State of Illinois and the tragedy that confronts every one of us, I know in each one of our district we represent people of a lot of means and some have less means than others. And as we look back as to how we got here, it seems so small of a school of a thought based on where we are. But I was listening to the prior speaker, prior to the speaker over that side... speaker here, when he was mirroring the citizens deserve and what the Constitution guarantees. And I was just listening and would like hearing his voice go in my ear and saying, you know these are the kind of conversations that should have been taking place when Bush came after Clinton when there was a surplus. Where was that school of consciousness for those colleagues who got a chance to address it at the federal level because I totally agree with you but it should start on top and trickle down before we get to that spot. But being that we don't represent the total country, we represent the State of Illinois, there's a here, now, and then. And so now it dictates that we find some common ground because the people whether they be Democrats, Republicans or Independent believers or nonbelievers they are all in the same boat and we are supposed to be pain killers for the pain that they are experiencing. So, I hope that we not let our personal egos get in the way of something moral that we should do. Thank you."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Speaker Lang: "Representative Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. For the majority of this Session, I've been pretty quite on a lot of issues that... that I care near and dear about. And in times like this I'm also reflective upon why I came here in the first place, almost 10 years ago. As many of you know I grew up in the north suburbs of Evanston and was privileged to a good education system, and I represent the south suburbs of Chicago where the educational system is not on par. And I've always advocated for a equal high quality education system and education funding no matter where you live and it shouldn't depend on the dollars on your zip code that you live in. Last year I was Chief Sponsor of a House Bill that came over and I believe I showed leadership as getting it through the House committee, because I was to believe, that's the right thing to do, to solve some of our structural problems in the state to try to deal with this head-on, and to try to make sure that we move our state forward. That has always been what I championed for, for the best of what I've tried to do. And now we present with some very difficult choices based on structural problems that I've tried to address over the past 10 years. The Bills that I've worked on have had more money for education but also helped with health care, also helped with pension, also helped with the higher education trying to make our state move forward no matter in good times or bad times to fix some of these problems. And so here we are today trying to do this 'at the last minute.' And I believe in a leaner efficient government. We

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

have to make cuts. Even if the Bill, House Bill 174 would have passed we still have to make tough choices, we still have to make cuts if the Bill passed. I believe transparency because part of the frustration that we in Illinois are having is the fact that our citizen. Don't understand the budgetary process. Citizens understand the fact that the decisions that we make may have a face attached to it. It is not just businesses, but it's also folks who need, day in and day out, governmental services, and that's very important to all of us in the State of Illinois. So having transparency is something that's extremely important; leaner, efficient trans... government is important. And so earlier today Members on this side of the aisle presented ideals to cut government, to try to make those ideals that we had, to make them more efficient to consolidate. They went through a committee process and failed. Representative Nekritz had some ideals in frustration that she's had in the past Session to try to deal with some of these problems, and came up with ideals. Ideals are not exclusive just to Democrats. Ideals are not just exclusive to downstate or upstate, or black, white or Latino. It's all of us that can come up with us trying to work together. And now we are faced with some really tough choices based on things that we've done. And I'm not here to point fingers; in fact, I stand with Bill Black in the leadership that he presented."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Miller, please bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Miller: "Thank you. I stand with Bill Black in some of the L leadership that he's represented because it's the right thing to do. And now we're faced with three options, three options and none of them are good. And not only that, we've got a society in the State of Illinois in a country that's fearful. Fear and I understand fear because I'm a dentist, I understand it. But however fear... the way you deal with fear is being open and honest with people and sometimes you got to tell them news they don't want to hear. And that news is today, that news is today. I do not like supporting this Bill. I do not like it but I will support it because it is the responsible thing to do based on the other options. It's not the fact that we're spending this money, regardless of Representative Fortner was right we are saving dollars, 20 billion, 10 billion, pick a number. It's che... it's more expensive than one billion. That's the fact, and the mere fact that if our pension system starts to sell asset it worsens and gets into a structural... more of a structural problem. And that is not why I'm here. That is not why we are here. We are here to lead Illinois forward. We are here to solve our problems. We are here to try to address our structural problems. And quess collectively we are going to do it. So I suggest you vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Eddy for two minutes."

Eddy: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. Do you really believe that the best way to solve the problems of this state is facing fiscally is to borrow more money? Do you really believe

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

that? That's exactly the kind of reasoning that got us into the position that we're in today. We're taking this thing in the wrong order. The budget's not out here. budget's not out here. We're borrowing money before we pass a budget. It makes absolutely no sense at all. I can't believe that anyone would fall for the shtick that somehow if you vote against borrowing you are voting to skip a pension payment. Those, my friends, are two separate votes. Now, if you choose later, when the Bill comes out, discontinue the continuing appropriation, you will be voting to skip the pension payment. Don't try to make this vote the vote to skip the pension payment. intellectually dishonest. This Bill is about whether or not it's wise public policy to borrow more money and kick the can down the road. That's all this Bill is. Vote on this Bill. It's bad public policy. We need a combination of strategic approaches to solve this problem and borrowing money should not be the first on that list and that's what we're doing by putting this Bill out front. We're saying everything in this state hinges on whether or not we continue to borrow money. That's asinine. That makes no sense whatsoever. If you're going to vote not to make the pension payment, be honest about it, wait a few votes down the road and then we'll see who's voting to skip the payment."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino for two minutes."

Mautino: "Thanks, Speaker. I rise in support of the Lady's Bill.

We've had a lot of debate on this. But I think the choices
that come down to us are really, are we going to make a

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

payment we don't have the financial ability to do. So we're The cost of borrowing is \$1 billion looking to borrow. versus borrowing it out over 35 years at a cost of \$20 billion. There are no great options that are out there. But there's an illusion that Senate Bill 95, 15 years ago which was the pension ramp Bill, was the end all save all. When we passed that Bill, it was backend loaded. Back then General Revenue fund was \$12 billion not 24 as today, but it assumed 15 years out we would be paying \$4 billion. There's a lot of things that led to where we're at today, but there's a reality that we have to face. The dollars aren't there. If you skip the pension payment, they have to sell \$300 million per month of assets that are earning for our retirees. If we do this, they don't have to sell those assets. It's a better financial mood... move in a year where we don't have a lot of great choices. I support the Lady's Motion. We tried to put a Bill on to cut \$3.7 billion. That Bill received 99 'no' votes in this chamber. Cutting the amount that we're talking about borrowing today. So, we're left with very limited options and difficult choices in a time when only two states in the union are currently not in deficit. So, this problem is going to take a while for us to work through. This is one piece so that we can move forward. And I ask for a 'yes' vote. I think it's responsible."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Rose for two minutes."

Rose: "To the Bill. I don't know how many more times this can be said, go read it for yourself. Current law clear is about the pension payments must be made on a continuing

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

appropriation, period. Don't believe me, go read it for yourself. Current law, they must be... they must be paid. They must be paid, period. Now not voting for this though does force us to come up with a real budget, a real budget, not kicking the can down the road or... and by the way still leaving a deficit by the way, we haven't talked about that yet today. How much is the deficit left after this? If we've started at, say, six and a half or seven true deficit, according to David Vaught in the Governor's Office, this is three and a half. Oh, we'll find about that later I guess. Still a deficit. But let's not anybody think for one minute that current law doesn't operate to ma... as a continuing appropriation, to pay that payment to the pensions. I would also think, well... enough. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair is in the possession of a Mo... written Motion by Representative Mulligan to table this Bill. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of order. Under House Rule 60(b), I moved to lay on the table Senate Bill 3514 as amended. I ask for a recorded vote on my Motion to lay on the table Senate Bill 3514. Under Rule 49 and Article IV Section 8(c) of the Illinois Constitution, any vote shall be by record vote whenever five Representatives shall show request. There are at least five Members on my side that wish for a recorded vote on the Motion to Table Senate Bill 3514 as amended."

Speaker Lang: "This is a nondebatable Motion. Those in favor of the motion shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please the take the record. On this question, there are 47 voting 'yes', 70 voting 'no'. And the Lady's Motion fails. Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. We have shown we can't cut \$3.8 billion; we have shown we cannot raise 3.7 million... billion in new revenue. That means we are stuck with borrowing. There are two ways to borrow. We can borrow the way we proposed to do in Senate Bill 3514. Borrow the money and give that money to the pension systems or we can borrow for 35 years by taking a hike on our responsibilities to fund the pensions. To do that is going to cost the taxpayers at least \$20 billion over that 35 years. The pension systems tells us they will start selling assets in a terrible market. The bill could be well more then \$20 billion. So, the question isn't borrow or don't borrow, the question is do we borrow and cost the taxpayers 1 billion or do we borrow and charge them \$20 billion. I would say that choice is clear. I urge your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill shall vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 71 voting 'yes' and 44 voting 'no'. Can we get some order in the chamber, please? And Representative Reis has asked for a verification of this vote. And the Gentleman... please read the affirmative, Mr. Clerk."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Clerk Mahoney: "Voting in the affirmative are Representative Acevedo; Arroyo; Beiser; Berrios; Biggins; Black; Boland; John Bradley; Burke; Burns; Carberry; Chapa LaVia; Collins; Colvin; Crespo; Representative Currie; D'Amico; Monique Davis; Will Davis; DeLuca; Dugan; Dunkin; Farnham; Feigenholtz; Flider; Flowers; Ford; Fritchey; Froehlich; Gabel; Golar; Careen Gordon; Jehan Gordon; Hannig; Harris; Hernandez; Hoffman; Holbrook; Howard; Jackson; Jakobsson; Jefferson; Joyce; Lang; Lilly; Joe Lyons; Mautino; May; McAsey; McCarthy; McGuire; Mell; Mendoza; Miller; Nekritz; Osterman; Phelps; Reitz; Riley; Rita; Sente; Smith; Soto; Thapedi; Turner; Verschoore; Walker; Washington; Yarbrough; Zalewski; and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw my Motion."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman withdraws his Motion. The Chair is in receipt of Motion by Representative Fritchey. Having moved on the... voted on the prevailing side, he moves to reconsider the vote by which this Bill passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Currie on that Motion."

Currie: "I... I ask that that Motion lie on the table."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves to table that... Motion by Mr. Fritchey. Those in favor shall say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Mr. Fritchey's Motion is tabled. The Chair recognizes Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, just a few minute ago you admonished our friends on the other side of the aisle for cheering and I think you were out of order. I believe that Democrats, real

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Democrats ought to be allowed to cheer loud and clear when they put the state further in debt, or raise taxes or do any of the other things that you folks... See they'll cheer about it, of course, of course, you're happy. So, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how to admonish the Speaker, but you should stand at ease for a minute and let them cheer some more."

Speaker Lang: "On page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 3660.

Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 3660 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Please withdraw Amendment 3."

Speaker Lang: "Amendment 3 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #9 has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Which Amendment are we on, please? I withdrew Amendment 3."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, did you say 9?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #9."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie on Floor Amendment #9."

Currie: "Okay. I'm sorry. Thank you. This is the Emergency Budget Act and what we do in this Amendment is pretty much what we saw in the original Amendment 2, Senate Bill 3660. And that is we provide that we should pay old bills. We

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

provide for contingency reserves for the Governor with respect to the agencies under his control. We make all programs subject to appropriation. We give the Governor emergency rulemaking powers until the 9th of January 2011. We extend the lapse period to the end of this calendar year. We provide that this Act takes precedence over others. We establish furlough days provisions; 12 days during the next fiscal year for Members of the General Assembly, for Constitutional Officers, directors, and assistant directors of all state agencies. We permit interfund borrowing until the beginning... to the early 2011. We securitize half of the tobacco settlement fund and we suspend the pension payment for one year. And that's what's in Amendment 9. And I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment.

The Chair recognizes Representative Eddy for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Eddy: "Representative Currie, the… this Amendment 9 that becomes the Bill can we inquire as to your plans with Amendment 10 because that also becomes the Bill?"

Currie: "I would intend to withdraw Amendment 10."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you. So, Amendment #9 does extend lapse period spending to December 31?"

Currie: "Twenty... Yes. And..."

Eddy: "That's one of the provisions of this Bill?"

Currie: "December 31, 2010 and that was in the original... original Amendment to the Bill."

Eddy: "Okay. This also contains interfund borrowing..."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Currie: "It does."

Eddy: "...some tobacco settlement securitizion."

Currie: "Yes."

Eddy: "Can you explain how that works with the..."

Currie: "What that means is that half of the tobacco fund money that we get under the master settlement agreement we will... we will securitize half of it. Which means that we will be able to realize significant dollars that will be available for us today, rather than waiting until those moneys comes in over the long-haul."

Eddy: "So, basically what we're doing is we're taking money up front from the tap... the tobacco settlement to meet the budget this year and those funds won't be available in years to come because we're... we're kind of taking them all now, half of all of those."

Currie: "But we are not taking all of it. That's going to be half of it, it's \$1.2 million this year."

Eddy: "Okay. Have there been other items... appropriation items over the years that tobacco money has been pledged to?"

Currie: "Yes, and some of those moneys we have actually paid off. That is, we made commitments with the tobacco money and some of those commitments have, in fact, been retired."

Eddy: "So, it's your contention that the amount of money that's already pledged from tobacco fund, from this money, is available to securitize? The last time I looked, the total amount of appropriations for the fund exceeded the amount we received every year."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Currie: "Well, my understanding is that the actuaries, the experts, have looked at this Amendment and they believe we can do it."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Eddy, please bring you remarks to a close, Sir."

Eddy: "Thank you. I... will. I... just want to ask one additional question. Does... is there any authority in this Amendment that in any way effects the pension payment?"

Currie: "No."

Eddy: "Nothing in this effects the pension payment at all?"

Currie: "No. No."

Eddy: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black for two minutes."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Black: "Thank you. I know that you... well, I won't... I won't even... preclude that. I don't believe this Amendment or any of the Amendments filed to this Bill are germane given the chapter of the Bill. I would like the parliamentary... parliamentarian to so rule. The chapter the original Bill is under has nothing to do with all of these things that deal with the budget: extraordinary powers to the Governor, suspension of the pension, continuing appropriation. The underlying Bill, the chapter of the underlying Bill doesn't have anything to do with appropriations, or operations of government. So, I don't think these... I don't think these Amendments are germane to the underlying Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black, the Chair will take your request under advisement. The parliamentarian will read through

141st Legislative Day

- what he needs to... to get you an answer. May I proceed with other members who wish to speak to the Bill?"
- Black: "All right. Yes. I... I will come back and ask questions after the... parliamentarian."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Chair recognizes Representative Watson for two minutes."
- Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."
- Watson: "Leader Currie, the Amendment notes that... that there will be a recertification of the allocation to the retirement system. When will that recertification number... recertified number be available?"
- Currie: "I think fairly soon and that's why we have been uncertain whether we're talking about a 3.7, a 3.8, or a 4 billion dollar payment. We believe that... we started out anticipating that it would be a little over 4 billion, but after we make changes in the pension system, substantive changes in pension benefits going forward, we believe that the pension analyst will come down with a lower sum of money."
- Watson: "Okay. When will that... but who determines that? How is that determined?"
- Currie: "It will be the actuaries from each of the five pension systems."
- Watson: "And we have to sell the bonds based on the previous debate by?"
- Currie: "September 30 of this year."
- Watson: "So, it's fair to assume then that this cert... renewed certified number will be available before then?"

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Currie: "We hope so, but if it isn't, this language provides that if we oversell then the oversold money will be... will revert to the General Revenue Fund. If we undersell then we will, enable pension systems to make up the difference from general revenues."

Watson: "That's in this Amendment?"

Currie: "Pardon me."

Watson: "That's in Amendment 9? That if we... if we oversell the bonds, we'll take those proceeds and put them into GRF?"

Currie: "I think that was in Senate Bill 3514, which was just approved by this chamber."

Watson: "Okay. Wow. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, I thought I had it in my desk and it's coming right now but I would like you to give me the list of the programs that the securitization of the tobacco fund would eliminate."

Currie: "I don't have the full list with me, but I do know that some of the items that we had funded, some of the health facilities, for example, much of those dollars have already been paid off."

Mulligan: "For one time, but then once it's securitized it will never be available to us again."

Currie: "We're only securitizing a portion of the tobacco settlement money."

Mulligan: "And what portion of that money are you securitizing?"

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- Currie: "The portion is about half and it's only for a 17-year period."
- Mulligan: "Well, I know you look rather young. I don't know if you're planning on being here for 17 years, but I think some of the rest of us probably won't be and particularly some of our constituents. So, those programs will be falling by the wayside and then we will no longer have them. So..."
- Currie: "In the first places, I said many of the programs we have finished funding. Other programs, of course, can be supported out of General Revenue Funds as easily as they can be out of tobacco settlement proceeds."
- Mulligan: "I don't think we have General Revenue Funds any longer. It seems to me that that would be a problem and I would think that that money has been used and should be used for health care programs and programs that we sued actually to get that money for. So, to move it off and to securitize, I think, is a big mistake."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Poe for two minutes."

Poe: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Poe: "Representative, talk to me about the extraordinary powers that the Governor has in this Bill."00

Currie: "Oh, yeah, okay. So, we do give the Governor, as we did with Governor Edgar, when we were in a difficult fiscal situation some years ago. I think we did the same with Governor Thompson before him. What we give this Governor is, for a limited period of time, the opportunity to reserve moneys under... of the agencies under his control. We

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

also say that he can do emergency rulemaking until the early part of January in 2011. We extend the lapse period to give more flexibility to us in paying our bills. We permit interfund borrowing, and we require the Governor to take furlough days along with the rest of us."

Poe: "Could you tell me, is there anything in his extraordinary powers who would deal in employee and retiree health benefits?"

Currie: "No."

Poe: "So, you go on record to say that the Governor, through this action we're taking today, there won't be any employee insurance benefits or anything like that be changed?"

Currie: "I believe not, Representative."

Poe: "I don't like that, I believe. For... for legislative intent, well, I want to make sure that we got current employees that works going to effect them in the next few years when they retire. We got current employees that are retired and I want to make sure that this doesn't give the Governor the power to unilaterally go ahead and change some of these benefits under..."

Currie: "It does not."

Poe: "...emergency..."

Currie: "It does not. There had been an Amendment offered that did not... that was withdrawn that might have raised that... the specter that the Governor, under that language, could have changed benefits, but I don't think there's anything here."

Poe: "Could... could you have your staff look at a Section 135 Acts takes precedence. And have them look at that and see

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

if it possibly could follow under... fall under that paragraph?"

Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to a close, Mr. Poe." Poe: "Thank you."

Currie: "All... all that says is this Act is the superior Act if there is conflict. But nothing in the emergency powers we give the Governor under this Act tells him that he can change benefit levels, copayments, set rates, any of those kinds of things. What this says is that he can hold back money so that, if there isn't cash to support appropriations, he doesn't need to spend it right now but it does not take away the responsibility ultimately to pay the bill."

Poe: "Well, thanks for the clarifications especially on the employee and retirees benefits. Thank you."

Currie: "Yes. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black. Mr. Black, the parliamentarian now has a response to your inquiry. Mr. Ellis."

Parliamentarian Ellis: "Representative Black, on behalf of the Speaker in response to your inquiry, Floor Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 3660, the... the underlying Bill is an Act concerning State Government and the provisions of this Amendment all concern to the operation of State Government. And so, it's the ruling of the parliamentarian that it is... it is a germane Amendment, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Mr Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Parliamentarian. So, we no longer look at the chapter in which a Bill appears? We're taking... this is a very broad interpretation from what

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

it used to be, on the issue of what's germane. Evidently, if the underlying Bill de... and I don't know what... most Bills deal with the operations of State Government, but we used to say if it wasn't in the appropriations chapter or it wasn't in specific chapter dealing with the Amend... the Amendments, then it wasn't germane. I don't understand how a general Bill dealing with the operations of State Government can get into appropriation matters or lack thereof."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black, have you completed your remarks?"

Black: "Well, okay. Mr. Speaker, could I ask some questions then?"

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Black: "Thank you. I disagree completely with the… explanation of the inquiry of the Chair. But Representative Currie, one thing I do not understand about this Amendment, you're suspending the pension payment with payroll and I understand what that is, the agencies will not forward the employer pension contributions for one year. I understand that. Where in the Bill are you suspending the continuing appropriation for the pension?"

Currie: "Actually, that's not in this Amendment, Representative, and although that would have been in Amendment 10, I believe we are withdrawing Amendment 10."

Black: "I'm sorry, what? You believe, what?"

Currie: "Actually, what this says is that right now for some salaries the Comptroller is supposed to cut a check to the pension system when cutting a check to an employee for

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

payroll and this only says that the Comptroller need not cut that pension check when paying the payroll check."

Black: "So, this means it won't be deducted, period? The money just will not be taken out, right?"

Currie: "It would be done separately. So, it's not a question of the money not coming out."

Black: "Okay. Then where would that money go? Since we are going to borrow the pension fund, then where would the employee… the employer contribution, the money taken out where would that go? Do you have a plan or an account to put that money in?"

Currie: "That will continue going to the system."

Black: "That's interesting."

Currie: "This will not abrogate our responsibility to continue with the ordinary funding of the systems that we do. What this... what the issue has been about is the question whether in addition to the ordinary expenses of payroll and the moneys that go to the pension system, we should make an additional above and beyond \$3.8 billion contribution to the pension systems in fiscal year '11."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black, your time has expired. Please bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. One... one last question. Not a trick question, Majority Leader. Suspend the continuing appropriation for general funds until January 31 of 2011. What funds? As... as I recall, we don't do many continuing appropriations, but there are some. And I apologize, I can't remember what they are, right now, but what continuing appropriation funds are we suspending?"

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- Currie: "We aren't. That is not in this Amendment, Representative.
- Black: "It's on... it's on my record. The last one, under Floor Amendment #9."
- Currie: "I believe that would be... I believe that's Amendment 10 and I believe..."
- Black: "No. It's in Floor Amendment #9. 'Suspend the continuing appropriation for general funds until 1/31/11' and then in parentheses it says Amendment 10. What'd you do, move that down to 10?"
- Currie: "Well, what I'm looking at, I believe, does not do what you're suggesting. I think that has to do with saying that the Comptroller can separate out those two funding streams.

 That's all that does."
- Black: "On the system this wouldn't be in there then? Okay."

Currie: "Right, right."

- Black: "All right. Thank you. One... one last question, if I could, Mr. Speaker. The extraordinary powers for the Governor, allowing the Governor to bypass laws and rules, is there a time period on that extraordinary power?"
- Currie: "Well, in the first place we don't give the Governor the authority to bypass laws and rules. What this says is that the items that we provide in this legislation; for example, giving him the authority to reserve appropriations, that last for a limited period of time, but nothing in this Amendment says that there are substantive powers that the Governor has to overcome other laws that are already on the books."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Black: "I'll take your word for it. It was in the… it was in our analysis and I was just wondering. Can you give me any idea of what the Governor indicates he can save by granting him… how much money he can save by granting him these extraordinary powers?"

Currie: "We've heard from the Governor's people that around 300 million might be a saving that can be attributed to this."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black, I've given you significant extra time, Sir."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis, two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reis: "Leader Currie, how is the furlough days going to be calculated under this Emergency Budget Act?"

Currie: "It's going to be for each Constitutional Officer, for each Member of the General Assembly, for every agency director and assistant director under the Governor's control. There will be 6 furlough days in the first half of the fiscal year and 6 in the second. So, a total of 12 furlough days for each of those groups; us, the constitutionals, agency directors, and assistant directors."

Reis: "How does that formula based on the number of days that... is it 365 days is it 360? How does that compare with the current fiscal year?"

Currie: "For... for the General Assembly, it's based on one out of 365 days and for the Constitutional Officers one out of 261."

141st Legislative Day

- Reis: "Am I not correct in saying that the current fiscal year the General Assembly is calculated the same way you'll calculate the Constitutional Officers for next year?"
- Currie: "I believe that we're calculated on the basis of 365 days this year. I think it amounts, Representative, to about a 5 percent pay cut. And that's I think what we were looking at during the current fiscal year and will anticipate the same in the next fiscal year."
- Reis: "How... we also have a provision in here. It says that all programs are subject to appropriation until 1/9 of '11. What does that mean?"
- Currie: "Well, what it means is, if there's no money appropriated for a program, the program is suspended."
- Reis: "How did you pick 1/9 of '11?"
- Currie: "Well, that's pretty much halfway through the fiscal year, so we were trying to be cautious and careful. We're giving the Governor a chance to see how this works and if we don't feel that he's behaved, responsibly, we might not want to extend the authority into the second half of the fiscal year."
- Reis: "Okay. I have one follow-up on this other. Our staff's telling us that the furlough days this year for the General Assembly are cal... calculated on 261. Could we have some clarification on that versus the 365?"
- Currie: "I don't have the current language in front of me, but I don't believe that you're right."
- Reis: "Well... we'd like to have some figure on that because if that's the case, if you support this Bill, you'll be voting yourself a pay raise because one in 261 is a higher amount

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

than one in 365. So, that's why we're wanting some clarification on that."

Currie: "Well, we can check, but I believe that it's 365 and let me remind you, there are later Amendments in which we are going to cause ourselves not a little grief, reducing the auto reimbursement and also... Oh, yeah and we're going to significantly cut the per diem for Members of the General Assembly and of course, we will deny to ourselves a cost of living adjustment in the... in fiscal 2011."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cole for two minutes."

Cole: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to give my two minutes to Representative Mulligan for further questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan for two minutes."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I got my list of the tobacco settlement money and Representative Currie was just a little bit off on her answer. The majority of that money goes towards medical assistance for prescription drugs which is \$580 million which we use every year. A good portion of the money also goes towards hospitals, doctors, and nursing home fees, which allows us to be in the 30-day payment cycle. There's grants for community health center, expansion program youth violence prevention, local health protection, a grant to the University of Illinois for sickle cell research. These grants have not been paid off; they are ongoing events that we pay for. A lot of the money goes to the Circuit Breaker and grants for senior health assistance programs. That money will go away. The money

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

will come in, in one big lump sum and then, as soon as you spend it all, it will be gone and we will not be able to provide for those programs unless we can come up with them somewhere from General Revenue which I think is going to be difficult. So, public health would hurt and certainly prescription drugs are going to hurt and youth violence programs. And I think to give that money away to what I consider making the Governor king for a year Bill I don't think it's a really good idea. The securitization only lasts for that upfront money and then it goes away. So, it all depends on how they use it, how they plan, it goes to General Revenue Fund it does not go back to cover the health care of all these very vital programs. I don't know how you're going to replace \$580 million for prescription drugs. Out of the \$796 million that we get for prescription drugs, much of that money is maximized because it goes towards matching funds for Medicaid which you would not be getting back if that money just goes into a General Revenue Fund never to be seen again. I strongly object to this money being securitized."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Moffitt: "Just a question on the interfund borrowing portion of this Amendment. Are there any funds that are, in effect, protected or off limits from borrowing from one to..."

Currie: "No. No, but there are protections for all funds in that the balances cannot be below, after the borrowing, of what they were required to spend in the previous fiscal year.

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

All of the money plus interest must be paid back within 18 months. So, the protection is that none of these funds will find itself without the ability to meet the responsibilities for which it was created."

Moffitt: "Okay. Thank you for that. This borrowing is different than funds sweeps, is that correct?"

Currie: "Very different and very much circumscribed, as I say, by the requirement that the funds have available resources after the borrowing that will enable them to meet their responsibilities."

Moffitt: "I hope that this would take into account... there are some funds that just get their income, their revenue, just maybe once or twice a year and it can be made to look like there's a surplus there, and yet they have a lot of obligations coming up. Those should be taken into account. They have not always been taken into account on fund sweeps. So, I hope that's different here. Would you give me some assurance of that?"

Currie: "Absolutely, you have my full assurance."

Moffitt: "And I wondered if there was any cap on it and in effect you're saying there is because you cannot borrow it down below what the actual expected needs are."

Currie: "Right."

Moffitt: "I thank you for your response."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment shall say 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.

Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #10."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie withdraws Amendment 10.

Is that correct?"

Currie: "12... 12. I want to withdraw 10 and 11 is tabled. Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie withdraws Amendment #10.

Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #12 has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Sente."

Sente: "Thank you. The path to restore our state budget mess will not be an easy one. We've been talking all evening about three choices: cut the budget, raise taxes, or borrow and yet we need more. We need an entirely new approach to budgeting because our process is flawed. It will certainly take us several years to recover entirely from a \$13 billion deficit. The silver lining in this time of crisis is that we can't continue with business as usual. This dark period affords us a unique opportunity to work together, to erase are preconceived ideas, to view with a broader lens and take a fresh approach at how we prepare the budget. The goal of my Amendment is to abandon a broken budgeting method that starts with last year's numbers and embrace a new outcome based method that focuses on the results our citizens value. The Amendment's FY11 changes start with increased transparency, the distribution of quarterly financial statements to the public, General Assembly, and Comptroller. The statements will be designed in an easyto-read format including each revenue type, expenditures and totaled to show a deficit and hopefully, one day, surplus balance. This immediate change allows

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

everyone to monitor the state's progress. The Amendment's long-term reform focuses on accountability for each dollar spent through budgeting for outcome. This is how successful businesses do their budgeting and if we are to also be successful, the State of Illinois needs to change its budgetary process. This ground-up budget approach projects realistic total revenues, establishes annual priorities, allocates spending based upon priorities, reengages the Appropriations Committees in the role they were designed for, regularly measures results and closes the spendingadjusting future years appropriations based on proven results. We infuse some creativity into the budget process through our results teams and we look for ways to obtain higher yield, prevent larger future cost, and eliminate ineffective programs. The Amendment's goal is to obtain better results for the price of government. Happy to take questions."

- Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Bassi for two minutes."
- Bassi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Chair. The questions that I have actually relate to Amendments 9 and 10. Is it appropriate for me to ask those at this point or do I wait 'til the entire Bill?"
- Speaker Lang: "It would be my suggestion you wait 'til Third Reading. Amendment 9 has already been adopted; Amendment 10 was withdrawn."
- Bassi: "Was withdrawn? Okay. I'll wait 'til the Bill. Thank you."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Mr. Moffitt for two minutes."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to the Amendment. And these things are in a lot of different pieces and there are pieces of it that probably a lot of people like and then it varies who can support different ones. But I just want to say on... on this Amendment and in a meeting that occurred this morning, at least there's a first step in trying to bring more Member input to the budget process. When a group of rank and file Members met, and talked for an hour, hour and a half I guess it was, in really trying to bring about some meaningful change. That's part of what the point was we were trying to make on the borrowing. We need more input earlier in the process. I know that's what the Sponsor's attempting to do here, and I just... I commend her and those that were responsible for the meeting for at least acknowledging that that's needed, go back to a time when appropriation committees had more input and more say. And so I think... I'm glad to see this dialogue taking place and this at least being raised. So, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment shall say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #14 had been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Who's the Sponsor of that Amendment?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Jakobsson is the Sponsor for Amendment #14."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Jakobsson on Amendment 14."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #14 requires that the state agencies review existing contracts. It also states that state agencies should modify or terminate and rebid contracts when in the agencies' best interest. We believe that by doing this... first of all, Illinois has over \$2 billion in contracts in effect for 2011, and by reviewing these contracts making sure that they are still needed, they shouldn't... should be renewed, maybe some of them should not be renewed, they should be at least renegotiated, rebid, we could save \$300 million. I would like to urge people to adopt this."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Mulligan for two minutes."

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

Mulligan: "Representative, how does this impact contracts to human service agencies such as DD community, mental health, things like that who get a contract, their board, who has a fiduciary responsibility to plan out their year, is basing their year on that contract and now all of a sudden we're giving the Governor the right to yank that contract and go over it?"

Jakobsson: "These are procurement contracts, Representative."

Mulligan: "Okay. That's what I wanted to know. That wasn't in our analysis. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black for two minutes."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Black: "Representative, procurement contracts for what: professional services, goods and supplies, or do they run the whole range?"

Jakobsson: "I believe that's all of the above, Representative."

Black: "All right. The difficulty I have with this is not the concept, it's... you're asking the agency who issued the contract to review the contract for possible savings. Generally, if the agency issues the contract they are, well, this is a good contract. Why not have the Auditor General review the contract or... since you've given the Governor extraordinary powers, have the Governor's Office of Management and Budget review the contract for possible savings. I just don't think the agencies are going to take this very seriously since they issued the contract to begin with."

Jakobsson: "Representative, I'm listening to you, but you know, in these times, very often these contracts are just renewed without even any review. So, we want to make sure that they do have review, that they are negotiated for... or rebid."

Black: "Will the agencies have to file any kind of documentation that would indicate they have, in fact, have reviewed them, who reviewed them, and who signed off on the review?"

Jakobsson: "That can be done by rules."

Black: "I hope it is, otherwise, I... I don't have much confidence that the agency going to do anything unless somebody is

141st Legislative Day

- held accountable so that you and others can go and say you reviewed this contract, we just discovered \$150 thousand in unnecessarily expenditures. You need some kind of accountability. Thank you, Representative."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment shall say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #17, offered by Representative Farnham, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Farnham on Amendment 17."
- Farnham: "Amendment 17 amends Senate Bill 3660 by inserting Article 30 in its proper numeric sequence. Notwithstanding any other provision for fiscal year 2011 only, the allowance for lodging and means is \$111 per day and mileage for automobile travel shall be reimbursed at a rate of 39 cents per mile. Any questions?"
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment shall say, 'yes' those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Black, you were a little late on the trigger."
- Black: "I don't think so. I think you were a little quick on the trigger."
- Speaker Lang: "No, Sir. Mr. Clerk."
- Black: "Wait, wait a minute, wait a minute. I got a legitimate question about this. The Federal Government sets these rates not the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black, the Amendment's been adopted, but if you insist, I'll allow you to ask your question."
- Black: "Thank you so much."

141st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Farnham, please answer Mr. Black's question when he asks it."
- Black: "The allowance for lodging and mileage is generally set by the... I can't remember the name of the agency."
- Speaker Lang: "Excuse me. Mr. Clerk, please put Amendment 17 back on the board even though it's been adopted."
- Black: "I don't remember what federal agency sets these. I know it's based on where the capital is. Some State Legislators are granted, depending on where they... what state they're in a much higher per diem, some are much lower based on cost of living. The mileage reimbursement, I think, is certified by the Internal Revenues Service. So, we're just going to unilaterally change all of that."
- Farnham: "We're just doing this for one year, Representative Black."
- Black: "Well, I... if you change it for one week, I think you're changing... what is generally established by federal rule not by State Law. I suppose State Law could trump a federal rule. I don't know."
- Farnham: "Yes. We're changing it as this regards State Law for one year not federal."
- Black: "Okay. We don't get paid for it anyway, so I guess it doesn't make any difference."
- Speaker Lang: "This Amendment's already been adopted. Mr. Clerk, Amendment 18. Mr. Walker. Mr. Walker."
- Walker: "Thank you. Amendment 18... Listen up, this is our salaries we're talking about. This Amendment 18 for the General Assembly Constitutional Officers and state's

141st Legislative Day

- attorneys will not have a cost-of-Living adjustment in fiscal '11."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Chair recognizes Representative Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."
- Eddy: "The... the cost-of-living adjustment for... first of all, who's it cover, the COLA is eliminated for?"
- Walker: "It covers the Members of the General Assembly, state's attorneys, other than their county supplement, elected Executive Branch Constitutional Officers, and persons appointed to certain offices of state and govern... of State Government. Yeah."
- Eddy: "Okay. Let me ask you this question. Could this... a technical question. Does this affect then the calculation of that final year salary as far as pension?"
- Walker: "I would... I don't know precisely the answer, but I would expect that if they were to do a cost-of-living adjustment and they are one of these officers and they did not receive it, that would affect the calculation."
- Eddy: "Okay. So, I think, though, that if it's not funded in the term that they retire, that they would continue to receive the calculation of the COLA in their final pension calculation. And I think that's an... that's important to know about this for those individuals who are in this situation."
- Walker: "And the answer, as I understand it... Yes. In the case where fiscal year '11 was your last year of employment and

141st Legislative Day

- you then retire, you did not receive a COLA, that COLA would not be calculated in your pension."
- Eddy: "Well, Representative, I... respectfully, I think that's not an accurate description of what the pension law actually states and I think it's important especially for those folks to know that if they don't receive the COLA, that it may not negatively affect their final calculation. I'd like to get it on the record correctly."
- Walker: "Can I take this out of the record just for a second and make sure of the answer."
- Eddy: "I'd appreciate that. I think it's important to those individuals and that we get it correct. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Take the Amendment out of the record momentary, but we'll leave this Bill on the board. Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you wave?"
- Mulligan: "Mr. Speaker, I... today the Bills, once again, which has been a big pet peeve of mine, have these wonderful things under them. Now, I don't know why this Bill says 'enterprise zone' and 'min unemployment.' Representative Currie's Bill on the pension had nothing to do... it was local lottery Bill. The Senate seems to be able to adjust the titles under the Bills so that perhaps if someone looks it up on the system it relates vaguely to what we're actually talking about. I just wanted to point that out again. We've tried to put legislation in for that, but I think the statements that are under Bills, even after they're amended, do not reflect what actually goes on. And I don't know why the Senate seems to be able to handle that while the House can't."

141st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Leitch, your light is on. Was that to ask Mr. Walker a question on his Amendment, Sir?"
- Leitch: "No. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's to request a... recorded vote on Amendment #18."
- Speaker Lang: "That will be granted, Sir."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Attention. The Rules Committee, you will meet immediately in the Speaker's conference room. The rules committee will meet immediately in the Speakers conference room."
- Speaker Lang: "House will be in order. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 25, 2010: approved for floor consideration is Floor Amendment #19 to Senate Bill 3660."
- Speaker Lang: "Returning to the place we were, Representative Walker on Amendment 18 on Senate Bill 3660. Mr. Walker to close."
- Walker: "Yes. In response to the inquiries, it appears that this Bill... this Amendment would... is about the adjustment that we will not receive in this period. The decisions of the pension board related to the pensions and how that's treated is up to them and part of a different Section. I would move adoption of this Amendment."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment shall vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Colvin, Turner. Please take the record. On

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

this question, 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #19, offered by Representative..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. With appreciation to Representative Reis and his eagle eyed staff, this Amendment does, in fact, correct a drafting error so that the… the furlough days that the Members of General Assembly take will be based on 261 rather than 365 days. That, in fact, is the measure that we will use during the current fiscal year and it will be the measure we use in the next. I would appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment shall say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 3660, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is the Emergency Budget Implementation Act... I'm sorry... the Emergency Budget Act giving some additional authority to the Governor, providing some improvements reforms in the way the budget process works. Making sure that the government... that the government reviews existing contracts in hopes of saving, perhaps, as much as \$300 million. It

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

provides further that the mileage amount reimbursed to Members of the General Assembly will be 39 cents rather than 50 in the coming fiscal year. There will be no cost-of-living adjustment for Members of the General Assembly, the Constitutional Officers or the directors of state agencies. And finally the per diem will be reduced to \$111 for Members of the General Assembly during the coming fiscal year. I'd be happy to answer your questions. And I hope that you will all vote for this excellent piece of legislation."

Speaker Lang: "Lady Moves for the passage of the Bill. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Eddy for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Eddy: "Representative, just for clarity. I think now we're dealing with Amendment #9 which became the Bill added to that Amendment 12, 14, 17, 18, and 19."

Currie: "17, 18, and 19... and 19..."

Eddy: "...and that is now the Bill before us."

Currie: "...and 19. Right. Right."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that Members on this side follow the score sheet and had selected the appropriate menu items for the meal. Thank you."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan for two minutes."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. In Amendment 9 one of the things that I would object to is going to a 18-months cycle on outstanding Bills. I think that this

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

eliminates any theory that we have a balanced budget and I certainly think it would be unconstitutional. I also would like to remind the Speaker the last time she gave a Governor unusual powers it was when she allowed us to vote on a Bill that gave Governor Blagojevich an open-ended KidCare Bill which has turned into a disaster and then they were mad because he went ahead and used it in different committees. I think giving open-ended powers like this to a Governor, making him king for a year, is totally ridiculous fact that you cannot have any kind of constitutional balanced budget when you go to 18 months rather then a few months after the end of the year, which is all you need to get the regular bills in. This is a terrible Bill. Because you made it into a Christmas tree and let different targeted Members put individual Bills on that make for bad votes does not make the bottom premise of the Bill or the underlying Bill better than what it was before. It's a horrible Bill. It gives the Governor powers that are really ridiculous and unconstitutional."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black for two minutes."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair." Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Thank you. Could you have the Clerk review this Bill as amended, as amended and tell me how long does the Bill last? Does the Bill last until 7/1/11 as amended?"

Speaker Lang: "That's not a question for the Clerk, Mr. Black." Black: "Who is it for?"

Speaker Lang: "You have an inquiry of the Sponsor?"

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- Black: "Well, if she'd like to answer it because there are parts of the Bill that are half a fiscal year and there are parts of the Bill that last all year and parts of the Bill that God knows what. So..."
- Speaker Lang: "I'm certain Representative Currie would go through that for you."

Currie: "I'd be happy to."

- Black: "I would appreciate that. As amended, Majority Leader, what is the end date of this legislation?"
- Currie: "Well, it depends on what portion. For example, when it comes to tobacco securitization, that's 17 years. When it comes to lapse period spending, that's to the end of December of 2010. When it comes to contingency reserves for the Governor or emergency rulemaking powers, interfund borrowing, that lasts until the 9th of January 2011. On the other hand, the Governor has 18 months to pay back funds that he might have borrowed from during this six-month interval. So, the prohibition on a cost-of-living adjustment for Members of the General Assembly will apply for the entire fiscal year that begins July 1, so will the reduction in per diem payment to Members of the General and limitation on Assembly so will the mileage reimbursement from 50 cents to 39 cents."
- Black: "All right. Just... if I could, Mr. Speaker, that was a long answer. Just two questions. Number one, the emergency... the ability to bypass certain rules and an emergency rulemaking authority, does that end at the end of this... the current Governor's term or does it go on until after the election?"

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Currie: "It goes until the 9th of January 2011."

Black: "All right."

Currie: "Approximately six months into the fiscal year."

Black: "All Right. Thank you. Yeah. So, I guess the answer to the question is this Bill has a number of provisions that last varying amounts of time..."

Currie: "Correct."

Black: "...some half of the fiscal year, some the entire fiscal year which could be an interesting implementation if, in fact, there is a new Governor in January. One last question just for my own edification. Majority Leader Currie, you and I have been here a long time. I just have a little feeling that the Senate really isn't going to take up this Bill. Do you have some kind of agreement with anybody in the Senate that, oh, yes, they're waiting anxiously for this Bill and they will act on it tomorrow."

Currie: "Actually, as far as I know they're not even here today."

Black: "Well, I know that."

Currie: "But with luck they will be here tomorrow. I have no agreement with anybody in the Senate, but there has been discussion back and forth with the Governor's Office, with the caucuses and I would certainly hope they would approve our action."

Black: "Well, one can always be hopeful. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bassi for two minutes."

Bassi: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A question of the Bill to the Speaker or to the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

141st Legislative Day

- Bassi: "Sorry. Representative Currie, I'm looking at Sections 120 and Section 135 of this Bill and it appears to me that all state programs are subject to appropriation notwithstanding on the other... to the contrary and it looks as if the possibility exists that even though we already passed a Bill to allow the borrowing for the pension, that this Bill would give the Governor the right in case of any conflict between provisions of this Act or any other law, that this Bill would be prevailing he, in effect, could choose not to pay that pension Bill even though we gave him the money to borrow."
- Currie: "I wouldn't read it that way at all. I think what it says is if there is not an appropriation then a program may not be funded and may not operate until funding becomes available."
- Bassi: "But it says if the funding is not available, then he doesn't have to do it. So, should there be a problem with funding or he needs that money for something else, what's to prevent him from using the money... the pension money for something else?"
- Currie: "No, I don't read it that way at all. He can't use money from here to pay bills over there. He does have the opportunity to reserve dollars that have been appropriated to state agencies, but that's different from saying that he can take dollars that were appropriated from one program and spend them someplace else."
- Bassi: "But if he can reserve it, can't he... then it allows him to spend general funds elsewhere."

141st Legislative Day

- Currie: "No. But it... what it says is if there isn't an appropriation, he need not spend the money that isn't there for a particular program."
- Bassi: "Okay. So, he would have to make the pension payment regardless, even though we're giving him this extr..."
- Currie: "Except to the extend that he could also reserve dollars that have been appropriated."
- Bassi: "Oh, so he could reserve dollars for the pension, if he chose to do so?"
- Currie: "I couldn't tell you. It's the Governor's Office that ask for the authority to borrow to make the pension payments and I think that's exactly what they will do."
- Bassi: "Well, he said that before, so let's wait and see. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Franks for two minutes."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sitting here and I'm thinking that our new state motto could be government, if you think that our problems we create are bad, you just wait until you see are solutions. Our state is insolvent and if it were a bank, it would be seized and if it were a company that we regulated, it would be closed down. Ronald Reagan was right when he said that government is not the solution to our problem; in this case, government is the problem. Illinois was recently rank the worst in the country by Forbes in their financial rankings because of our state liabilities, our tax revenues and our employment prospects. Two years ago, Illinois had 5.1 million private sector jobs and now we are down to 4.7 million private sector jobs. Our unemployment rate is 11 percent; our

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

underemployment rate is approaching 18 percent and with a dwindling private sector, we simply can't spend so much money because there are so many fewer people to carry the load. And even some who are gainfully employed don't pay taxes. Some statistics show that 47 percent of our citizens don't pay taxes. Now, we have boards and commissions that are being paid hundreds of thousands of dollars for little or no work. The hate crimes commission hasn't met for years, yet they have an executive director making six figures. It's a do-nothing job that the administration refuses to cut. Now, the recent audit of the All Kids Program shows that the state lost million of dollars due to poor management, yet there's been no correction to that management. Over one year ago, we had a hearing concerning the soft drink contracts for the state. At that time, the Governor's Office said that the contracts would nullified within two weeks and sent out for a bid to get the best return. Still nothing has happened. Never before in the history of our great state have so many been taken for so much and left with so little. We are in a fiscal disaster, one that is man-made. It's as serious as the oil spill in the Gulf. It is a disaster that we created and one that we need to repair. Now..."

Speaker Lang: "Bring your remarks to close, Sir."

Franks: "I need some... few moments. I think the time for politics is long passed and we have an obligation to make hard decisions to cut the budget where necessary. We must not give this Governor or any Governor the unbridled power that they're asking for. Now, it may take us all summer, but

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

it's worth it and I don't fear the Minority Party's involvement, rather I welcome it 'cause this is one of those golden moments of our history, one of those opportunities which may come and go but which rarely returns. I respectfully ask for a 'no' vote on this very dangerous and ill-advised Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Durkin for two minutes."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Durkin: "Representative, I'm very... I'll be... I'll be very brief.

Does this Bill grant the Governor the authority to rescind
the \$330 million in pay raises that are going to union
employees this year?"

Currie: "No."

Durkin: "Thank you. I will not be voting for this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Stephens for two minutes."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Franks."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks rejects the time."

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, he has to take my time."

Speaker Lang: "He's not interested in..."

Stephens: "Otherwise you got to listen to me."

Speaker Lang: "...he's not interested in your time, Sir. Those in favor of the Bill shall vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Colvin. DeLuca. Please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

passed. On page 8 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 859. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you very much, Speaker and Members of the House. This would be a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7, to House Bill 859. This is basically the budget Bill for fiscal '11. It is very much reflective of spending in fiscal 2... 2010 expect that there is a 5 percent cut in the operations of state agencies. When it comes to federal funds and other funds, they are very much as they were in the Governor's introduced budget. I'd be happy to answer your specific questions, but rather than go through the entire Bill, I think we'll leave it as basically the blueprint is what we're spending this year except that we are making 5 percent across the board cuts in the operations of state agencies. Be happy to answer your questions."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves to concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Eddy: "Leader Currie, what's the total GRF in this budget, spending... GRF spending?"

Currie: "We believe 26.2 billion."

Eddy: "Twenty-six point two billion. How does that compare to FY10 GRF?"

Currie: "It is down and I was going to say down by about 300 million, but I think it's closer to 400 million."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- Eddy: "How does the estimated \$26.2 billion in spending compare to revenue estimates?"
- Currie: "Because of some of the provisions in the Emergency Budget Act, the securitization of the tobacco settlement money, the interfund borrowing, we believe that there will be a good match between these revenues and these revenue projections and... the revenues we anticipate will be available."
- Eddy: "So, with the securitization of the tobacco funds, the fund sweeps and with..."
- Currie: "No. There's no fund sweeps. Interfund borrowing is the preferred term."
- Eddy: "Oh, that's what we're calling it. Okay. The interfund borrowing and the securitization and the pension bond, what we're basically saying we're balancing this budget on revenue that is not necessarily anything but borrowing."
- Currie: "Representative, our job is to have a balanced budget, and we think we are meeting that test with this measure and the other measures including the budget... the Emergency Budget Act, and including some measures we haven't yet addressed, for example, tax amnesty."
- Eddy: "Okay. Representative, thank you. Now, I'm very... I want to talk about the education portion of this... It appears as if the foundation level is funded at the same level 6119, but this is 6,120. Is that right?"

Currie: "I believe that's right."

Eddy: "What about mandated categorical spending?"

Currie: "They're down 320 million, but they're... first of all, there is another Bill. The... Senate Bill 44 which already

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- has passed the Senate. Should we pass that Bill, it would provide for an increase in the tobacco tax and the receipts from that new revenue would be used to fund mandated categoricals to about the tune of \$320 million."
- Eddy: "So that's the... that's the process by which the tobacco...

 the increase in the cigarette tax is turned over and

 matched with Medicaid money."
- Currie: "That could also happen, but it would make clear in the Amendment to Senate Bill 44 that that would provide for full funding of the mandated categoricals."
- Eddy: "Okay. But that would have to happen."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Eddy, your time has expired. Can you complete your remarks, Sir?"
- Eddy: "I... I will as quickly as I can. I just want to make some points on the mandated categorical money. Thank you. The..."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis is going to give you two additional minutes, Sir."
- Eddy: "Thank you. Thank you. The mandated categoricals then, let's assume for whatever reason the tobacco... the cigarette tax doesn't happen. Then what level will the mandated categoricals be funded as compared to last year's, about 80 percent?"
- Currie: "It would be 327 million less; I don't have that percentage."
- Eddy: "Okay. What about... what about other grants?"
- Currie: "Other grants are not affected. We're doing other grants at the levels that... as the Governor introduced his budget.

 I'm sorry, FY10, FY10."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Eddy: "At FY10. So, whatever the Governor... would the Governor have the authority under... is this a lump sum that the Governor would decided then? For example, an early childhood education last year, it was at 90 percent of FY9. Would he have that authority to decide with the same amount of money level funding what got funded as far as grants?"

Currie: "Yes."

Eddy: "So textbook loan which didn't get funded may not get funded again, but that's going to be totally up to the Governors discretion based on a lump sum?"

Currie: "Correct."

Eddy: "Thank you, Representative. I think the idea that the mandated categorical depends on, you know, something that we haven't acted on yet is... is it, you know, it's an unknown here."

Currie: "It's entirely in your hands, Representative. I'm counting on your support."

Eddy: "Is in mine. And... well, then we may be in trouble because I... I'm probably not going to support the tobacco incr... the cigarette tax increase, but I just think it's important though that this..."

Currie: "For the school kids, for the school kids, Representative?"

Eddy: "...this particular tie is... is made to mandate a categorical. Is there a reason mandated categoricals were chosen for that?"

Currie: "I didn't choose."

Eddy: "Okay. So, you're not sure if there's a reason that... that was tied so closely to..."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Currie: "Let me just point out, this a concurrence Motion with Senate Amendments. So, perhaps when they come back tomorrow, you can address the question to them."

Eddy: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks two minutes."

Franks: "I need some help with the math, Majority Leader. This will cut around \$400 million from the budget, correct?"

Currie: "Yes."

Franks: "Okay. And we just agreed to borrow \$4 billon, correct?"

Currie: "Yes."

Franks: "Okay. And our... and we're going to get about 1.2 billion out of securitization of the tobacco?"

Currie: "That's right."

Franks: "So, that's... and then we're also... we'll probably sweep those funds. You said that's a loan."

Currie: "It's not a sweep. It's an interfund borrowing. The money must be paid back with interest within 18 months."

Franks: "We have no idea how we're going to do that though."

Currie: "And there are limitations, limitations on what... on what must be left within the fund."

Franks: "No, I understand."

Currie: "Yes."

Franks: "I'm not sure we'll ever get them paid back, but my question is how much can be borrowed? We'll use that term."

Currie: "The Governor's Office projects about a billion dollars but we won't know until we see what's actually in the funds, as the year progresses."

Franks: "So, if we use the Governor's num... numbers of borrowing a billon for the fund and securitizing the tobacco at 1.2,

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

that's 2.2, and then we cut 400, that's 2.6, and then we borrowed 4. We'll be at 6.6, correct, in additional revenues and cuts."

Currie: "Right."

Franks: "Okay."

Currie: "And you'll remember Representative that we will owe at the end of this fiscal year at least \$6 billion in unpaid bills."

Franks: "You just anticipated my next question. We're told there's a \$13 billion deficit yet we're only cutting 6.6, where do we get the other 6.4 to close the hole?"

Currie: "And I think one way we're doing that is by not paying those Bills. Although in the budget imp... the budget...

Emergency Budget Act which you did not support we do suggest to the Governor that his first priority ought to be paying the old bills. I was sorry we didn't have your support for that since that was I thought..."

Franks: "Right."

Currie: "...one of your priorities."

Franks: "But there's still going to be \$6 billion in unpaid bills. I mean, what we're basically saying is we're going to defer \$6.4 billion and we're still going to keep that structural problem. Would that be correct?"

Currie: "Unless the economy improves, yes and I do think the economy will improve. I think we will see stronger receipts in the coming fiscal year, so I'm hopeful that... that the situation will not be nearly as dire on May 25, 2011 as it is on May 25, 2010."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Franks: "If I could briefly just go to the Bill, I promise it will be very quick."

Speaker Lang: "You can do that, Sir."

Franks: "Thank you. So, I appreciate the candor and the answers here and we understand that there's been some movement especially with the borrowing, but there's still a \$6.4 billion hole no matter how you look at it because what we're saying is we're not going to pay those bills. And I'm going to rise then and I'm going to vote against this budget because we have a Constitutional Amendment and a constitutional requirement to have balanced budgets. This is not balanced; we know there's a \$6.4 billion hole in it. We can't in good conscience vote for this. We should be spending time on the budget cuts. I appreciate the efforts of the Majority Leader and others, but we haven't got our job done here, folks. If you vote for this, you're voting against the constitutional requirement of a balanced budget. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan for two minutes."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's always interesting when we get to the budget that now we get two minutes and the people in committee that come to hear stand before us get two minutes and everybody gets two minutes to figure out what a bad budget this is. Normally, this is a time that I would ask questions on the budget, but what a joke this budget is quite frankly. I think this is a very bad budget. I think we've d deteriorated here into what the Members actually do. So, my feeling is I would vote 'no' on this budget. I apologize to the people of Illinois that we

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

represent or that I represent, that we're handing off such a horrible budget, such a horrible Bill that gives the Governor unusual powers. This is just a total fiasco. I don't understand how you can go home and tell the people that you represent that this is what you did while you were here in the General Assembly this year."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Washington for two minutes."

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I just want to... to the Bill. I just want to say this is a good piece of legislation and of course, there's no perfect Bill. You know, Representative Franks, you know, I love you dearly, but you know, sometimes you go overboard to me. You know, but I just want to say there's no perfect Bill on an extreme set of circumstances that we face and I know everybody is working as hard as they possibility can to come up with what we can because of the time and the other factors involved in that. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brady, Colvin, Feigenholtz, Fritchey, Osterman. Please take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 3662. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 3662 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Amendment #3, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Majority Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This Amendment would include the provisions of the Budget Implementations Act of the coming fiscal year. This is the substantive language that will make possible the working of the budget in the coming year. Most of the provisions here are not new, that is to say we see them almost every year; for example, increased flexibility for the distribution of Medicaid funds in the Department of Healthcare and Family Services; for example, a freeze on nursing home and longterm care DD rates, certain GRF expenditures to individual funds. We do this also on pretty much an everyday basis. One thing that is new is that we are saying that if somebody is a frequent vender to the State of Illinois the state should wait to send them a check until they've accumulated \$50 worth of refunds and we've also reserved a smaller amount of money for individual income tax refunds. We think based on this year that this number is reasonable, but it will help free up some additional authority. I'd be happy to answer your specific questions and I hope you'll give us support for passage of this Amendment and then Senate Bill 3662."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment 3. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Sullivan for two minutes."

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

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- Sullivan: "Representative, one of the aspects of this Bill that might seem a little out of place, and I don't quite understand it. In regard to the Capitol architect that would be hired and the provision that will allow them to file the tex... the tiebreaking vote. Can you explain why we need this provision?"
- Currie: "Yeah. Right now the board that makes decisions about what goes on in the Capitol, what kind of construction, what kind of maintenance is made up of the two secretaries: the Secretary and Assistant Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk and the Assistant Clerk of the House. That means there are four people who are making the determination and sometimes those four people may come to an impasse. There may be a tie and what this provides is that the Architect of the Capitol would be able to cast a tiebreaking vote."
- Sullivan: "So, this has been a problem. There have been instances where there's been a tiebreaker where they've just been at an impasse?"
- Currie: "It could present a problem and since the Architect of the Capitol has a special expertise in terms of planning."
- Sullivan: "Well, I guess the question is has there been a problem, not could there be a problem, 'cause certainly with four people there could be. But has there been a problem in the past?"
- Currie: "Actually, I can't answer the question, but as a hypothetical it certainly could be a problem."
- Sullivan: "Okay. You're certainly correct. The Capitol architect we've always tried to have and we've even, when we advertised for the position, we offered as a nonpartisan

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- position. Don't you think this makes it a little more partisan to have this Capitol Architect be beholden to whoever has hired them?"
- Currie: "You know, I think the selection doesn't change. I think there still is a nonpartisan selection of the Capitol architect, but what happens under this provision is that if there's an impasse on what should happen next, the Architect of the Capitol is able to cast a tiebreaking vote."
- Sullivan: "I guess from our side of the aisle it seems that it would be harder for us to have to work with somebody that we know is beholden to one Party and not the other. And so this makes it more of a partisan issue."
- Currie: "This doesn't change the selection process for the Architect of the Capitol. So, I don't see any reason to think anybody is beholden to anybody, but it does establish a clearer procedure in the event of an impasse for breaking that tie."
- Sullivan: "Well, I guess you can certainly say that it doesn't change the procedures, but the reality of how people are motivated by what they do and don't do is certainly based on who is going to be hiring them and who is not going to be hiring them. So it does cause us some problems to see this and more importantly, it begs a question, what's coming? What's coming down the pike where you would need to have this type of change, where there might be an impasse. Because there's never been a impasse in this board and now you're contemplating that there is and it begs a question,

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

what are you contemplating and what do you think is coming down the road?"

Currie: "I think there've been a variety of plans having to do with some of the portions in the Capitol that have not yet been restored as has, for example, this House chamber. There are offices that are in need of help with their heating and air-conditioning systems. So, I think there still are lots of issues for Capitol maintenance and Capitol construction."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan..."

Sullivan: "Well, thank you for your comments. Hopefully, you are correct. I... I'm done, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. I appreciate it. The Chair recognizes Representative Connelly for two minutes. Representative Connelly has changed his mind. Representative Mautino for two minutes."

Mautino: "Thank you. Just a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Mautino: "Majority Leader Currie, could you give a little bit more detail, go into a little more detail on the prompt payment Section within the Bill itself."

Currie: "The idea is that the vendors really don't want to be sent a check for \$1.22. So the idea is that when a vender is owed a refund, is owed money from the State Comptroller, that that money should accumulate and when it reaches as much as \$50, it's worth the comptroller's time and money to cut the check and it's worth the recipient's time and money to cash it. Now, at the end of any given fiscal year, checks will be sent out even if they don't reach the level

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

of \$50, but the idea is to save cost in the Comptroller's Office, also make for easier bookkeeping for the vendors who are getting the repayment by aggregating the moneys that are owed until they reach a particular point."

Mautino: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fritchey for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Fritchey: "I just have a question with respect to one provision here, just so I understand it. It says that this allows the State Board of Education, with approval from GOMB and consultation with the Comptroller, to transfer appropriations from mandatory categoricals from GRF to the Education Assistance Fund. Does this mean that there will be a diversion of mandatory categorical dollars?"

Currie: "Pardon me? Say again."

Fritchey: "Does this mean that there will be a diversion of mandatory category... of dollars from mandatory categoricals?"

Currie: "Yes. So... yeah. In order to make sure that you don't short one categorical but you got too much money in another categorical line, this gives the State Board of Education the opportunity to balance out those levels of appropriation."

Fritchey: "All right. But nothing in here would result in a overall reduction..."

Currie: "No..."

Fritchey: "...in the amount of money to mandatory categoricals?" Currie: "No, not at all."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Fritchey: "Okay. That's all I wanted to know. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Eddy for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Eddy: "Representative, there was a lot of talk this year about hold harmless for schools, the old hold harmless. Can you... what... what happens with the hold harmless funding in this? There were proposals that hold harmless would be at 50 percent and I think Representative Reis passed a Bill that kind of slowed that down to try to wean those funds. Do you... Does this eliminate hold harmless funding completely?"

Currie: "This is... this Bill, as I understand it, is silent on the hold harmless."

Eddy: "So, I guess the question is, does that mean that school districts that received less money, based on this year's calculation that they did in 97, will receive the full amount of the hold harmless that they're due?"

Currie: "That's a separate Bill. This is... this really... it does not deal with the hold harmless. The only... besides the mandated categorical transfers which we just discussed, as I understand it, the only other issue is that if the State Board of Education's appropriations are not adequate to meet the full funding that they anticipated they would be able to do, they will do a prorated general state aid payment. So, today they prorate the poverty grant first, this would just say all of the general state aid payments will be prorated in the event of the shortfall."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- Eddy: "Okay. What will the effect be of the change in the deposit in the individual income tax refund from 9.75 percent to 8.75 percent?"
- Currie: "We think that may free up about \$92 million and we believe that this will not underfund refunds for individuals in the next tax year."
- Eddy: "Will it cause those to be delayed... those refunds to be delayed?"
- Currie: "Well, that... that could happen, but you know, one of our staffers was telling me that he filed his income tax return electronically and he got his refund three days later. And also I should mention that the corporate refund account is the same in this current budget as it is... in the next budget as it is in the current."
- Eddy: "One final question, if I can. What happens with the actuarial calculation for the pension fund payments? The way I read this, this kind of delays the implementation until FY12 the language that would require actuarial calculated payments to be made to the system. It would allow us to actually reduce the amount that we pay."
- Currie: "This only delays legislation we recently adopted that said that any of our payments to the pension system would be over and above what they actuarially said they needed. So we're delaying the implementation of that Act for one year."
- Eddy: "So, it's the reduction..."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Eddy, your time has expired. Do you need more time, Sir?"
- Eddy: "Just about 30 seconds. I'll be set."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Speaker Lang: "You can have that."

Eddy: "Thank you. So, it actually reduces the actuarial reserve deficiencies not the actuarial payment. Is that..."

Currie: "No, it just maintains current law for one year."

Eddy: "Puts off the implementation of that from FY11 to FY12."

Currie: "Right. Right. That's right."

Eddy: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McCarthy."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

McCarthy: "Representative, I was listening to Representative

Mautino's question, did that eliminate the retail

merchants' opposition to the Bill?"

Currie: "Yes."

McCarthy: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Black: "Representative, in your trying to consolidate interest payments on the lack of prompt pay, I just signed off on a voucher yesterday to... so they can pay a vendor in my district 18 cents."

Currie: "Right."

Black: "So, I understand what you're trying to do there, but there has been some concern expressed by the Illinois Pharmacists Association that they have been removed from the interest provision of the Prompt Payment Act?"

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Currie: "Right. And the language that we're adopting today does not raise that specter, the pharmacists, the retail merchants are very comfortable with the language as drafted."

Black: "All right. So, all… all your prompt payment Amendment is trying to do, is to not send a check to a vendor for five cents, or ten cents."

Currie: "Exactly."

Black: "What... what is the threshold? I mean..."

Currie: "Fifty dollars."

Black: "...you said so and I didn't hear."

Currie: "Fifty dollars."

Black: "So, they would..."

Currie: "So once... once they've accumulated \$50 in interest..."

Black: "Okay."

Currie: "...payments, then the check is cut, but at the end of a fiscal year even if it's only \$25, the Comptroller will cut the check."

Black: "Okay. Fine... fine. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment shall say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.

Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 3662, a Bill for an Act concerning

revenue. Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- Currie: "Thank you. The Amendment became the Bill. I'd appreciate your 'aye' votes."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Brauer, Mr. Durkin. Please take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Black, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I tried to bring this Motion forward before the caucus was called, and you said we'd get to it. I... I've waited long enough. I'd like to go to my Motion that I filed in writing. So, I rise to a point of order."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black, I have your Motion. Do you wish to read it, Sir?"
- Black: "If... if I could, just so everybody has a clear understanding of what we're attempting to do."

Speaker Lang: "Please do."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Under House Rule 18 (g), I move for the discharge... I have filed the written Motion, and let me tell you what we're trying to discharge here, Ladies and Gentlemen. I could have filed a hundred and fifty Amendments, none of which would have probably been heard, but let me just tell you what we've done, is I've taken every Bill that the Republican Caucus, and been joined by many of my colleagues, that had to do with budget reform, saving money, eliminating the FY11 COLA, which was denied. But very quickly, this Discharge Motions has 58

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Bills, one... excuse me, four House Resolutions, and one House Joint Resolution. The Bills, if you want me to read House Bill 389, House Bill 474, House Bill 570, House Bill 828, House Bill 1173, House Bill 4095, 4622, 4659, 4771, 4777, 4800, 4809, 4943, 5199, 5212, 5244, 5484, 5488, 5541, 5544, 5793, 5794, 5795, 96, 97, 98, 5805, 5806, 5807, 5808, 5809, 5810, 5811, 5812, 5893, 6086, 6159, 6139, 6146, 6265, 6269, 6270, 6275, House Bill 6277 Amendment #1, 6296, 6622, 6625, 6626, 6558, 6861, 6870, 6872, 6873, 6875, 6876, 77, 79, 6880. House Resolution 109, House Resolution 423, House Resolution 1057, House Resolution 1218, House Joint Resolution 112. I wish to debate my Motion to Discharge those Bills. I ask for a recorded vote on my Motion to Discharge under the applicable House Rule. are at least five Members on my side of the aisle that wish for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge the Bills I have read into the record."

- Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Representative Currie on Mr. Black's Motion."
- Currie: "Thank you very much, Speaker. Painful, though it is for me, I find I must object to the Gentlemen's Motion."
- Speaker Lang: "And the Chair is going to presume you are objecting to the Motion as to each item on his Motion. Is that correct?"
- Currie: "Absolutely, the whole shebang."
- Speaker Lang: "Since... the Chair rules that since this requires unanimous consent and since you don't have unanimous consent, the Motion fails. Mr. Black."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Black: "Thank... thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think this proves the point that we've been trying to make since September and October of last year. We have been called dropouts, we've been called nonparticipants, I don't know what that added to the situation. I may be a number of things, but I'm not a dropout, nor any of my colleagues. Again, I may be many things to different people, but I'm not a nonparticipant. I think part of the frustration that I feel is that we're not allowed to participate. We aren't asked. We aren't invited. We've tried to present to you a panoply of Bills over the last few months that would save money, reform how we budget, do a number of increase employment opportunities, address the third rail, according to you, workers' compensation costs. I don't care what employer you talk to, it's number one on their list about reasons why they don't come to Illinois. We've been denied that opportunity. Representative Reboletti filed, some months ago, one of the Bills on this record to deny the FY COLA, was never allowed to be debated, never sent to committee. We asked that it be discharged from the Rules Committee and of course, we were denied that. I think it's very disingenuous when you repeatedly insinuate that it's our side of the aisle that doesn't participate, doesn't add anything to the process, just say 'no', on and on and on. It's not only disingenuous, it's sometimes is aggravating, and on occasion can even be laughable. So, what we've tried to do tonight is to give you all of the items of reforms, inefficiencies in State Government that we've tried to do all year. We again bring up the Free Rides for

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Seniors, that could save over a hundred million... over \$40 We've asked that we consider the pay raises granted to our union employees, realizing the sanctity of a contract. Who knows what could happen if you come to the The All Kids Program is a joke. Our proposals to table. change that program, ignored. We've asked for income verification for Medicaid, where any interested disinterested observer, any impartial observer would say that we have a billion dollars in fraud, a billion dollars. Nope. Nope. Don't want to do that. Don't want to do that. I've been here a long time and I've always tried to participate and I don't really appreciate the earlier remarks of the Speaker, that we're simply dropouts. don't you let some of these Bills be debated? You might like some of them. And all we have ever asked you, is that you give us the opportunity to have a discussion on the Bill. We're not asking you to vote for the Bill. We're not asking you to vote for any of these things on the list. We're simply asking for an opportunity to join with you on the problems that we face. You say, no. Okay. That means it's going to be your budget, your situation. You can, from now until November, run around the state and say, if the Republicans would have only joined us, if they would have only reached out, who knows what we could have done. That is... that is not disingenuous. That's an outright lie. And if any of you say that in your direct mail or any of your other things, I promise you, I will have the time, I will come to your district, I will have a press conference, as was done to me back in 1986, and I will call you a liar.

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

I'm not going to put up with that kind of campaigning anymore. And you didn't run me out of office. My age and my health run me out of office. I can't put up with it anymore. Don't want to do it. My doctor doesn't want me to do it. But by God, I promise you I'll show up in your district, and I'll do what was done to me by the then Majority Leader and I will call you, to your face or to your supporters, a liar. You won't let us participate. You won't join with us to do anything. You do it all yourselves and then you try to throw it on us. That ain't going to work. You're out of time. You're out of ideas. You've already showed that today. Who knows what we could have done if you'd let us work together. We have some pretty intelligent people on our side of the aisle, as you have on yours. I don't know when this will end. It will It's counterproductive, doesn't add anything to the process. And as I've told you a hundred times on this House Floor, I try not to take myself very seriously, but I've always tried to take the process very seriously and if you just let the process work, who knows, who knows, what we might have been able to accomplish. Mr. Speaker, under House Rule 57(a) I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair and have a recorded vote on my Motion to overturn the ruling of the Chair that we're not allowed, once again, to discuss ideas that I think are worthwhile and could help and that's all I'm trying to do. I've reached out. Whv aren't you willing to reach out?"

Speaker Lang: "The question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?'

Those in favor shall vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'.

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brauer, Franks, May. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 68 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no'. And the Chair is sustained. On page 4 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 375. Representative Walker. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 375 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Walker, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Walker."

Walker: "House Amendment 2 becomes the Bill. This is the Bill about managing renewals in the procurement process. I'd like to get that Amendment adopted, and then moved to Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Eddy: "Representative, this... this looks familiar. Is this language from some... some other place that we've seen this spring?"

Walker: "Yes. There is another reform Bill in the procurement process, Senate Bill 3576, that had other Sections as well as this. I prefer to move this... that has passed both Houses, is on the Governor's desk. I would live... like to

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

give the Governor the opportunity to focus on this as one item and to pass it and sign it."

Eddy: "What... what's the difference between just this Floor Amendment and that Bill?"

Walker: "Yeah. The issue... the issue is that there's no guarantee that the entire comprehensive Bill will pass, but I want to make sure that this passes."

Eddy: "So, Floor Amendment 2, to this procurement Bill adds to the underlying Bill, correct? That's what you're doing here."

Walker: "Floor Amendment 2 on this Bill is the Bill."

Eddy: "This does not add to the Bill? This becomes the Bill?"

Walker: "It becomes the Bill."

Eddy: "But this language is..."

Walker: "...of Senate Bill 375. The language in this Bill was included in a different Bill that had many other Sections as well. So, I want to give the Governor the opportunity..."

Eddy: "Are you... are you concerned?"

Walker: "...of passing this, even if he does... chooses not to sign the other."

Eddy: "Are you concerned about the original Bill, the Governor signing it?"

Walker: "Not especially. I just want to... want to make sure that this goes forward."

Eddy: "So, you... you felt like perhaps that the only way to ensure that your part of this would... would... would maybe get the Governor's signature is to separate it from the original Bill?"

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Walker: "That's correct. And I... I believe this is a very important idea."

Eddy: "Okay. Representative, it's kind of different. It's... it's kind of odd to take particular parts of language from Bills that are sitting on the Governor's desk and... and file a separate Bill containing a portion of that Bill. I... I assume you... you have good reason. You... you think that... that Bill's just not going to make it? The Governor's going to turn his back on the whole Bill and your... your original language will be lost?"

Walker: "I am... I can't predict what the Governor's going to do with it..."

Eddy: "Well..."

Walker: "...and I'm not making an assumption."

Eddy: "Well, I think with the flip-flop act he's performed in the last several months, no one could predict what the Governor's going to do. Well, I just wanted to... to make sure we were... we're working under the correct assumption that this was contained somewhere else. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment shall say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 375, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Walker."

Walker: "Yes. Senate Bill 375 is a update and clarification of an improvement of last year's procurement Bill. It covers

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

the area of renewals, renewals of procurement contracts and other contracts that are over \$250 thousand. It requires that they be submitted to the Procurement Policy Board, that the policy board has 30 days to respond. The policy board can demand a hearing, if they wish, and then they will go through the regular procurement process without an objection from the Procurement Policy Board. Then the procurement officer in the given division can go forward with the renewal. This answers some of the questions brought up previous today, about these ongoing contracts, who's going to renew them? How is it going to work? How are we going to make sure that they are reviewed? Well, this is how."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill shall vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Black, Brauer, Poe. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 3 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 377. Representative Currie. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 377, a Bill for... is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Please take the Bill back to Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Lang: "The Bill will be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you. This is a technical Amendment. It says the Department of Revenue will be in charge of debt collection because that's the people who do it today. It also would change the period for amnesty, making it a five-week period, from October 1 to November 8, 2010. I'd appreciate your support for the Amendment. And I'm happy to explain the whole Bill on Third."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady's moved for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 377, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "This is a proposal that does four things. It provides for a tax amnesty period toward the end of this calendar year. It also provides that agencies could accept deferred payment plans, they could settle debts that are old, for no less than 80 percent of the amount that's past due. And in certain circumstances, the agency could sell debt to a private vendor. It is estimated that between the tax amnesty and the provisions having to do with debt collection, we might be able to bring in as much as 250 million for spending in fiscal year 2011. I would

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

appreciate your support and I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Mulligan for two minutes."

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

Mulligan: "Representative, we were in the middle of a tax amnesty Bill when the Session was called for the evening a couple of weeks ago. Is this Bill similar or is it... did you just amend another Bill or did you change that Bill and how is it different?"

Currie: "This is the same Bill. We added an additional Amendment just a moment ago."

Mulligan: "And what does the Amendment... and why is the Amendment different from the original Bill, what did it mean?"

Currie: "The Amendment changed the period of the tax amnesty.

Originally it was to go to the middle of November and now it would go to November 8. And in addition, this Amendment clarifies that debt collection responsibilities will remain with the Department of Revenue where they are today."

Mulligan: "And is there still a penalty if you owed back taxes and you don't apply for the amnesty, that there's a penalty then?"

Currie: "Yes."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Dun... Sorry. Representative Black for two minutes."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. This is a classic example of some of the Bills that we tried to move earlier in the Session. We had two Bills. I think one was filed by Representative Pritchard. I think the other one was filed by Representative Reboletti. I can't remember, back in 2009, that called for a tax amnesty. We were called... just taking care of tax cheats, helping the wealthy avoid their fair share, ridiculed, laughed at, insulted. That's our nonparticipation; that's our dropout. You wouldn't let either Bill get called for a vote. Now, here you are, almost a year later, going to run basically the same Bill. You could have already been depositing money in the bank, if you would have taken either one of the Republican Bills. We would have loved to have Democrat Sponsors. I made it clear, we would take all kinds of Amendments that you wanted. It's... it's amazing how some of you can look yourselves in the eye. This Bill only benefited tax cheats in September and October of '09. Now, that it's a Democrat Bill, it's well thought out. We'll bring in money. We'll help the state. What a bunch of baloney. I... I'm going to vote for the Bill. I liked it when two of our Members filed it. I liked it when you picked it up, but the hypocrisy, good Lord. All you've done is waste months. money could have already been rolling Congratulations, your intransigence, your unwillingness to work with other people. What've you done? All you've done is delay taking in money that we so desperately need. So, take all the credit. Do whatever you want. But the record

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

is out there, you wouldn't even consider tax amnesty Bills that Republicans offered months and months ago. That is the height of hypocrisy and if I may be so bold, it's the height of stubbornness, if not maybe some affliction of your brain."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Careen Gordon for two minutes."

Gordon, C.: "Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Please state your inquiry."

Gordon, C.: "Which House Amendments have been adopted? May I ask the Clerk?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr... Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Amendment #1 was Adopted to the Bill, Floor Amendment... in committee, but Floor Amendment #3 has been adopted as well as Floor Amendment #6."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon."

Gordon, C.: "Thank you. Representative Currie, so does this in any way... how far does this go back for... how far can you go back to apply to this tax amnesty program?"

Currie: "I think up until... from June 30, 2002 up to July 1, 2009."

Gordon, C.: "And this is for individuals... individuals..."

Currie: "Any taxpayers."

Gordon, C.: "...who would file individual tax..."

Currie: "Any taxpayers, so it'd be individuals and businesses.

Gordon, C.: "Individuals and businesses. Corporations or small businesses? I mean, how..."

Currie: "Yeah, any kind. Any entity with tax liability or with tax liability incurred during that period."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Gordon, C.: "So, like a big corporation, like a ComEd, or a Exxon Mobile or someone like that, as well as a small individual taxpayer on Main Street in..."

Currie: "Correct."

Gordon, C.: "...Morris, Illinois. And there would be no penalty and no interest that they would have to pay at all?"

Currie: "Correct."

Gordon, C.: "If they're currently in court or currently in a fight with the Department of Revenue, can they still apply for this amnesty program?"

Currie: "Yeah. Actually, if they're in court, if there's litigation, either civil or criminal against them, then the tax amnesty provisions do not apply."

Gordon, C.: "Okay. And if any... so, if they're in court, or if any other actions have already started, this doesn't apply as well?"

Currie: "No, if they're in a dispute with the department, then they would be able to go ahead and pay up without having to pay penalty and interest."

Gordon, C.: "Okay."

Currie: "That's the way previous tax amnesties have operated as well."

Gordon, C.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Dugan for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Dugan: "Yes. Leader Currie, I just wanted to kind of... what my seatmate just talked about, 'cause I asked this question before. If there's someone that right now is making

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

payments to the State of Illinois for back taxes, okay, so they came into the state and said I couldn't pay them on time, and they, of course, are paying interest and penalty in this payment plan that they're on. Will this amnesty program allow them to... the agency to waive all of those interest and penalties that... that an individual who... I think I asked that question before."

Currie: "Yeah. And I don't... I believe the answer is no. Once somebody's been caught out, and they've fessed up, and they've begun to pay what they owe, I think those people would not be considered for amnesty."

Dugan: "So, if you didn't come to the state to try to set up some kind of payment arrangement during this amnesty period, you don't have to pay interest and penalties..."

Currie: "That's right."

Dugan: "...but if you did come..."

Currie: "Well, or..."

Dugan: "...to try to set up payment plans, then you do have to pay interest and penalties?"

Currie: "Or more likely, if the state caught up with you and said okay, we're going to take you to court unless you pay up, but you'll have to continue paying up."

Dugan: "Well, and I appreciate that, Leader Currie. I'm sure that maybe it is, in some cases, that the state caught up with them, and I'm assuming, not a whole lot or we wouldn't be thinking we were going to get \$250 million from people who haven't paid their taxes. I mean, I'm just aware of some people who weren't able to pay and so they set up

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

payment arrangements and I was just wanting to see if they..."

Currie: "Yeah, and some portion of the money we anticipate this Bill will bring in will come from the opportunity for state agencies to adopt deferred payment plans, the opportunity to collect less than a dollar of... for every debt that is owed, and the opportunity to sell really old accounts to private vendors. So, not all the money will come in through the tax amnesty portion of the Bill."

Dugan: "Thank you, Leader Currie."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cole for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Cole: "Representative Currie, I'd like to follow up a little bit on what Representative Dugan just brought in. I mean, I heard you say no to her question, but let me... let me put it this way. We have some businesses in Illinois that have fallen on the hard times. They haven't been able to pay their taxes, they've been threatened by the Department of Revenue to shut them down, close their doors, sell off their assets at 20 percent of their value, they're trying to pay a little bit of what they owe. They have huge fines, they have huge back taxes as well as penalties. Those businesses that are owed for the last three years are not going to be part of this amnesty program and yet a company who's paid nothing for three years, who's made no attempt to pay their taxes, they're off the hook?"

Currie: "Well, that's what an amnesty program is, Representative. If you don't like it, you can vote 'no'.

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

But I would say that a company that owed taxes clearly had revenue 'cause you don't pay taxes if you don't have income. And for those that are already in the pipeline, for those the department found owing taxes that they were not paying, those that are now on a payment plan, this will not affect them. To do otherwise, when it seems to me, open the door to the idea that all you have to do is fail to pay your taxes, and sooner or later the Legislature will bail you out. Ours is a voluntary..."

Cole: "Representative, that's exactly what... that... that's exactly my point. The guy who's paid nothing for five years gets the amnesty, gets the penalties and fees removed, but the guy who's gone and got a loan from his home, who's used his personal revenue to try to pay a little bit, he gets nothing."

Currie: "Many people..."

Cole: "He gets the..."

Currie: "...many people do not think that it's a good idea to reward anybody who failed to pay their taxes, and I would encourage you, if that is your view, that you might wish to oppose this Bill."

Cole: "To the Bill, Representative. I think the businesses that are struggling to do… to keep one employee, who've tried to pay 10 percent of what they owe for the last three for four years, who have these huge penalties and fines, they're the businesses we want to keep in Illinois. Those are the businesses we should be helping, not the ones who've paid nothing for 5 to 10 years. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie to close."

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- Currie: "Thank you very much, Speaker and Members of the House.

 I think this is a very straightforward proposition. I'm certain Representative Lang would welcome adding Members of the Minority Party as Sponsors of this excellent Bill. And I urge your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cole, Coulson, DeLuca, Jakobsson, Tracy. Please take the record. On this question, 102 voting 'yes', 14 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 2534. Representative Jehan Gordon. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2534 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Gordon, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon."

Gordon, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 20... excuse me, Senate Bill 2534 is a historic tax credit. It started off as a statewide project, but because of the fiscal note on it, we decided to scale that down. This particular... this particular piece of legislation would be a pilot project for the City of Peoria. Today in committee, the mayor of Peoria, Mayor Jim Ardis as well as Tim Drea, from the AFL-CIO, along with Mike Everett, who is president of the West Central Illinois Building Trades, came to speak on this particular piece of

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

legislation because of the amount of jobs that it would bring to the City of Peoria, 890 construction jobs right off the top, over 250 permanent jobs. And this Bill would give us the vehicle to be able to create an opportunity so that we would be able to generate on an annual basis \$30 million. I would like to ask the Members of the Body for a favorable 'aye' vote. And I'd like to answer any questions at this time."

- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment.

 On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative

 Leitch for two minutes."
- Leitch: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Peoria community is very much in favor of the Bill. I'll be voting 'present'. I did not anticipate that state money might be involved in the project and I've been working with a developer to make this happen. So, I'll be voting 'present', but it's an outstanding Bill for the community, and commend the Lady for all her hard work to get it accomplished."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment shall say 'yes'; those opposed shall say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2534, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill shall say 'yes'... vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Franks, Kosel. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Jakobsson."
- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that I intended to vote 'yes' for Senate Bill 377."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will flect... reflect your intentions.

 On Supplemental Calendar #1, on the Order of Senate BillsSecond Reading, there appears Senate Bill 3012. Please
 read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 3012, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Read the Bill. Under the Order...
 on Supplemental Calendar #1, under Motions, there appils...
 appears Senate Bill 333, Representative Boland."
- Boland: "Pursuant to Rule 25, I move to suspend the posting requirements for Senate Bill 333 in Rules Committee and have the Bill sent to State Government Committee."
- Speaker Lang: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Coulson, Hatcher, Mulligan. Please take the record. On this question, there are 87 voting 'yes', 30 voting 'no'. And the Motion is adopted. Mr. Black, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry, Sir."
- Black: "Thank you very much. On Hou... Senate Bill 3012, I believe I had filed several notes on the Bill, and I noticed it moved to Third. Was the paper work lost, delayed, whatever?"
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black, the Chair is aware of your note request, but the Chair would like to re... let you know that the note request did not get into the Well before I moved the Bill to Third Reading."
- Black: "I wonder... how could that happen? I mean, I... I know I had the proper postage, and I had a dedicated staff person.

 Look, Speaker Madigan knows it was there. He just nodded at me. He said, absolutely, I saw you take it down there.

 Could we ask Speaker Madigan if he... he saw it go up there."
- Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan's not in the Chair, Sir, I am."
- Black: "In all dye respect to the Speaker, Speaker Madigan looked at you like, don't get too comfortable up there, in all due respect."
- Speaker Lang: "I never said I was comfortable, Sir. I'm just reporting the facts as they are."
- Black: "So... so, in other words, the notes that we had filed on Senate Bill 3012 were ruled not timely."
- Speaker Lang: "That would be correct, Sir."
- Black: "I would ask that the Chair be overridden."
- Speaker Lang: "The Motion is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?'

 Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

who wish? Carberry, Hoffman, Tracy. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. And the Chair is sustained. Mr. Clerk, committee schedule."

- Clerk Mahoney: "Committee announcements. Committees for tomorrow, on Wednesday at 9 a.m. All committees are at 9 a.m. The Executive Committee will meet in Room 118, State Government Administration will meet in Room C-1 Stratton, and the Elementary & Secondary Education will meet in Room 114 at 9 a.m. tomorrow."
- Speaker Lang: "For the knowledge of the Members, please listen, Ladies and Gentlemen. You heard that we will be in Session at 10:00 in the morning after 9 a.m. committees. The Members are notified that you should be expected to be here on Thursday, at least. We may go beyond Thursday; we will be in Session on Thursday. Having said that, Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 1248, offered by Representative Osmond. House Resolution 1249, offered by Representative Mulligan. Resolution 1251, offered by Representative Leitch. Resolution 1255, offered by Representative Brady and 1256, by Representative Brady. House Resolution 1258, by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Resolution 1259, by Representative Hoffman. House Resolution 1260, by Representative Farnham. House Resolution 1261, by Representative Farnham. House Resolution 1262, offered by Representative Connelly. House Resolution 1263, offered by Representative Lyons. House Resolution 1264, offered by

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

Representative Brauer. House Resolution 1265, offered by House Resolution 1266, Representative Brauer. Resolution 1267, and House Resolution 1268, all offered by Representative D'Amico. House Resolution 1269, offered by Representative Ford and House Resolution 1270, offered by House Resolution 1271, offered by Representative Ford. Representative Chapa LaVia. House Resolution 1272, offered by Representative May. House Resolution 1273, offered by Representative Ford. House Resolution 1274, offered by Representative Crespo. House Resolution 1275, offered by Representative Crespo. House Resolution 1276, offered by Representative Feigenholtz. House Resolution 1278, offered by Representative Osmond. House Resolution 1279, offered by Representative Tryon. House Resolution 1280, offered by Representative Sacia. House Resolution 1281, offered by Representative Madigan. House Resolution 1283, offered by Representative Coulson. House Resolution 1284, offered by Representative Coulson and House Resolution 1285, offered by Representative Feigenholtz."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. The Chair recognizes Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for you.

Originally, when we were asked to come back, we were told
that we would have Session on Monday, Tuesday, and
Wednesday. So, needless to say, in terms of being prepared
for Thursday, I wasn't told that we were going to be here

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

- on Thursday. So... so, what is the possibility of us being here on Friday, so that if I need to have clothes FEDEXED to me or something, that I can at least make that request because I'm sure the Members here don't want to see me wear the same clothes over again. And... and because we have voted to cut down on per diems and things of that nature, I don't have any money to go buy clothes now. So, I'm just curious to know if we're going to be here the rest of the week, so I can try to make appropriate provisions."
- Speaker Lang: "That is unknown at this time, Sir. Although I'll give you the number of a very fine cleaners on MacArthur, which I use, you'll like it, Sir."
- Davis, W.: "Use the cleaners. Okay, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "It's a really long run back here, Mr. Speaker.

 I'd like to suspend the posting requirements for House

 Resolution 1024."
- Speaker Lang: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Is there leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted, and the posting requirements are suspended. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Currie now moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Wednesday, May 26 at 10 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does stand adjourned."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Introduction and reading of House Bills-First Reading.

141st Legislative Day

5/25/2010

House Bill 6882, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 6883, offered by Representative Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act concerning education. And House Bill 6884, offered by Representative Eddy, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. First Reading of these House Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."