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CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: The House Special Investigative Committee will come to order and the clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK: Currie.
CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Here.

THE CLERK: Durkin.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Here.

THE CLERK: Acevedo.

REPRESENTATIVE ACEVEDO: Here.

THE CLERK: Bassi.

REPRESENTATIVE BASSI: Here.

THE CLERK: Bellock.

REPRESENTATIVE BELLOCK: Here.

THE CLERK: Black.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Here.

THE CLERK: Bost.

REPRESENTATIVE BOST: Here.

THE CLERK: Davis.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Here.

THE CLERK: Eddy.

REPRESENTATIVE EDDY: Here.

THE CLERK: Flowers.

REPRESENTATIVE FLOWERS: Here.

THE CLERK: Franks.
Representative Franks: Here.

The Clerk: Fritchey.

Representative Fritchey: Here.

The Clerk: Hamos.

Representative Hamos: Here.

The Clerk: Hannig.

Representative Hannig: Here.

The Clerk: Howard.

Representative Howard: Here.

The Clerk: Lang.

Representative Lang: Here.

The Clerk: Mautino.

Representative Mautino: Here.

The Clerk: Rose.

Representative Rose: Yes. Thank you.

The Clerk: Sacia.

Representative Sacia: Here.

The Clerk: Tracy.

Representative Sacia: Here.

The Clerk: Turner.

Representative Turner: Here.

Chairwoman Currie: We have a quorum. A few housekeeping details. Exhibit 67 will include the information that Representative Lang presented.
yesterday. That was the information provided the committee December 29th by the Department of Health Care and Family Services on the question of the expansion of FamilyCare.

Exhibit 68 is information in response to our subpoena to Friends of Blagojevich, and that information is in a graph that will be presented to each member of the committee. What the committee tells us is that after November 23rd all their records are in the hands of the United States Attorney. They have given us material from July 10th through November 23rd. There presumably will be gaps in the items that they have given us, but the members are free to look at that information, and as I say, that will be part of Exhibit Number 68.

Exhibit 69, the copies of the Friends of Blagojevich semiannual reports, D-2s which were requested by Representative Lang sometime late in December.

And a quick update on the status of the status call in federal court today. In respect to the U.S. Attorney's hope that he might share with us four of the audio tapes in the wiretap that were approved by the federal court, apparently several of the lawyers
objected to the sharing of those documents with members of this committee. The judge has set another date, January 23rd, another status briefing as I understand it, and has asked for material from those who objected to our listening to the tapes. At that time we assume that after that date there presumably would be an opportunity for the U.S. Attorney to respond.

So we cannot at this time tell the members of the committee or the members of the public how long it might be before this committee will have access to that information or whether if, not only when, but whether.

My sense from talking to members of the committee yesterday and today is that the members of the committee feel that we may have enough material to go forward absent the audio tapes.

And it is further the recommendation of this committee in conversations yesterday that we would ask the next House of Representatives, the House of Representatives of the 96th General Assembly, to reconstitute the Special Investigative Committee so that should new material, including possibly these tapes, other material, become available to us, the
committee could go back to work and then bring other material to the members of the Senate.

Mr. Genson -- we have with us, just for the record, we have with us Ed Genson and Sam Adam, Jr. representing Governor Blagojevich. Did you wish to say something?

MR. GENSON: Yes, I believe the next status in federal court, our filing date is the 23rd, the government's filing date the 29th, but I believe the next status is actually January 29th.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Thank you very much for that helpful information.

And we now have with us Roland Burris. And I believe that you are responding to a subpoena that we sent you at the behest of the Minority Spokesman of the committee, and I am told that the members of the United States Senate are following closely your testimony before this committee this afternoon.

So if you'd like to make an opening statement we'd be happy to hear from you. But first I'd ask you to take the oath. I'd ask you to raise your right hand.

(Roland Burris was duly sworn.)

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Thank you. Proceed.
MR. BURRIS: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I do not have an opening statement. I would like to thank the members of this state's distinguished committee of the House of Representatives, and I am prepared to respond to their questions pursuant to their subpoena that I appear this afternoon.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: We appreciate that.

MR. BURRIS: And by the way, I thank you all for extending that, because it was impossible for me to be here on Wednesday, so I really appreciate that.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: And we were very happy to accommodate you.

MR. BURRIS: Thank you so much.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Are there questions in general? Representative Durkin.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Good afternoon, Mr. Burris.

MR. BURRIS: How are you doing, Representative Durkin?

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: I'm doing fine. How are you?

MR. BURRIS: Terrific, thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: I know you had a lot of travel over the last few days, but I appreciate you
spending some time with us this afternoon. I think it's important, your testimony is important. It's been a month since the Governor was placed under arrest for a multitude of federal crimes.

And one of the major aspects which we are investigating in this committee is the sale of the United States Senate seat from President-elect Barack Obama. We contribute approximately six to seven pages in our recommendation to the allegations of the sale of the United States Senate seat.

So I believe your testimony is relevant, it's important to us, and I think your appearance as well. I ultimately believe that your testimony is important to the people of the state of Illinois. I think they owe an explanation about the circumstances upon which you were appointed to the seat, and also to explain the relationship with the Governor.

These are things that I'd like to inquire into today. But obviously as you know, Senate Majority Leader Reid has stated that he was looking forward to this testimony, and I'm sure a few other people are watching it as well.

But the committee has received a copy of your affidavit. We reviewed it, and I'd like to --
you're ready I'd like to go into some questions.

MR. BURRIS: Proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Now Mr. Burris, upon

the Governor's arrest on December 9th, what were your

thoughts upon the arrest?

MR. BURRIS: Surprise.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Surprise?

REPRESENTATIVE FRITCHEY: Excuse me, if I

may. While we obviously have a lot of leeway on this

committee though as well we still need to be

constrained by what our objective here what this

committee was convened for. As to what Mr. Burris's

thoughts may or may not have been upon hearing that

news, I don't know what impact that would have upon

our investigation as to the actions of the Governor.

Mr. Durkin, I obviously -- Representative Durkin,

I obviously appreciate you wanting relevant inquiries

with respect to the actions regarding the appointment

of the Senate seat. I would be remiss if I didn't

remind you and the rest of the committee that our role

here is to investigate Rod Blagojevich and not Roland

Burris.

And to that extent I don't see what Mr. Burris's

opinions would have any bearing on this matter.
Representative Durkin: Well, Mr. Burris was appointed not too long ago by Governor Blagojevich, and one of the major inquiries of this committee is investigating the circumstances of that appointment. So I think it's relevant. But if his thoughts -- I'll leave it to the chair.

Chairwoman Currie: Well, I think I suggest that we leave it to Mr. Burris. If you'd like to answer that question, we'd be happy to hear your answer.

Mr. Burris: I would stick to my original answer.

Chairwoman Currie: Pardon me?

Mr. Burris: I will stick with my original answer. I was surprised.

Representative Durkin: Have you had a chance to read the federal complaint and the affidavit that was filed in federal court against the Governor?

Mr. Burris: No, I haven't read it at all.

Representative Durkin: No? Not the least bit concerned about it or trying to see exactly what has been alleged against the man who is appointing you to this seat?

Mr. Burris: Naturally I read what was in the
newspaper, but I did not read the complaint.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: All right. When did you first become interested in the vacant United States Senate seat?

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Could you speak a little more closely to the microphone? We're having trouble hearing you.

MR. BURRIS: It must have been around the time that President-elect Obama was -- had won the Democratic primary for President, and naturally my thought was that he would more than likely be elected President and we would have a vacant seat for the United States Senate.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Did you make a public announcement of your interest at any time around when Senator Obama won the election?

MR. WRIGHT: Excuse me.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: By made a public announcement, could you kindly define it for him? What do you mean by public? Did he tell anybody?

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Did you make any public statement regarding your interest in the United States Senate seat after the election of
President-elect Obama?

MR. BURRIS: No.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Now, prior to the Governor's arrest, did you have any conversations, prior to his arrest did you have any conversations with the Governor about your desire to be appointed to the seat?

MR. BURRIS: No.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Did you talk to any members of the Governor's staff or anyone closely related to the Governor, including family members or any lobbyists connected with him, including let me throw out some names, John Harris, Rob Blagojevich, Doug Scofield, Bob Greenleaf, Lon Monk, John Wyma, did you talk to anybody who was associated with the Governor about your desire to seek the appointment prior to the Governor's arrest?

MR. WRIGHT: Give us a moment.

MR. BURRIS: I talked to some friends about my desire to be appointed, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: I guess the point is I was trying to ask, did you speak to anybody who was on the Governor's staff prior to the Governor's arrest or anybody, any of those individuals or anybody who is
closely related to the Governor?

MR. BURRIS: I recall having a meeting with Lon Monk about my partner and I trying to get continued business, and I did bring it up, it must have been in September or maybe it was in July of '08 that, you know, you're close to the Governor, let him know that I am certainly interested in the seat.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Okay. Did you speak to any individuals who -- any individuals who were also seeking the appointment of the United States Senate seat, otherwise people we've referred to as Senate candidates one through five?

MR. BURRIS: No, I did not.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Okay. At any time were you directly or indirectly aware of a quid pro quo with the Governor for the appointment of this vacant Senate seat?

MR. BURRIS: No, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Okay. If you were aware of a quit pro quo, what would you have done?

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Chairman, I think that calls for a -- that's a hypothetical question that I don't think that what he would have done, it could have depended. I don't think that's an appropriate
QUESTION.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: I disagree. I think that it is highly relevant. You're speaking to the committee, but you're also speaking to the state of Illinois. I think it's important to know what his response would have been if he was aware of a quid pro quo with the Governor and also for the appointment.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Representative Fritchey.

REPRESENTATIVE FRITCHEY: Madam Chairman, if I may, Mr. Burris had already stated that he was not aware of any quid pro quo, which answers that question and puts it to rest. What his response would have been had there been something, which he stated did not occur, is clearly irrelevant to this, and according to Mr. Burris, to speculate on something that would have happened if another situation had happened which he clearly says has not.

Representative Durkin, I'm not trying to stifle you whatsoever, and I understand the generalities where you're trying to go. But again, I think that we're outside the realm here of what's germane to this hearing.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: I think it's germane, and I think in the conduct of this committee over the
past month that we've been given significant leeway to try to find responses to individuals who are sworn in before this committee, and I think that it's a reasonable request to ask what would have been Mr. Burris's response if he was aware of a quid pro quo for the United States Senate seat.

Representative FritcheY: But the leeway has been with response to representatives on behalf of the Governor and the Governor's administration, not with respect to third parties who have clearly stated that they have no involvement with those actions.

Mr. Wright: Representative, Senator Burris wants to be clear and open, so to the extent you're asking him to speculate, he'll try to respond to that.

Representative Durkin: Thank you.

Mr. Burris: Representative Durkin, knowing my ethics, I would not participate in anybody's quid pro quo. I've been in government for 20 years and never participated in anybody's quid pro quo.

Representative Durkin: I guess the point is would you have gone to the federal authorities if you were aware of that?

Mr. Burris: I have no response to that.

Representative Durkin: Now, I want to talk
about after the Governor's arrest. What contact did you have, what contact did you have with anyone regarding the appointment, regarding the appointment, I'm talking after December 9th?

MR. BURRIS: None whatsoever.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Did you have any contact with the Governor after the arrest then?

MR. BURRIS: No, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Now, there's --

MR. BURRIS: Let me say this. Naturally there was a contact afterwards, you know.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Which is what I want to get into. Would you explain the contact that you had with -- who did you have a contact with regarding the vacancy and the appointment following the Governor's arrest?

MR. BURRIS: Yeah, it was on that Friday after Christmas, December 26th, oh, it must have been about 4:00 in the afternoon, I received a call from an attorney whose name I knew, because I knew the young man, and he said I would like to come and speak to you about something and it's very important. And I said --

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Could you identify
that person you spoke with on the phone?

MR. BURRIS: Yes, I can. It was attorney

Sam Adams, Jr.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Do you see him here today?

MR. BURRIS: He's sitting at the table.

MR. ADAM: Hello, Mr. Burris.

MR. BURRIS: There he is, I only saw Mr. Genson, I didn't see him. Yes, and so he came to my home and we exchanged pleasantries. And then he said the Governor would be interested or would like to appoint you to the vacant Senate seat. And I was just a little surprised, and said well, you know, let me think about that. And I'll get back to you Sunday afternoon or Sunday, late Sunday evening.

And I wanted to make sure that he was serious, you know, I didn't know -- because I knew I had to go out and touch base with a whole lot of people because I just did not want to make a snap decision.

So I went out that night to a big black tie event with about 1500 individuals, and I must have talked to all of them. But all of the responses were positive. You are a qualified individual, you have represented the state well, there's no one better to represent us
in the United States Senate than you. I accepted all of those comments, not one negative.

I then on Saturday spent the time calling my friends around the state saying that look, if the Governor were to make me an offer for this seat should I take it? All of those persons in Illinois and out of Illinois whose judgment I valued said yes.

And so based on that when I did get a call and a visit from Mr. Adams on Sunday afternoon.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: What day can was that can you give me some --

MR. BURRIS: Sunday afternoon, that would be December 29th, December 28th.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Let me just ask you when Mr. Adams contacted you, did he indicate that he was contacting you in his capacity as the lawyer for the Governor?

MR. BURRIS: That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Okay. When you went to this -- you conferred with a number of people. Were any of those individuals close associates of the Governor?

MR. BURRIS: Oh, no, absolutely not.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: All right.
MR. BURRIS: These are all friends of mine.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Okay. What happened after that with respect to Mr. Adams?

MR. BURRIS: Well, on Sunday afternoon Mr. Adams came by and we discussed this again, and I told him that should the Governor make the offer then I would accept the offer, if the Governor would make it. Mr. Adams left my home.

Shortly after I got a call from the Governor, and we exchanged pleasantries, and he says to me General Burris, if I offer you the Senate seat vacated by President-elect Barack Obama, will you accept my offer? And I said to him Governor, yes, I will. That was the extent of it.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Did you exchange any type of writings or documents with the Governor or any of his staff regarding the qualifications, which many people are very aware of your past, but anything that went between you and the Governor or his staff in the form of documents?

MR. BURRIS: No, there was not.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm sorry, you asked were there an exchange of documents, and I wasn't sure of your timing. Are you speaking of at the time of that
conversation or at any other time?

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Well, any time during the -- when you began an interest in the appointment. Thank you for clarifying that. Any time at which you expressed an interest and the time which you accepted the Governor's offer, did you exchange any type of documentation or any writings about your interest or qualifications for the office?

MR. BURRIS: Yes, in the conversation with the Governor, you know, he was praising my background and experience in Illinois, but there was nothing written in any transaction. He just explained to me and I was surprised at some of the things that he knew about my background and my accomplishments as he prepared to ask me the question.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Okay. So it was a very brief conversation with the Governor, correct?

MR. BURRIS: That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: And what did he state about the timing of the announcement? Did he tell you when -- the timing of the public announcement, did he indicate when that would happen?

MR. BURRIS: No, we did not discuss that. The details would be worked out with my staff.
REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: So could you explain to the committee when is the last time you had a conversation with the Governor?

MR. BURRIS: That Sunday afternoon.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Have you talked with him since?

MR. BURRIS: Yes, when we did our announcement on Tuesday at the press conference.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: How about since the press conference, have you had a conversation with the Governor?

MR. BURRIS: No, I have not.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Any of his staff members?

MR. BURRIS: No, I have not.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Okay. Mr. Burris, I also said I think one of the things that we would like to understand is the relationship that you have with the Governor. So I'm going to go down this line of questioning.

Now, you are -- are you currently a registered lobbyist with the state of Illinois?

MR. BURRIS: As of today I am not.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: How about with Cook
MR. BURRIS: I am not.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Were you a lobbyist with Cook County?

MR. BURRIS: I was, but I've resigned all my lobbying responsibilities.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Including the city of Chicago?

MR. BURRIS: That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: U.S. House?

MR. BURRIS: That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: United States Senate, were you registered with the United States Senate to lobby before that body?

MR. BURRIS: I was registered with the federal government, but that's -- I resigned that.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: This is inclusive of both the House and the Senate, is that correct?

MR. BURRIS: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: All right.

MR. BURRIS: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: While you were a lobbyist, and you're a lawyer as well, you had a consulting firm, correct?
MR. BURRIS: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: What's the name of that firm?

MR. BURRIS: Burris and Lebed.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Could you explain to the men and women on this committee the type of work that you -- well, let me ask you to back up a little bit.

Did your consulting firm do any work for the state of Illinois?

MR. BURRIS: Small contracts, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Could you explain those contracts?

MR. BURRIS: We had a small contract with the Illinois Department of Transportation, I think that was in '04, and then a little bit -- another contract the following year. So that was to help Department of Transportation qualify minority vendors to be able to do work for the Illinois Department of Transportation.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: And you stated it was a small contract. Do you recall what the fee arrangement was for that contract?

MR. BURRIS: The first one I think was a $150,000 dollar contract, of which we must have
collected about 75,000, because it didn't start until August or maybe July of the year when it was awarded, and the other one we did receive a full two-year contract the following year, but it was canceled after we had done one service, one year of service on it.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Did you do any other type of work for the state of Illinois where you contracted, where your consulting firm contracted with the state of Illinois for any other matters other than the IDOT work?

MR. BURRIS: I don't believe so, Representative Durkin.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Did you do any work for the State Board of Investment?

MR. BURRIS: State Board of Investment, no, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Now, could you give us an understanding of who your lobbying clients were before this legislature over the last, I'll say the last two years, would you identify your clients?

MR. BURRIS: One was the Mortgage Brokers Association, I think I lobbied here on behalf of them. One was the small tobacco, the small tobacco clients I lobbied for. Let me see now. Give me a minute. I
have to think through these.

I don't know if I have these written down, but certainly it's a matter of public record. You all can go to the Secretary of State, because we have to disclose all of that information, so I'm pretty sure you might be able to tell me better than I can tell you who my clients -- so if you can tick some off I can tell you.

MR. WRIGHT: I'd be more than happy to supply the committee with any information. But we're talking about clients that began in 2002 up to the present over a series of years, and if you're asking for all of those, I'd be more than happy to supply that information to the committee.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: We may have pulled those, I just want to know if Mr. Burris knows firsthand. But do you recall, there was a report in the Chicago Sun Times within the last week and a half which stated that your lobbying clients received approximately 3 million dollars in state contracts. Is that an accurate statement?

MR. BURRIS: I think that is inaccurate. I have not received 3 million dollars in state contracts.
MR. BURRIS: Oh, my clients. I don't know what my -- what the dollar value my clients received. They may have, I don't know.

MR. WRIGHT: And I'm sorry, is that supposed to be over the span of the eight or nine years we're talking about?

MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, I mean because he answered your question, it really depends upon what period of time you're talking about. And if you're talking about in the year 2002 it's one thing, but if you're talking about from 2002 all the way up to 2008 or 2009 it could be a very different answer.

MR. WRIGHT: We could supply the information based on the records that we have.

MR. WRIGHT: We could supply the information based on the records that we have.
brief research established that either yourself or your lobbying firm has made approximately 22,000 contributions to the Governor, is that accurate?

MR. BURRIS: No, that is not accurate, Representative Durkin.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: What would be an accurate total?

MR. BURRIS: Give us one moment. Burris and Lebed over an eight year period of time had just over 11,200 dollars.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: How about not just the consulting firm, but how about you individually and your law firms or --

MR. BURRIS: Individually I gave 4,500 dollars.

REPRESENTATIVE BURRIS: Do you recall how much -- what law firms have you been associated with since 2002?

MR. BURRIS: Burris, Wright, Slaughter and Tom and Gonzalez, Saggio and Harlan. And Gonzalez has given in 2008 1,000 dollars, and Burris, Wright, Slaughter and Tom over that same period had given 5,000 dollars. And I am not in the management of Burris, Wright, Slaughter and Tom, I'm of counsel to
that firm. I have no type of partnership interest or business interest in that firm. The Burris by the way is another Burris.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: What firm -- are you with the Gonzalez firm currently?

MR. BURRIS: The Gonzalez firm merged with the Burris, Wright, Slaughter firm.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Have you divested yourself from the interest in that firm?

MR. BURRIS: I had no interest. I was always of counsel.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Are you still of counsel with the Gonzalez firm?

MR. BURRIS: Well, as of -- I resigned from that also as of my appointment.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Okay. Our research has just shown that since 2002 between yourself, the consulting firm, and your law firm, members of your law firm, have made contributions approximately 22,700 dollars to the Governor. We can show you that afterwards.

MR. BURRIS: That's over the eight year period, is that correct?

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Six.
MR. BURRIS: Six years.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: I'd like to get into a little bit -- since the last reporting period was up until June of this year, could you tell the men and women of this committee whether you've made any contributions to the Governor since July, 2008?

MR. BURRIS: July of 2008. No, I have not. The last one was July 27th going to our records, June 27th, I'm sorry.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: June 27th. Has your law firm made any contributions to the Governor since July of this year?

MR. BURRIS: I have no jurisdiction over the law firm, I do not know, and I don't believe so, but I have no authority over the law firm. I'm of counsel to the law firm.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Did you bundle any money for the Governor's campaign fund at any time in the last six months from July of 2008 until the present?

MR. WRIGHT: I'm sorry, Mr. Representative, when you say bundle, what do you mean by bundle?

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Collected money.

MR. WRIGHT: Like given a fundraiser, is that
what you speaking of?

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Sure, I'd like to know that, and I'd also like to know if Mr. Burris directed anybody to make contributions to the Governor since July of this year.

MR. WRIGHT: Okay.

MR. BURRIS: The answer is no.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Have you been present at any fundraisers for the Governor over the past year, in the year 2008, were you at any of the Governor's fundraisers?

MR. BURRIS: I was at the one that he gave I think it was June with 1,000 dollars that I gave June 27th, or whatever that fundraiser was during that period.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: In 2006 did you have a fundraiser, did you personally have a fundraiser for the Governor?

MR. BURRIS: Yes, 2000 --

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: 2006.

MR. BURRIS: No, it was for his re-election. Was he running for re-election in 2006? Yes, that was for re-election, that is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Let me ask you this.
In 2002 you ran in the Governor's race against Congressman Blagojevich and Paul Vallas, is that correct?

MR. BURRIS: That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Had you entered the race before or after Congressman Blagojevich announced his candidacy?

MR. BURRIS: I have no idea. I don't know when he announced. I'm trying to think about when I announced.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Did you have any discussions with Governor Blagojevich prior to your entry into the race?

MR. BURRIS: Representative Durkin, I will try to answer your question, but you are an elected official. I think you know the answer to that, Representative. The answer is no. We're competitive trying to win a primary, and it got pretty rough and tumble there for a while.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: So no one from the Governor, Congressman Blagojevich's staff asked you to get involved in that race, that's basically what you're stating, correct?

MR. BURRIS: The answer is no,
Representative.

Representative Durkin: I'd like to talk a little bit about that 2002 race for a few more minutes. Do you know a man by the name of Joseph Stroud?

Mr. Wright: Excuse me, Representative. I think we've -- all I want to suggest is I don't know how far this is going, but if this is relevant to the issue of this appointment, we're more than happy to continue down this road.

But it seems to me that we've taken a rabbit trail and we've gone into something that's very, very different. And I just would like to ask the chairman where we're going with this, how far we'll go.

Chairwoman Currie: First of all let me just remind people this is not a court of law, we're not bound by the kinds of evidentiary or questioning standards that might apply in a courtroom. But we are certainly concerned that the questioning is focused on our mission. And Representative Durkin, perhaps could you explain what the purpose of that question might be?

Representative Durkin: Absolutely. Mr. Stroud had made a 1.2 million dollar contribution to
Roland Burris's campaign in the 2000 election under a company by the name of Telephone USA Investments. That is the single largest contribution in state history, and the only other individual to receive a contribution from Telephone USA Investments was Rod Blagojevich and that was in 2006 for a hundred thousand dollars. So I think it's a relevant question and I want to go down that questioning.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm -- Madam Chairman, I'm sorry, but I didn't understand if are you suggesting that Senator Burris made a hundred thousand dollar campaign --

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: No, Telephone USA Investments was the only -- they made a 1.2 million dollar contribution to Mr. Burris in the 2002 campaign.

MR. WRIGHT: Are you suggesting --

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: The only other individual who received a contribution from Telephone USA Investments ever was Governor Blagojevich in 2006.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, my question is are you suggesting that the Senator's a part of this telephone company of which you speak?

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: No, I want to
I understand who Robert Stroud is, because that is the single largest contribution as I stated, and there are only two people who received contributions from Mr. Stroud, and that was Mr. Burris and also Governor Blagojevich.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, I don't know that to be true. We can accept that I guess since you're making that representation.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: It sounds to me that it's a question that probably Mr. Burris could go ahead and answer.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you very much, Madam.

MR. BURRIS: Well, certainly Mr. Stroud in 2002 made a loan to the Burris for Governor campaign, and that loan is still outstanding, that's all I know about that situation. I have no other relationship to whatever Mr. Stroud does with his money. That is not my business nor anybody else's business if he wants to give his contributions and the contributions are legal and disclosed, I would think under all of our laws in this state that he could do that, Representative Durkin.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: So you're saying that was not a campaign contribution?
MR. BURRIS: It was a loan to my campaign.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Are you still trying to pay it back?

MR. BURRIS: It's still on the -- the committee's been closed down, Madam Chairman, but the loan is still on the books, that is correct.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Could you explain when you first -- how long have you known Robert Stroud, prior to 2002 how long have you known Mr. Stroud?

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Just a second, Mr. Burris. Representative Lang.

REPRESENTATIVE LANG: Well, thank you. I think Mr. Durkin's entitled to his leeway, Madam Chairman. But I don't really understand the purpose of this question as it relates to the reason Mr. Burris was brought before this committee.

Is the gentleman suggesting that way back before the 2002 election there was some conspiracy to help Rod Blagojevich in 2008? What is the purpose of the question? I don't understand the relevance.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: I think that as I stated earlier, I believe that there's a few things
and that Mr. Burris can explain the circumstances regarding the payment, and also the relationship that he has with the Governor. And I believe that the single largest contribution that was made to a campaign in Illinois history by a company, I'd like to know a little bit why it wasn't forgiven or what were the terms of it and why it still is an outstanding loan.

And I find it ironic that the only other individual who's received a loan from Telephone USA Investments was the Governor.

REPRESENTATIVE LANG: So it's ironic. You have a loop you want to close up, close it up. Otherwise why don't we move on. The fact that Mr. Burris still owes this man 1.2 million dollars from his campaign fund is not relevant to the appointment of Mr. Burris to be the next United States senator from Illinois.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Did you talk to Mr. Stroud about making a contribution to Governor Blagojevich in 2006?

MR. BURRIS: Representative Durkin, you just heard me say that I have no control or contact with Mr. Stroud or anyone else to whom they give money to.
And so please.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: I guess maybe it would help if you would explain to the members of this committee how one can forgive a 1.2 million dollar loan to a political action committee, I'd like to find out. But I'm just having a hard time thinking that there's a lack of communication with Mr. Stroud over that amount of money and that loan has been forgiven.

Was there any terms to the repayment of the loan or anything in writing which established the conditions of the repayment of the loan?

MR. WRIGHT: May I object? Madam Chairman, this isn't a court of law. You know, we're open, we're willing to talk about a lot of things related to this. It just seems that this line of questioning continues to go further and further, and so if you suggest that we continue we will.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: I would suggest that Representative Durkin finish up this line of questioning quite quickly. I don't think there's anything intrinsically wrong with asking if there was some paperwork that describes what you first called a contribution, Representative Durkin, but which has been characterized by the recipient as a loan. So
maybe you could let us know quite quickly --

Representative Durkin: One last question if I might. I stand corrected. This loan, has Mr. Stroud forgiven this loan?

Mr. Burriss: I have not had -- the campaign committee no longer exists. I have no way of repaying the money, and I've not heard one word from Mr. Stroud about anything that is due and owing as a result of that loan.

Chairwoman Currie: Mr. Durkin, do you want to try another line? Are you finished?

Representative Durkin: No, I've just got just a few more questions.

Representative Davis: Are they about this year? I hope they're about this year.

Representative Durkin: Absolutely. Now you had recently a meeting with Senator Reid and Senator Durbin in Washington just in the last 24 hours I believe.

Mr. Burriss: That is correct.

Representative Durkin: All right. Do you expect from that conversation, do you expect to be seated in the United States Senate any time in the near future?
MR. BURRIS: That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Can you tell me if they stated that they will seat you and what would be the conditions of you being allowed entry?

MR. BURRIS: We had a great meeting, Representative Durkin. I was really impressed with the Majority Leader Reid and of course our distinguished Senior Senator from the great state of Illinois, Dick Durbin. And what they described to me is in the press. There was no other comments outside. They indicated that they would like for me to make an appearance here before this distinguished House committee. And secondly, that we have to get the Secretary of State's signature on the appointment. We had a very pleasant and how should I say distinguished meeting.

And then upon those clearing up they indicated that my documentation would go to the Rules Committee and the Rules Committee would consider it, and then it would be passed out of the Rules Committee. That was the extent of our conversation.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Did you state whether you would run for election in 2010 if you were appointed to that seat?
MR. BURRIS: That question did not come up.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: I would agree with that, I believe that Secretary White I believe does not have the authority to exercise discretion so I'll throw that one to you since essentially it will be required.

I've just got one last line of questioning. And this is I'm going to ask you about a radio interview that you did on December 13th, just a few days after the Governor's arrest, and that's with WBBM radio. You had commented upon the Attorney General Madigan's lawsuit to remove the Governor.

You stated "I certainly applaud our actions. Illinois is too important to its 18 million citizens to have a chief executive who is now incapacitated. The Governor's behavior is reprehensible."

If you believe that he's incapacitated and his actions were reprehensible, how can you accept this appointment and claim legitimacy to it?

MR. BURRIS: Number one, I said 13 million people. Illinois doesn't have 18 million.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: That's what the paper stated.

MR. BURRIS: So that means that they're wrong
sometimes, right?

    REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: I'm with you.

    MR. BURRIS: And if I were Attorney General

at the same time that Attorney General Lisa Madigan

was Attorney General, I would have taken the same

action that Attorney General Madigan took. Because

there's an obligation upon you as the chief law

enforcement officer of this state when you have

certain obligation at your disposal to pursue, and

that would be her or my responsibility to pursue the

action to make a determination as to whether or not

the statute would apply to the Governor. I would have

taken that same action, absolutely.

    REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Would you have

accepted the appointment on December 13th for the

United States Senator from the Governor?

    MR. BURRIS: That's hypothetical.

    REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: It's reasonable to

ask. Since he's incapacitated, is he no longer

incapacitated?

    MR. BURRIS: Well, the Supreme Court

dismissed that action, so your question, sir, is not

relevant.

    REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: That wasn't your
lawsuit, it was Attorney General's Madigan's lawsuit as I recall.

MR. BURRIS: Representative Durkin, the Supreme Court did not pursue her actions.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: So you don't have a response whether you would have accepted the appointment on December 13th of this last year, correct?

MR. BURRIS: When the Supreme Court did not hear her actions, when there was no special election, my thought was at that time that should I get the appointment, that Illinois should not be short a senator, that I have the experience and knowledge of this great state, and that I could be present to hit the ground running to represent the state of Illinois in the United States Senate, should I get the appointment.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: I understand that incapacitation is a legal defense to virtually everything. So again, let me ask, I'll ask you one more time.

Would you have accepted that appointment on December 13th when you stated that the Governor was incapacitated to run this state?
MR. WRIGHT: Madam Chairman, I think we've answered that a number of times.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: It doesn't hurt to answer it twice. We often do that in this committee.

MR. WRIGHT: Okay.

MR. BURRIS: I did not say that the Governor was incapacitated. What I said was we must pursue that legal remedy to make the determination, and the Supreme Court acted on that, Representative Durkin, and that's the end of that.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: I'll go back and look at the transcript from that date, but I feel fairly confident about that.

Let me ask you just a few more questions and I'll rap it up. Should the Governor resign?

MR. BURRIS: That is up to the Governor. I have no authority over the Governor.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: I'm asking you, do you believe it's in the best interests of the state of Illinois that the Governor resign his post as Governor?

MR. BURRIS: I will repeat, Representative Durkin, what I said. I have no authority over the Governor. That is his decision and he said he would...
REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Do you support the impeachment efforts going on in this committee?

MR. BURRIS: I don't know what you all are -- what the evidence are, but I support my legislature and you've got to take whatever action you feel that your duties to the Illinois Constitution that you have to do, and I support that effort that you're carrying out your duties and your responsibilities.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Whatever answer we take today or tomorrow you would support, correct?

MR. BURRIS: The answer is I wouldn't have anything to do about what you all do. Do you think I've got power over what you all do?

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: You know what we're doing, the whole world knows what we're doing. This is no secret, Mr. Burris.

I've just got two more questions. Mr. Burris, would you support a special election for the seat, take a temporary placement in the United States Senate and let the people make a decision upon a balance of the Senator-elect Obama's seat?

MR. BURRIS: That's up to you, Representative Durkin. That's up to this august body, that's not up
to me.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: I can see where this is going, but I appreciate your patience, and good luck, sir.

MR. BURRIS: Thank you very much, Representative Durkin.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE FLOWERS: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Senator Burriss, congratulations on being appointed for the U.S. Senate seat. And I want to also congratulate you on having the tenacity to weather the storm in which you had to endure the other day in the rain and in the cold and humiliation.

But I guess you knew that there was a rainbow someplace out there, so you was willing to endure so -- and it was a history lesson that was given to our young people. And I had the opportunity to talk to my daughter to let her know that when you believe in what you're doing, regardless of the sacrifice, that it may not always be easy, but if you believe in what you're doing, you just stay the course and it will be a brighter side.

So once again I congratulate you, and it was
really -- you have an impeccable career, and I want to congratulate you again on having that type of career.

And as a result of what’s going on in this state, the news headlines has been that the seat is tainted. I want to say to you, sir, that as a result of your answers here today, I don't see your seat being tainted by you, but it’s tainted by the allegations in which this Governor has been accused of and he is innocent until proven guilty, and these are allegations in the complaint that we had.

And the Governor, there’s a -- in the complaint there’s a headline that says “refused to appoint an individual to the Senate seat without consideration of something in return.”

The Governor was overheard on the tapes as saying that before he would give up this seat for nothing, he would take it himself. And it was too important and he was determined to get something legal, something political, or either something personal.

Can you say before this committee, sir, emphatically that none of those things were promised from you to the governor or there was no exchange in regards to anything legal, personal or political?

MR. BURRIS: Representative Flowers, I can
before this committee state that there was nothing legal or --

REPRESENTATIVE FLOWERS: The three points were legal.

MR. BURRIS: Legal.

REPRESENTATIVE FLOWERS: Personal.

MR. BURRIS: Personal.

REPRESENTATIVE FLOWERS: Political.

MR. BURRIS: Or political, exchanged for my appointment to this seat.

REPRESENTATIVE FLOWERS: There was no conversation, none to that effect, and I know you answered this on numerous of occasions, no quid pro quo, none of that?

MR. BURRIS: Absolutely, positively not.

REPRESENTATIVE FLOWERS: Well, thank you very much, sir. And once again, congratulations, and I look forward to you serving not only the state of Illinois but the people across the country well.

MR. BURRIS: Thank you, Representative Flowers.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Representative Black.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson.
Attorney General Burris, it's always good to see you.

MR. BURRIS: Good to see you.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: It's been more than forty years. I recall when you were living in Centralia.

MR. BURRIS: Yeah, that's right.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: In the Illinois Jaycee days.

MR. BURRIS: Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Where did that time go, sir?

MR. BURRIS: We've all gotten older, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Yes, indeed we have.

Let me just ask you a couple of questions and follow up on one if I might.

Have you established a federal political action committee that would take contributions for any activities that you may be engaged in in your two years in the Senate?

MR. BURRIS: Yes, I think we did that a couple days ago, January 5th, that's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: And I would expect you
to do that.

MR. BURRIS: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: That's what you have to do when you're assuming public office at the federal level.

MR. BURRIS: That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: I want to ask you one question. You say it was two days ago, correct?

MR. BURRIS: January 5th.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: I'm not familiar with the federal rules, it's hard enough to keep up with all the state rules as, you know, you've been through as we all do every six months.

Do you have to show on your federal political action committee that you have an outstanding loan of one million dollars from your state political action committee?

MR. BURRIS: I think the laws are different and that certainly is on the record here in Illinois.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Right.

MR. BURRIS: And that was a loan not to Roland Burris.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: To the committee.

MR. BURRIS: To the Burris for Governor
Committee, and that's been on the books since we lost the primary in '02.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: I understand that. My campaign committee has never had to deal with the amounts of money in that range.

MR. BURRIS: It still wasn't enough, Representative Black. I needed about another two or three million.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: I understand. My brother donated I think ten dollars to me and now he calls it a loan.

But let me ask you, when did you resign your lobbying activities with the state of Illinois? Has that been recent?

MR. BURRIS: Very recent, that is correct, upon receiving the appointment, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Okay. I think earlier if I heard you correct you said that you had met with Mr. Lon Monk who was an employee of Governor Blagojevich in 2008 regarding state business. Did you missspeak? I'm asking, I don't know if Lon Monk -- I don't think he was an employee of the Governor or the state of Illinois in 2008.

MR. BURRIS: No, he had resigned as
Governor's chief of staff, but he was in the lobbying business, and as lobbyists do, we touch base with each other to see how we can assist each other and Lon --

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Your conversation then was as lobbyist/lobbyist?

MR. BURRIS: That's right.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Fine, I just wanted to clarify that, thank you very much.

One other question, and obviously you've been in this business a long time, Mr. Senator, and bear with me. When we are appointed or elected or being vetted or whatever the process may be, we're often asked many things. When you met in Washington and/or with people in Illinois, have you made any promise to a member of the Illinois Democrat party or the Democrat National Committee in Washington that you will be a candidate in 2010 or that you will not be a candidate in 2010?

MR. BURRIS: Representative Black, that has not come up in any conversation.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: And the reason I bring it up is there was a report alleged to have come from a Washington journalist that did come up, and that Mr. Reid allegedly was adamant that you not be a candidate.
CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Representative Fritchey.

REPRESENTATIVE FRITCHEY: With all deference to Representative Black, we're clearly outside the scope of anything that's germane to the investigation.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: I'm beginning to think that anything we ask Mr. Burris is outside the scope of this examination, do you know it? With all due respect, Mr. Fritchey, I didn't -- I had no input in you releasing the report of this committee at 9 a.m. this morning. I don't know why you did that. We haven't taken any vote on the committee. We are here determining if there's any link between Governor Blagojevich and anyone who accepted an appointment from Governor Blagojevich to an office of the United States Senate.

And I would expect to answer any of the questions that's been asked if I were sitting where Mr. Burris is, and I wouldn't think any of it would be irrelevant.

REPRESENTATIVE FRITCHEY: I understand, Representative. You and I go far back on too many issues. But let me tell you when we're discussing whether or not there's been --

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: I've asked two
questions and I’ve gone too far back?

REPRESENTATIVE FRITCHLEY: No, I say you and I have.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Oh.

REPRESENTATIVE FRITCHLEY: But it’s been a bigger portion of my lifetime than yours. But let me just say obviously we all want to get to the facts. But asking whether or not there’s been a commitment as to whether or not the gentleman is going to run in 2010 and whether any discussion was taking place between himself and the Senate majority leader, if you can explain how that would be a bearing on any discussions between him and Mr. Blagojevich pertaining to the Senate seat, then obviously you’re entitled to do that.

Obviously you’re entitled to do whatever you like, Mr. Black. But I’m simply saying I do not see the relevance between any conversations he may have had about a 2010 bid with Senator Reid has on how he got appointed to the Senate seat by Governor Blagojevich.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: I accept your critique. I would just remind you that most of us downstate often see more clearly the relevance of
It has been widely reported, Senator Burris, that Mrs. Blagojevich has a position with a nice salary, I don't know what nice salary is, with the Christian Industrial League, and certainly members of the press have inferred that your business partner, Mr. -- is it Levin?

MR. BURRIS: Lebed.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Lebed, may have had discussions with either Mrs. Blagojevich or Governor Blagojevich regarding her employment by -- is it the Christian Industrial League? I'm not -- I can't remember what that name of the agency is.

MR. BURRIS: Yeah, I think it's the Chicago Christian Industrial League.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Chicago Christian Industrial League?

MR. BURRIS: I think that's it.
not your business partner had any discussions with the Governor or Mrs. Blagojevich regarding this position?

MR. BURRIS: That is not in my purview, I do not.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: So he wouldn't have checked with you?

MR. BURRIS: Checked with me? No.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Or said hey, I've got this really neat job, do you think we should recommend somebody?

MR. BURRIS: No, he did not check with me at all on that.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Okay.

MR. BURRIS: I knew nothing about that.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: All right. Mr. Burris, I thank you very much. As always, it's always good seeing you. You and I used to talk about more than four decades ago young men can change the world, remember that?

MR. BURRIS: Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: And now that we're much older, sir, I don't know if we've changed it, but I think a few of us have tried.

MR. BURRIS: I certainly tried in my days as
a public official of Illinois to make an impact on my citizens of this state. Thank you, Representative Black.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Thank you.

Representative Eddy.

REPRESENTATIVE EDDY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Burris, I read your affidavit, and as I read it a couple of things jumped out at me and I want to clear those up with you if I could.

It states in the affidavit that on Friday, December 28th, you said it was probably about 4:00, that you received a call from Mr. Adams, Sam Adams, Jr. When I read that it struck me as a little curious as to why the Governor's criminal defense attorney was doing business --

MR. GENSON: I don't mean to interrupt, but it's been stated he's not his criminal defense attorney. That's all I want to say. Mr. Adams, Jr., does not, has not, and will not represent Governor Blagojevich in the criminal case. And it's been said publicly and I just wanted to make it clear that just because --

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: We'll clarify the record of this committee. Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE EDDY: Thank you, sir.

Let me ask you this, Mr. Burris. When Mr. Adams called you, what capacity did you believe Mr. Adams was acting within? Did you believe he was the Governor's criminal defense attorney?

MR. BURRIS: I know Mr. Adams, he's a good friend of my son.

REPRESENTATIVE EDDY: Okay.

MR. BURRIS: I helped raise Mr. Adams to some extent. Mr. Adams contacted me and indicated -- and I had to verify that he was coming from the Governor, that he was delivering a message from the Governor, and I treated it as being a counsel to the Governor, that's how I treated it. I didn't know whether or not he was criminal defense or what defense, as a counsel to the Governor.

REPRESENTATIVE EDDY: Okay. So it didn't seem in any way odd to you that it wasn't someone who was -- had some authority that was acting through the Governor's office to contact you about a power that's designated to the office of the Governor?

MR. BURRIS: Well, after he came and visited with me, I verified the fact that he had the authority to discuss this with me. That's all I needed to do.
REPRESENTATIVE EDDY: You verified it with --

MR. BURRIS: With him.

REPRESENTATIVE EDDY: He called you up and he said he had the authority to act that way and your knowledge of him and his background led you to believe that he was acting on behalf of the Governor?

MR. BURRIS: Let me try to clear it up for you. He contacted me and asked if he could come meet with me, he had something important to discuss. And he came and we began to discuss this. And he then related to me that he had the authority to determine from me whether or not I would be interested in the appointment should the Governor appoint me and that would -- you know, I said okay, are you sure about this, you know, saying okay, the Governor's sending you? And he said well, yes, I have the authority, and that's the extent of it. That's how we got the verification.

REPRESENTATIVE EDDY: So you basically -- his explanation to you was enough that hey, he must be?

MR. BURRIS: I don't think he would come on a lark.

REPRESENTATIVE EDDY: Okay. Now, my serving on this committee, I've seen Mr. Adams sit at the
table of the defense counsel of the Governor. So my concern, I'm going to ask the question and I'm going to ask it because I think it needs to be asked.

Did Mr. Adams discuss with you any of the elements of the Governor's criminal case during the time you met with him regarding the Senate appointment?

MR. BURRIS: The answer is no.

REPRESENTATIVE EDDY: Okay, so there is nothing related to the criminal case that is related to the Senate appointment at all based on those conversations?

MR. BURRIS: Absolutely not, Representative Eddy.

REPRESENTATIVE EDDY: Okay, thank you.

MR. BURRIS: You're welcome.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Representative Davis.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

First of all, Senator Burris, I don't know if anyone welcomed you back to Springfield, but I think you left here after being the Comptroller very successfully, and then you left being the Attorney General without an ounce or smear of any taint, and we
appreciate that kind of service to the state of Illinois.

MR. BURRIS: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Since you have been asked to serve by this sitting Governor, the Department of Homeland Security has removed his ability to get any access to Homeland Security information. I'm sure you will be seated as a Senator from Illinois.

Will you in any way attempt to remove this, what shall we say, this ruling by the Homeland Security department not to provide this Governor with the ability to partake in our security in the state of Illinois?

MR. BURRIS: Representative Davis, I have heard this on the news, and when I'm a Senator I don't know what authority I would have, but if it becomes an interest of the citizens of Illinois and the protection of them, I think that we should be protected.

I don't know all the ramifications of that, but that is certainly something that if it would come to my attention at that level I would probably confer with our senior Senator Dick Durbin to really, you
know, check to see just what authority I would have. But I would act on that immediately because not be able to answer that with intelligence.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: I think the fear that some people might have is that you are being appointed by a Governor who perhaps won't be around in his capacity much longer. Would you in any way attempt to let's say delay his loss of power or help him in any way to be viable in relationships to citizens in our state or in our government in your activity? I mean would you in any way find yourself involved in any behavior of his because he has appointed you as Senator?

MR. BURRIS: The answer is no. And if it involves a protection of the 13 million people of this state, that would be my concern. The Governor will have to deal with his problems that he has, and that's certainly something that you all are going to deal with this committee.

But I would in no way be trying to interfere with any of the legitimate information that has been brought about against the Governor. That is not my - that is not my purview.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Well, based upon my
knowledge of your past behavior, and usually that's all we can go on is one's past behavior as a prediction of the future, I think you served Illinois in a very honorable fashion.

MR. BURRIS: Thank you, Representative Davis.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: We thank you for coming before us, sir.

MR. BURRIS: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Thank you.

Representative Rose.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSE: Thank you. General Burris, Senator-designee Burris.

MR. BURRIS: Good afternoon.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSE: I want to ask you a couple quick questions. One, I understand what Mr. Genson just said. I'm not saying I agree with it, I understand that he said that.

You're a smart guy, you're the former Attorney General of the state of Illinois. I'm sure you watch the papers. Sam Adam, Jr. who in the papers at least has been reported to be part of the legal defense team of the Governor comes to your home on a Friday evening, early afternoon, whatever it was, December 26th. Don't you say in the back of your mind why is
the defense attorney coming to my home, don't you ask that question?

MR. BURRIS: The answer to that question is it was then considered why, because he wouldn't talk to me over the telephone. He said that he had to talk to me about something and I need to talk two you in person. And so I eventually said okay, what's it about.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSE: That's a crafty answer but it's not an answer.

MR. BURRIS: Well, I -- I'm sorry if you don't think I'm answering your question. I'm speaking truthfully.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSE: I understand what Mr. Genson said, but many of us saw a press conference where Mr. Adam, Jr. stood with Mr. Genson and Shelly Serosky and claimed how proud he was to be part of the team.

MR. GENSON: I was never at any press conference.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSE: Well Mr. Serosky, I saw Mr. Adam have that press conference. So the bottom line is wouldn't you somewhere in the back of your mind, Mr. Burris, wonder why it is that he's coming to
talk to you?

MR. BURRIS: In the back of my mind the answer would be I was certainly curious as to what he had to talk to me about. Because when he called he would not talk to me over the phone. And so he came to me and, you know, I said yes, please come on over, I'm getting ready to go out to a black tie event, but come on over. And he came and we had a conversation. That's --

REPRESENTATIVE ROSE: But you knew who Mr. Adam, Jr. was before --

MR. WRIGHT: Excuse me.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Excuse me, Representative Rose. Representative Lang.

REPRESENTATIVE LANG: Madam Chairman, I just feel it necessary to point out to Representative Rose that Mr. Burris indicated that he's known Mr. Adam for many years. Mr. Adam could be coming to visit him on any number of issues.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSE: You interrupted me before I got to say it, but he certainly knew that Mr. Adam was part of the governor's legal team in that instance.

REPRESENTATIVE LANG: But he knows Mr. Adam
for years, he said he helped raise him I think were the words he used, so he could be coming to talk about a family matter or any other matters.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSE: Mr. Lang, I find it interesting that we can ask about Homeland Security questions of the U.S. Senate designee, but we can't ask questions about the actual appointment itself.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Representative Rose, I think he pretty much answered your question, so if you want to follow up.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSE: Okay, I have another question I want to pose here to our former Attorney General. You have said, you previously said if I understood you correct, and maybe I missed this, but you previously said you thought the Governor lacked the legal capacity to make the argument or to make the appointment.

MR. BURRIS: No, that's --

REPRESENTATIVE ROSE: And you agreed with the Attorney General's litigation?

MR. BURRIS: No, that's not what I said. I said I would have brought the same action that would cause us to allege that that would be the problem and that would -- as Attorney General is an obligation
upon us to carry out what we think of the use of the laws. And I really support Representative Madigan for what she did in that capacity.

But the Supreme Court will determine whether or not there is capacity to do that and they did not hear her petition. So therefore, that issue in that capacity is off the table.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSE: And do you still believe the Governor doesn't have the legal capacity to make that decision?

MR. BURRIS: If I were the Attorney General -- I will repeat myself. If I were the Attorney General --

REPRESENTATIVE ROSE: I'm asking about you, if you still believe it.

MR. BURRIS: Representative Rose.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSE: Mr. Burris.

MR. BURRIS: If I were the Attorney General, I would have brought that action, because I would have felt constitutionally and for the people of the state of Illinois we must pursue that particular legal responsibility that would be placed on us to take that action. And that would be up to the courts to make the determination.
We cannot determine guilt or innocence when we bring an action. We bring an action into our courts so that then the proper authority can then make the determination. It wouldn't do any good for me to have any type of personal feelings about a legal situation. We don't do that as lawyers and prosecutors. We must follow the law.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSE: I think the question was pretty specific, but I understand I'm not going to get an answer. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Representative Tracy.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: Thank you, Madam Chairman and General Burris.

A few items that I wanted to clear up in my mind in regards to the earlier questioning. You said that you had visited friends perhaps in September of '08 or July of '08 concerning a desire to perhaps be appointed as a senator if our President-elect was elected. And could you give me the names of those friends?

MR. BURRIS: I don't think I said in July, I said they were friends that I contacted after the election, but I was talking to people, I mean I don't know who you want as my friends that I consider as
persons. For example, when I handled a press conference to express my interest in the seat, was the press conference -- I did hold a press conference and some of my friends were there, for instance.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: I'm sorry, I didn't get that. You held a press conference to talk about your desire --

MR. BURRIS: To express an interest in the seat of being appointed.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: And when was that?

MR. BURRIS: I don't recall the day. One of those persons was the former justice of the Illinois Appellate Court Justice Cousins. And then some other friends that supported me to seek to be appointed to the seat.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: But I still don't understand. I'm asking when that press conference was held.

MR. BURRIS: That was the time I made the statement about Representative Madigan having taken the correct action. It was during the time when the action had been filed by -- I'm sorry, filed by Attorney General Madigan, so it was at that same conference.
REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: So this is in December of '08 when you held a press conference to express your desire?

MR. BURRIS: That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: To be appointed to the Senate?

MR. BURRIS: That is correct. That is a result of my friends saying, you know, you qualify, and so they actually set the press conference up and had me to appear, because they were going to just state that Roland Burris should be appointed to this seat.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: But I think I earlier heard you today testify that in September, '08, or perhaps as early as July, '08, you had visited with some friends about your desire to perhaps seek the seat.

MR. BURRIS: No, I think I testified that that's when I began to express an interest in it. As I saw that --

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: And I just was wondering who those friends were.

MR. BURRIS: One of them was my law partner.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Is that when you talked
about your interest with Lon Monk? I think that --

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: Was it Lon Monk, was

that the extent of it was Lon Monk?

MR. BURRIS: That came up in our conversation

when we were talking about, you know, if he had some

excess clients in the lobbying business, you know, as

we try to see whether or not he had conflicts

somewhere with some type of a client because of his

previous relationship with government. That's what we

were talking about then.

And it just came up, and in fact I said, "Now

Lon, I don't know what's going to happen, but I think

that I'm qualified to be appointed to the Senate

seat." And Lon said, "Well, Roland, I think you are,

too." And that was the extent of it.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: So you don't recall

that there was anybody else besides Lon Monk that you

expressed that interest to at that point?

MR. BURRIS: No, I can't recall. Because

people were coming to me saying Roland, you should

pursue that appointment, you're qualified, and this

was --

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: Is there anybody that

comes to mind in that light that you can --
MR. BURRIS: Yes, Rich Barber from Summerset, New Jersey, the gentleman I introduced at my press conference in Washington the other day, he contacted me from Summerset, New Jersey, and said "Roland, there's no one better qualified for you to be United States Senator from the great state of Illinois. And therefore, I'm going to start contacting --" you know, I was just wait a minute, you know, Obama hasn't -- well, that happened after, maybe after November 4th.

See you're asking me a question that has so many moving parts to it that I might not be -- and my counsel reminded me that the class of 1955 from Centralia, Illinois, also were contacting me. And of course a lot of them, that got started after President-elect Obama had been -- had won the election.

And so I'm -- and I can start giving you names if you need names of people who you can follow up after that, after November 4th I can certainly give you a few names, but I can't give you the thousands of people who were involved in this.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: Going to a different area of your testimony, the 1.2 million dollar campaign donation or campaign loan, I was just curious
and wanted to finish in my mind what type of business
Mr. Stroud was in.

MR. BURRIS: Owns TV stations.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: Do you know where?

MR. BURRIS: Channel WYCS, channel 62 and 34
I think.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: Does he have any
contracts with the state of Illinois?

MR. BURRIS: I have no idea what contracts he
has.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: Do you have regular
contact with him at all or --

MR. BURRIS: I see him socially.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: So you have -- do you
remember when the last time you might have discussed
this campaign donation or understood it's just not
going to be repaid?

MR. BURRIS: It has never come up since I
lost my primary in '02.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: Now, going to your
present appointment, do you recognize that given the
circumstances of last month, that your appointment is
not under ideal circumstances?

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: I think that's an
editorial comment. I don't know that you need to respond.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: Well, certainly what I'm trying to establish is, you know, on a personal level, I believe that certainly you have the exemplary qualifications. However, what we have to consider is the people of the state of Illinois. And what I'm asking is do you recognize that continuing as a U.S. Senator under an appointment under less than ideal circumstances, which I think you would agree your appointment was not under ideal circumstances or the way you would have liked to have been appointed.

MR. WRIGHT: Excuse me, state rep, are you asking whether -- you say ideal, do you mean whether or not the appointment was legal?

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: What I'm getting at is that we recognize that this appointment was made kind of at the 11th hour, it was not -- what I'm -- my point I suppose and what I'm asking is do you recognize that there's going to be a cloud as long as whatever investigations follow from hence forth regarding Governor Blagojevich, that that cloud cannot escape some of our junior senators?

MR. WRIGHT: I'm sorry, Madam Chairman, that
sounds like a speech or an opinion. I don't know if it's a question that we can respond to.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: Well, my question was do you recognize that your appointment was less than ideal circumstances?

MR. BURRIS: No.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: Do you think it was a perfect case scenario?

MR. BURRIS: No, the appointment was legal, there's no cloud, there's nothing -- the appointment was according to law.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Representative Bellock.

REPRESENTATIVE BELLOCK: Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. And thank you very much, Mr. Burris, for coming to Springfield.

I just wanted to ask somewhat similar to that, is that did you believe the statement that was made on behalf of the Governor and by Mr. Genson about two weeks earlier in mid December that when they assured the people of Illinois and the General Assembly that they would not go forward with making an appointment?

MR. GENSON: I don't assure the people of the state of Illinois, I don't want that representation to
be made. I made the statement to a reporter. I did not have anything to do with this appointment. And obviously I was disagreed with.

But I don't want to tell anyone that I represented anything to the state of Illinois or in front of this committee because a reporter took a quote.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Representative Bellock.

REPRESENTATIVE BELLOCK: Thank you very much. Just the question stands. The majority of people in Illinois felt that that statement assured people that he was not going forward with an appointment. I wondered if you had felt that way also.

MR. BURRIS: I had no knowledge of the statement, Representative Bellock.

REPRESENTATIVE BELLOCK: Okay. Because in this testimony today to hear that Mr. Adams then after the other statement had been made two weeks earlier, that for Mr. Adams to come back to request that you have that appointment seems highly irregular. No matter who Mr. Adams was working for, the Governor or Mr. Genson, that the statement was made assuring the people of Illinois that the appointment was not going to be made, and that no matter who that statement was
made to, it was on behalf of Mr. Genson making the statement, correct?

MR. BURRIS: Again, I can't respond to that.

REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: I'm just saying in the testimony today as we hear it, it seems highly irregular to find out the statement was made by Mr. Genson and two weeks later Mr. Adams comes forward and asks you for that, if you're interested in the appointment.

MR. BURRIS: I have no knowledge of that.

REPRESENTATIVE BELLOCK: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Representative Bassi.

REPRESENTATIVE BASSI: It's been asked.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Representative Hamos.

REPRESENTATIVE HAMOS: Thank you. Good afternoon, Mr. Burris.

MR. BURRIS: Good afternoon.

REPRESENTATIVE HAMOS: Just to refresh your memory, I came to meet you and to introduce myself and to get your insights about the Attorney General's office.

MR. BURRIS: That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE HAMOS: And that was October 8th, three months ago, and you told me that one of
your dreams was to become the United States Senator.
So congratulations, I think you're really close to
becoming the United States Senator.

MR. BURRIS: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Representative Turner.

REPRESENTATIVE TURNER: Thank you, Madam

Chairman and members of the committee.

To Senate-elect, Senate-appointee, Mr. Burris, I
want to welcome you here today. I just wanted to send
a message to the people I guess out in radio land and
in TV land in terms of trying to clarify just a little
bit what's happening here today.

In particular for some of my friends on Roosevelt
Road and 16th Street who have no idea as to where
we're headed or just what we're doing here and so
often -- I'm not an attorney, so in terms of some of
the information that's being expressed here, and I've
enjoyed listening to Mr. Genson, listening to our
committee members, those who are attorneys, and this
is a rather confusing process, one that we all admit
we're not honored to be sitting here trying to
address. And I know your appearance here today is a
little outside our original goal, which is to deal
with the impeachment process.
And oftentimes in the day sometimes when I'm at home I get a chance to visit with my sister, and she still looks at a lot of old Perry Mason reruns. And if you don't mind I'd like to ask you a couple questions, because I think that Perry had a way of doing things where when you left you sort of understood what the final verdict was.

And I also should share that as we make laws, that oftentimes when you go to court, and I know that there's a lot of court TV on these days, and I know that some of those same people on Roosevelt Road watch those programs, that at the end of the program there's always someone that comes out and says they were either dealt a bad hand or things didn't work the way they worked.

And so I said that to say that sometimes the way the laws are implemented, people are not always happy. There's someone who is going to be opposed to any decision that is made.

And so in your role as the former Attorney General, and could you just briefly tell me as the Attorney General, what is that -- what was your role, what does the Attorney General do? And the point I'm getting at is I believe you're the lawyer, and in that
role you were the lawyer for the state.

And in that role I would like to ask you regarding filling Senate seats, what does the Illinois Constitution say are the steps to fulfilling a vacancy in the U.S. Senate?

MR. BURRIS: Thank you, Representative Turner. The Attorney General is the chief legal officer for the state of Illinois, and he has to represent all the people of our state in any legal matters. He is the only lawyer that can go into a courtroom and argue on behalf of the people of the state of Illinois. He has trial authority, prosecutorial authority, and appellate authority to carry out the laws that this body passes to protect the citizens of the state of Illinois.

REPRESENTATIVE TURNER: Now I know it's been a while since you served in that role as the Attorney General, and I'm not going to ask you to recite the exact statute, but can you tell me briefly, if you can recall, how do we fill a U.S. Senate vacancy -- actually I'll start, let me back up.

How do we fill congressional vacancies in the state of Illinois? What is the process as you recall?

MR. BURRIS: The process is this.
Representative Turner: For congressional.

Mr. Burris: For the congressional seat there must be a special election that will be called by the Governor, and he has a time line as outlined in the Illinois statute as to when he can upon the resignation of a congressperson, then he must within a certain period of time call for a special election. That is for the congresspersons, and that must be under our laws a primary election and a general election.

Now as far the other appointments for the United States Senate seat, under the Constitution of the United States, Article 17, it says that the Governor shall fill a vacancy upon the resignation of the United States Senator, and that the -- I think it says executive, that the executive, and that the executive, the state legislature can then also make other implementing or changing statutes to implement the filling of that particular vacancy.

And under our laws currently following the 17th Amendment the Governor has the sole authority with no equivocation, with no taint, with no cloud, to make an appointment.

Representative Turner: And may I ask as we
speak or this appointment that was given to you or that was given to you, what's the date of that appointment again, how long ago was that?

MR. BURRIS: I was appointed by the Governor on December 30th, 2008.

REPRESENTATIVE TURNER: And you say by the Governor. And who was the Governor December 30th, 2008?

MR. BURRIS: All powers and authority rest in the chief executive of our state, by the name of -- actually it was the 31st, I'm sorry.

REPRESENTATIVE TURNER: 31st of December.

MR. BURRIS: The 31st of December, and that is in the name of Rod Blagojevich.

REPRESENTATIVE TURNER: I rest my case.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Representative Rose with a follow-up question.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSE: It's not a question as much as a statement. Mr. Genson was correct, he was not at the press conference. But there's a -- as of December 20th, a New York Times article where Mr. Adams, Jr. appeared with Serosky after the Governor's press conference to address many of the legal concerns related to the criminal complaints.
And while this -- I asked my question of Mr. Burris, but I hope at some point in time we're going to be able to ask some questions as to what the status of Mr. Adams is.

MR. GENSON: Well, I'll give you the status, but don't count on Mr. Adam answering it.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: All right, thank you very much. The committee is going to take a five minute break, and we appreciate the appearance of Mr. Burris, and we appreciate all of your questions. We're going to take a five minute break. We're going to come back, there is one additional item to enter into the record, and that is a letter from Brenda Gold who was fired inappropriately from the Illinois Department of Transportation.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Chairman, does that mean we're excused?

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: I'm sorry, you're gone, you're out of here.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you very much.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Back to Washington.

MR. BURRIS: Thank you, Madam Chairman, Members of the House. God please you all. Happy new year.
CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: The committee will go into consideration of the report.

(A recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN CURRIE: The Special Investigative Committee will come back to order.

We have one piece of housekeeping before we move to the report itself, and that is a statement of Brenda Gold on her firing from the Illinois Department of Transportation. And this document will be distributed to the members.

And I believe Representative Davis wanted to say a word about it, this topic. Representative Davis, Representative, if you would just briefly just say a word or two about the importance of this document, and we're going to put that into the record as Exhibit 70.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Thank you, very much, Madam Chairman. And I want to say that I really thank Brenda Gold, I don't know if she's still here, but she drove down from Chicago and she has been in touch with me for a long period of time attempting to provide me with information about the improprieties that are taking place at the Illinois Department of Transportation.

I have listened to her, I have listened to other
people who have worked for the Department of Transportation, and I decided that this is the best time of all to provide other members of this Illinois legislature with the kind of activity that Miss Gold was telling us about the Department of Transportation.

Madam Chairman, I don't know if you wanted me to read it or part of it or it appears -- there's -- it appears that one of the things going on in that department was in personnel where they would give answers to people taking tests in order that they could be hired. And usually the people were hired over African Americans.

When African Americans were applying for these positions and other people were applying, the others were provided with the questions and answers so that their scores could be higher. And what when she investigated this she lost her position. She had been with the -- in state government for 27 years, she was getting ready for retirement, and they terminated her position because she questioned these policies and procedures that were in violation of the rights of African Americans.

She took her case to the Department of EEOC, and the law states that they're supposed to respond in 90
She took it to the Civil Rights Commission. Anyway, they have yet to respond. They have not responded to her even, so that means there's another place we should look for improprieties.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Representative, the written testimony is in the record.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: I would ask that the committee take a look at this and realize that this document is significantly important. And there are a lot of African American people who feel that this Governor has been extremely good and kind to them, but when they look at these kind of practices, and this is just one example, they will know that this Governor carried his vendetta against people for no reason to a large extent, which was very harmful to the state.

In other words, you're not getting the best people for the job, you're getting the best -- the person who got the information from the personnel department to get the job. You didn't get the best person for the job. And that's what Mrs. Gold wanted us to see and I urge you to read it. Yes, we do have copies, thank you very much.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Thank you. And this will be part of the record as Exhibit 70.
We are now going to move to consideration of the report. As we earlier discussed, the timing of the court activity with respect to the hearing of the audio tape which the United States Attorney has asked to share with us is such that I think the members of the committee indicated that they feel we have enough information, enough evidence in the record to make some determinations to share with our colleague on the floor of the House.

Representative Lang moved that we add as an addendum to the report a document that is a draft House resolution that would include an article of impeachment, and I'm just briefly going to run through what those are.

We would say that the totality of the evidence contained in the House report, report of our committee, amounts to impeachable offenses on the part of the Governor.

And that would include the Governor's effort to obtain a personal benefit in exchange for appointment to the Senate seat.

We would count that as an abuse of power.

The condition of awarding state assistance to the Tribune on firing members of the Chicago Tribune
editorial board as a trade.

Official acts in exchange for campaign contributions. The signing of legislative -- that would include the signing of legislation in helping the horse racing industry.

The effort to trade official acts in exchange for campaign contributions, which would include the awarding of the state tollway contract and expansion, again as identified in the final report.

And the effort to trade official acts in exchange for campaign contributions, that would be the release of pediatric -- reimbursements in exchange for a significant contribution to the Governor's campaign fund from the administrator at a children's hospital.

The effort to trade official acts in exchange for campaign contributions with respect to appointment to the Illinois Finance Authority.

Another effort to trade campaign contributions for the awarding of certain state contracts.

And again, we have the Health Facilities Planning Board.

The refusal of the Governor to recognize the authority of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules in respect to his unilateral expansion of a
state health program.

The procurement of flu vaccines, never mind that no one in Illinois was able to take advantage of the flu vaccines and yet we were stuck with a 2.6 million dollar bill.

The Governor’s actions with respect to the ISaveRX program, and also with respect to agency efficiency initiatives.

The violation of the Governor -- by the Governor of state and federal law regarding the hiring and firing of state employees. And that of course was detailed in the report from the Inspector General of the Executive Ethics Commission.

So this resolution would say that under the totality of the evidence, some or all of these acts of the Governor constitute a pattern of abuse of power, and in the opinion of this committee we believe that this abuse of power warrants impeachment and trial, removal from office as Governor, and disqualification to hold any public office of this state in the future.

Mr. Lang has moved that we add this as an addendum to the report. Is there leave? Leave is granted.

Representative Black.
REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Thank you, Madam Chair. An inquiry of the chair if I might before we vote on that. It has nothing to do with the motion before us.

I would ask the Chair, I don't know if Mr. Adam will come back in the room, and there certainly isn't time for a subpoena. But if he is willing, could we swear him in and ask a few questions? I am very, very confused as to just what Mr. Adam's role is in this process.

You have been very fair, Madam Chair, he has questioned witnesses, he has appeared with the governor at various press conferences, he approached Senator Burris, and I didn't get -- I never got an answer. I don't understand what his role is in this process.

Now he may not come back and my question may be moot. But if he does come back would the chair be willing to accept my inquiry as to whether he would be sworn and answer those questions?

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: We'll take that question under advice. Mr. Adam and Mr. Genson have both left the hearing room, and it's my understanding that they've left for the day, they are not planning to
come back. But remember that we have talked about --

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: I thank you for
letting me make the inquiry, because there are things
I simply don't understand.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: And if we reconstitute
this committee in the next General Assembly and if we
were to do that, I think one of the items we might
want to undertake is precisely the examination you are
suggesting.

Shall we hear now -- Representative Durkin moves
that the committee adopt the final report of the
committee with the amendment from Representative Lang,
and that includes the article of impeachment. And on
that motion, Representative Durkin.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: Yes. Madam Chairman,
I just want to just take a few moments just to thank
the men and women on this committee, and particularly
our staff, the hard work they put in for the past
month.

None of us take any great joy in being here.
This is a very sad moment in this state's history.
But we all recognize at the same time that when we
took an oath, that we're going to follow the law. We
are the directors, we're part of the board that's
trying to oversee the operations of this state, and we have an executive, chief executive officer who has run amok.

It's unfortunate we're here, but we heard some of very I think troubling evidence and testimony. And starting with the first day when Mr. Ellis went through the allegations, you know, allegation by allegation what was in the criminal affidavit. To me you look at each one of those, the auctioning off of the United States Senate seat, extortion of the Chicago Tribune, the extortion of Children's Memorial Hospital, and the contributions that were required in exchange for the signing of legislation regarding the horse racing industry is shocking. It's not something that anyone would tolerate in any circumstance in any form, and we are not going to tolerate it here in the state of Illinois.

We've heard plenty of evidence also regarding the Governor's actions regarding abuse of power, going around the legislative process and a number of issues. And also issues regarding the hiring and firing practices of the state. I look at this as a whole, and we had an opportunity to look at it as a whole. And I think basically the document which we produced,
which is the record, speaks for itself.

Now mind you, we've given the Governor and his
counsel ample opportunity to participate in these
proceedings. I've heard issues regarding lack of due
process. Mr. Genson has had the opportunity to
question witnesses. We have given him the opportunity
to bring in witnesses. We've allowed him if he
chooses to do so to subpoena witnesses. We've asked
him whether his client, the Governor, would
participate, and each time he stated no.

At the beginning of these proceedings I stated
that the function of the House of Representatives in
this process is similar to a grand jury. We gather
the evidence and we try to determine whether or not
there is cause to send charges which go to some type
of forum for a trial.

And I will say that Mr. Genson in all his times
as a criminal defense attorney, I find it -- no one of
that nature is allowed access to the grand jury. No
one is allowed the ability to cross-examine witnesses.
No one in that capacity is allowed to subpoena
witnesses or bring defense or mitigation witnesses.

So I am very satisfied that we have met all
notions of due process.
But I will just state that there has been tremendous work that's been done by this committee, but it's extremely important. A lot of us sacrificed our holidays, but we were glad to do it and so were our staff.

But I'm glad that we're here and we're doing what is right for the people of the state of Illinois. And I am prepared to vote in favor of the resolution that we go to the full House stating that the Governor has committed impeachable acts.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Thank you, Representative Durkin.

Representative Durkin moves adoption of the committee report with the articles as an addendum. One possibility is that as we vote, and we will vote orally, and we'll be asked to sign the document, each member may choose to in a couple of sentences express whatever he or she might like to express. Otherwise of course if people want to talk now they may.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Just one procedural question. If you could enlighten me, keep in mind I'm just a poor country boy
trying to keep up with this process and procedure as best I can. Could someone enlighten me as to why the preliminary report was released at 9 a.m. this morning prior to any committee vote, prior to the committee even actually sitting down and being able to read the report? That is something I simply don't understand. Why was that done? Is there a particular reason I'm not able to focus on?

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: This was a proposed draft, Representative, and it's important I think for the people of the state to have an idea of what it is we're working on. It was a draft seen twice by every member of this committee.

I think the goal of transparency, the goal of accountability, the ability of the members of the full House to have at least 24 hours to digest the likely contents of a report approved by this committee warranted their opportunity to see the proposed draft in advance.

And I haven't heard from anybody that they were sorry to have a look at it, and I think that the goal of transparency in government is one that we should all applaud.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Well, don't
misunderstand my remarks, I'm not the least bit upset.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Good.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: -- that we got to read it. I'm just simply trying to understand why the committee did not convene at 8 a.m. as we were originally told we would, review the report, and then vote to accept the preliminary report. That would have been equally as transparent, would it not?

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Actually the idea of the 8:00 meeting today was to look at the draft articles, rather than to look again at the report. And I would remind you that we had hoped to hear better news from the federal court this afternoon. If we had heard this afternoon that we could have access to those four audio tapes today or tomorrow, we would not have wanted to vote on the report until such time as we had heard them. So the timing just didn't work.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Well, I appreciate the opportunity to ask the question. I appreciate your answer. I have no quarrel with making this public at least 24 hours in advance, I do thank you for that. I just thought we would have perhaps been better served to have an opportunity to comment as individual
members within the committee on the report. When we were called here Sunday, unless I misunderstood the direction was we weren't even supposed to talk among ourselves. I was in the cone of silence. With a numbered --

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: You could never be in the cone of silence.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: It worked, it worked Sunday. I had a numbered copy. I had to show my birth certificate to get in the room and pledge on my grandchildren that I would not abscond with the report. But all is well I guess that ends well. I was just curious. I was not used to that procedure.

But I do certainly agree with you that I'm glad it's out there, I'm glad the press and the public and the fellow members of the House have had a chance to see it. And I'm not afraid to admit I learn something down here every day, Madam Chairperson, especially from you. You have been my idol for many years.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Clerk, call the roll.

THE CLERK: Currie.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: I vote aye. And I, too, would commend the staff. They've done an amazing job, pulled away from their family and friends over the
holidays, and I have to commend the members of this committee as well.

I think we have worked in a fully bipartisan cooperative fashion, and I appreciate the contributions of each and every one of you. This is a very sad day in the state of Illinois. To undo the results of a fair, open and free democratic election is a grave responsibility.

I think there's no question that the totality of the evidence before us, whether the Governor committed a criminal act or not, its very language suggests that he was willing, that he was willing to talk about the benefits of the public should be used for his own personal benefit rather than for the public good, and there's no question that his excessive use of authority in respect to the Joint Committee, in respect to flu vaccines and the other items, the totality of the evidence clearly suggests that this is an individual who is not fit to be Governor of the state of Illinois. And I vote yes.

THE CLERK: Durkin.

REPRESENTATIVE DURKIN: And I would again, the comments that I previously made, I'm not going to repeat them, but I want the public to know that this
was a bipartisan effort. We did have our moments, Representative Currie and I did have some moments, but that's part of the process.

And part of the process is that we find a common ground on certain procedural and factual issues. But I have the utmost respect for Chairperson Currie, but also David Ellis and Matt O'Shea, our lawyers who spent many time away from their families.

But again this was a tough, tough assignment, but we made commitments to our constituents a few years back to represent their interests, and this has been the highest calling that we've had, that I have had, and I hope that we won't go down this road again any time in the future. My vote is yes.

THE CLERK: Acevedo.

REPRESENTATIVE ACEVEDO: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the committee.

I, too, want to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle for the tremendous job they've done for us, and I want to thank my colleagues, all 21 of you to allow me to spend the holidays with you.

The Governor has lost both trust in the general public and his colleagues in government and is simply unable to govern. It is our responsibility as elected
representatives to the people of Illinois to put this awful chapter behind us and move forward with the agenda to do the work of the people. The people of Illinois deserve much better from their elected leaders.

Based on the evidence, it is clear to me that the Governor has acted in a manner inconsistent with the Illinois Constitution and beyond his lawful scope as Governor. Moreover, his conduct in this matter continues to be a deterrent to the work of the people, important work the people of the state of Illinois need to do on behalf of the citizens of Illinois.

For this reason I will vote yes on the articles of impeachment against Governor Blagojevich.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: Bassi.

REPRESENTATIVE BASSI: Thank you.

Impeachment is a remedial proceeding to protect the public from an officer who has abused his position of trust. We have seen a pattern of abuse in power that has gone on since January of '03. We've seen neglect of duty.

The Governor has been in his office more in the last three weeks than he's been there in the last six years. There's been an encroachment on the
legislators' prerogatives as evidenced by what's happened with JCAR, with FamilyCare, the approval that came without legislative -- without legislative approval and without funding source. Evidence of corruption, thanks to his 25,000 dollar club. There's been a betrayal of trust.

This Governor ran as a reformer, as a champion of ethics, and then provided obvious hiring malfeasance within his office. He has -- we've seen evidence of his exceeding his constitutional bounds of office.

There is a totality of evidence that has resulted in absolute cause for impeachment. Holding office is a privilege and not a right. I vote yes.

THE CLERK: Bellock.

REPRESENTATIVE BELLOCK: Thank you very much. I'd like to thank Madam Chairman and Representative Durkin and all the members of the committee and the staff, too, for all the wonderful work they did. I think that it has been a true action of a bipartisan committee, more than I've ever seen here in the last ten years I've been here.

I think history will probably be the final judge of the actions that have taken place by this committee today and tomorrow. Impeachment has been rarely
invoked in Illinois and really throughout the rest of the United States, and should only be reserved for egregious acts of misconduct.

The testimony we have heard over the last couple of weeks has been accurately reported in the report before us, and it shows a totality of evidence that demonstrates I think clearly as to a cause abuse of power.

I hope the actions that we take here today and hence forward will start the process to regain the trust and the confidence of the people in Illinois back in our government, because that's really what this is all about. Thank you. I vote yes.

THE CLERK: Black.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: Thank you very much. My fellow members of the committee, fellow members of the House, let me thank staff. It goes without saying that I don't know how this place would work without our staff.

I'm going to take a different tact if I might. It's a privilege to work with all of you, a privilege I never, ever take for granted, not one single day that I'm privileged to serve in this body. But I'm going to take a different tact.
I don't think this is a sad day for Illinois. I think it's a good, glad, happy day for Illinois, because it points out that nobody is above the law and anybody will be held accountable for their actions. It may take too long, and there have been egregious abuses if what we read, if half of what we read is true.

And I hope the message is received by all those in office and all those who will seek office in the future. Enough is enough. No more.

And to the people of the state of Illinois, I think your charge is simple. Hold each of us accountable, become informed voters, and do not tolerate what has been often winked at in this state. We make a move forward I think today and I hope everyone gets the message. And I vote yes.

THE CLERK: Bost.

REPRESENTATIVE BOST: Thank you. Members of the committee, thank you for working together as we have over these holidays. When we first came in I said that none of us believed when we took our oath of office that we would ever be taking a vote like this, or at least we hoped we wouldn't have to.

Looking at the move forward with the resolution,
and many of -- I was criticized by many on the 7th of July of 2007 when I asked for a committee to be formed to check into these allegations, but all but about three of these actually date back prior to that.

I agree with Representative Black in fact that it is a good day in the fact that we're moving forward. It is a sad day in the fact that we have to do this. None of us take this job lightly. And if you'll remember also during this hearing I read actually the oath of office of the Governor of the state of Illinois. If these allegations which we've shown proof by several ways are factual, he has snubbed his nose at that oath of office, and therefore snubbed his nose at the people and the Constitution. And it hurts tremendously to know that we have a chief executive officer that can't realize the pain that his actions have caused the state of Illinois.

That being said, my vote is definitely yes.

THE CLERK: Davis.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I want to say that I have -- I am certainly very grateful to David Ellis, the attorney, to our chairman, because every piece of evidence that we wanted, they made every attempt to make sure we got an
opportunity to review.

Many of us read articles in the newspaper or we heard rumors, but sitting on this committee we were able to view documents, to hear testimony, and to know that a great deal of those rumors were actually true.

The state of Illinois operates under democracy, it does not operate under a dictatorship. Having one corrupt leader at the top makes all people think we must be a part of it if we don't attempt to solve it.

I think talking to my colleagues and meeting with each one of you from each side of the aisle, missing our families on the holiday, I think we've come up with a document that serves the state of Illinois very well. We cannot allow the corruption, we cannot allow the misappropriation of our funds, we cannot allow the discrimination in employment to continue. I vote yes.

THE CLERK: Eddy.

REPRESENTATIVE EDDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I also want to thank everyone, that it's been a true pleasure and a privilege to work with the folks who have paid attention, have studied and taken their responsibility of constitutional duty seriously. I'll never forget the experience and the opportunity to do that.
We are a government of laws and not of men. And this process which was written into the state Constitution, probably by those who had hoped it would never have to be used, has been followed. And that process has resulted I believe in a very good, solid document and report, one that I'm happy to have had the opportunity to be involved with.

This Governor has clearly behaved on multiple occasions and in multiple situations in a manner that demonstrates clearly he is unfit to govern. The hard working people of the state of Illinois deserve public servants, not self-servants.

It's our responsibility when someone abuses their power to this end to step in and do something that may be unpleasant and difficult. But I'm proud to have been part of the group that took on that responsibility so well.

My vote is yes.

THE CLERK: Flowers.

REPRESENTATIVE FLOWERS: Thank you. Madam Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you and the other members of this committee, and I also would like to thank Dave Ellis and the rest of the staff for putting all this together and the time
and the tenacity that we have dwelled into this situation.

This is a sad day here in the state of Illinois. It's unfortunate that it had to get to this. It's unfortunate that the Governor, and he has not been found guilty of a crime, he is still innocent until proven guilty, I would have appreciated if the Governor could have just merely stepped aside so we would not have been made the laughing stock of the country. This today is about the restoration of the power back to the people of the state of Illinois.

And with that being said, Madam Chairman, I would like to add my aye vote.

THE CLERK: Franks.

REPRESENTATIVE FRANKS: When the Governor was arrested I thought I'd have a different response, a different feeling. I've been a vocal critic for quite some time, but I didn't feel any joy at that time. I felt I guess ashamed of what our government has become and the culture of corruption that's seized the state.

But I'd say serving on this committee has been one of my proudest moments as a legislator, and I believe today's a great day. Today is the day that we begin to give back to democracy and the government
back to the citizens of the state of Illinois. It's been a long time coming, it's been much too long.

We know that Rod Blagojevich has been much more comfortable being the problem rather than the solution. He has been AWOL and derelict in his duties. He has abused his powers and he's brought shame to our great state. Former New York Governor Spitzer was a hypocrite, and when exposed he did the honorable thing for the benefit of New York and he resigned.

And we know that Rod Blagojevich will spend much of the next year fighting his pending indictment. He's mortally wounded politically and cannot lead our state. His political life is over.

We saw at these hearings that the only way that Rod Blagojevich can communicate with the legislature is through his criminal attorneys. He has shown little interest in actually governing. Issuing press releases with no follow-up is not governing, it's pandering. Calling special session after special session without getting any results is just floundering.

I believe that Rod Blagojevich is a liar. I also believe he's a thief. I think he's stolen the public
trust. He has knowingly violated state procurement laws. He has knowingly violated state ethics laws. He has willfully violated court orders. He has driven our state to the edge of the abyss.

Perhaps Rod Blagojevich will soon be convicted of various crimes, ranging from extortion to selling public assets for personal gain.

But that's not our concern at this time. Our concern is solely whether Rod Blagojevich can continue to lead this state. And that answer is as obvious and it's as notorious as his 10,000 dollar commute on the state planes to Springfield.

It's as obvious as the millions lost on the flu vaccine debacle where Rod Blagojevich knew, where he knew that we did not need those vaccines, he knew that they could not be brought into this state, yet he still spent millions of our dollars to get that.

It's as obvious as the 60 million dollars in efficiency initiatives where he gave large campaign contributors no bid contracts.

It's as obvious as the one million dollars he gave to the Loop Lab School which had no assets, no faculty, no students, and that money was used to purchase a condominium from a mole at the Tony Rezko...
trial.

It's as obvious as the workers that can't get jobs because we can't pass a capital bill because no one trusts the Governor, so we can't enter into any agreements.

It's as obvious as the guilty plea of Ali Ata who said he paid 50,000 dollars and purchased his state job.

It's as obvious as the guilty plea of Joe Cari when he was being shook down for campaign cash.

It's as obvious as the conviction at the Tony Rezko trial where he was complicit in selling state jobs.

It's as obvious as his chief of staff, his Deputy Governor and his lawyer's resignations.

The Governor ought to today before the whole House votes tomorrow resign, and he should spare himself the further indignity of being the only Governor in Illinois history to be impeached.

I know he wouldn't do it for the public; everything he's done has been for him. But if he doesn't resign, this committee has done exemplary work and I'm so proud of them. And I know that none of us will rest until he's impeached. I vote aye.
THE CLERK:  Fritchey.

REPRESENTATIVE FRITCHEY:  Let me echo the
thanks of the prior speakers to the members of the
committee and to members of the staff.  They've done a
tremendous job.

It is no surprise to anybody here that I've had
my differences with the Governor for years now.  It
was a unique difference for me to have, in as much as
he's not only my constituent, but my predecessor in my
House seat.

But there are some absolutes regardless of any
circumstances that we find ourselves in.  One of those
 absolutes is the truism that no man is above the law.
What we've seen is what happens when a man believes he
is above the law.  We're not bound to follow those
laws.

As has been adduced by this committee and the
testimony given to us, when a man believes that he is
above the law, it has ramifications from social
service providers in our neighborhoods to the halls of
the United States Senate.  When a man believes that
he's above the law, others suffer because of his
belief.

This institution I revere and I continue to do so
more with every day that I've been here. The institution has suffered under a Blagojevich administration. Not because of political differences, not because of policy differences, because of a Governor who sought to govern not on behalf of the people that trusted him and elected him, but to govern on his own benefit.

We have been pitted against each other, we have had chambers pitted against each other. We've had a state suffer in the interim. Whether it's a capital bill, whether it's economic recovery, at a time when people are being forced out of their jobs and out of their homes, we are spending time and energy dealing with the transgressions of the Governor, rather than getting those people back to work and getting our economy back on track.

Representative Flowers stated that the Governor is not guilty of a crime, and I would submit that while I believe he is and will be found to be, that's not our job. But he is guilty in my opinion of something far worse. He is guilty of violating the public trust of 13 million men and women who believed in him and trusted upon him and relied upon him to lead our state for their benefit, not for his.
When I cast my vote I'm not casting a vote so much against Rod Blagojevich, it's for the people of the state of Illinois. These are historic times, and I assure you that each and every one of us on this committee and at this General Assembly and indeed across the country will likely never forget these times, at least as long as we may live.

But as we put this chapter into history, I would urge my colleagues that we must join not only in putting this behind us, but in focusing on the future.

Ladies and gentlemen, my colleagues, we have a lot of work to do. Public confidence in state government is not damaged, it's shattered. We have not let them down, we are taking the first step toward restoring that public confidence. But it's going to be a long journey. We must work day and night, every day, to get public confidence back into state government.

I've said repeatedly that the overwhelming majority of my colleagues are hard working and good and decent men and women that want to do the right things for the people that sent them here. Now more than ever we have to step up and reaffirm that duty and reaffirm that belief, both in Springfield and when
we all go back to our districts to tell the people of Illinois, we have heard you, we are fighting for you, and we will continue to do so every day. To the people of Illinois, please don’t judge us for the bad acts of one man and one administration. We have been there for you and we will continue to be there for you.

Madam Chairman, it is with a sad heart but with sincere optimism for the future of our state that I vote yes.

THE CLERK: Hamos.

REPRESENTATIVE HAMOS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I join the chorus of others in thanking you and Dave Ellis and Mr. Durkin in a bipartisan and cooperative effort.

During these proceedings we have had a chance to reflect on the Illinois Constitution. And I think at times I have been concerned about the vagueness of the Illinois Constitution in not setting forth a specific standard for impeachment. And that’s why it became a major responsibility for 21 people here to define that standard. And to me the standard became to be thorough, thoughtful, and fair.
Perhaps because I along with my family escaped from a totalitarian country, I am at times cautious about expanding the power of government. But I think -- and that's why I actually have spoken often about the precedent that we are setting here today that would have to survive the generations.

We have not had an impeachment in Illinois for 176 years, and I sincerely hope that we will not have to have another impeachment for another 176 years. And to me this is a sad and historic day. Sad, not because we are taking an action that is the responsibility of the Illinois legislature, but sad because we have a Governor who has betrayed the public trust.

And Madam Chair, with that I vote aye.

THE CLERK: Hannig.

MR. HANNIG: Yes, thank you, Madam Chairman.

Let me also applaud the Chairman, the Spokesman and the staff for the good work that they've done as well. The framers of the Constitution gave us powers and duties, and they gave the greatest powers and the greatest duties to the Governor. And I think it's unfortunate that we're here today to examine the shortfalls and the failings of this Governor.
But we have duties as members of the legislature to consider what is best for the state of Illinois. And I think we've been here many days, we've heard much evidence, we've asked a lot of questions, and in my mind it's just simply a case where the evidence is overwhelming. And it seems to me that it's anything -- it seems to me that there's no choice but to vote to impeach this Governor.

And so, Madam Chairman, ladies and gentlemen,

it's a difficult task I think to overturn an election,
it's a difficult task to remove someone from office,
but indeed we have that obligation as members of the legislature, and we need to live up to our obligations. And so I vote aye.

THE CLERK: Howard.

REPRESENTATIVE HOWARD: Yes, thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

I, too, am certainly very appreciate to my colleagues and to our staff for having been willing to assume this awesome responsibility.

When I made my opening remarks before this committee I said that I hoped that the proceedings would be fair and impartial. And after days and days of testimony, and reams of documents, I believe that
this has been the case. It has been fair, and it has been impartial.

The one quandary that I've had throughout this proceeding has been that I am aware that there are many in the districts that I represent and beyond who believe that this Governor is a saint, and they believe it because of the health care program expansions and because of the free rides to seniors. And they tell me that they think those are great things and wonder why we are even doing this.

While I think those programs are worthy as well, I think that the end does not justify the means. In fact, many, many rules have been broken. Many laws have been broken. And that's what we have to be concerned with.

Therefore, as has been the case with everyone speaking before me, I believe that we should in fact pass this matter over to the Senate. I vote aye.

Thank you.

THE CLERK: Lang.

REPRESENTATIVE LANG: Thank you. Let me echo what's been said by many of my colleagues, to Representative Currie, you've done an outstanding job shepherding this committee through these troubled
waters.

Representative Durkin, you're to be commended as well. And to our staffs, particularly David Ellis and all the other staff members on both sides of the aisle. We could not have finished this process without you.

This is a grave and sobering time for the members of this committee. I want to thank all the members of this committee for their diligence, but also those members of the House who are with us today who are not on the committee who are just as invested in this process as we are, just as concerned about the present and future of the state of Illinois as we are, and just as concerned about the rule of law as we are.

The Governor took a constitutional oath, as every elected official does and one of our questions, probably the most important question we had to answer was has the Governor violated his constitutional oath? There's been a good amount of debate in this committee, some of it coming from Mr. Genson, relative to the issue of what standard we should hold that question to.

The Constitution doesn't refer to clear and convincing evidence, it doesn't refer to probable
cause, it doesn't refer to a preponderance of the evidence. It refers to one word, and that word is cause.

Whatever cause is to the members of this committee and tomorrow to the members of the House, that's what cause is.

But strangely enough, under any standard of proof, this report should be adopted. Whether we use Mr. Genson's strongest words as to what the standard of proof ought to be, the proof adduced in this committee over the last several weeks is well sufficient to satisfy any standard of proof he would put to it.

The Governor's violated his oath in all of the ways enumerated in the resolution. The Governor has been involved in an abuse of power well beyond that contemplated by the many members of the House who have been discussing this issue privately for months. You've all heard members of the House talk about impeachment.

But I don't think any of us contemplated that we could put a document together that would enumerate seven or eight or nine or ten different grounds, each of which might be grounds for impeachment in and of
This has never been about the competence of the Governor, because if it was about competence, impeachment would be rampant. Not every public official is competent. We can't hold people to that standard once they're elected by the people of our districts or of our state. It can't even be about whether we like the guy.

It has to be about what the Constitution says, has the Governor violated his constitutional oath, and do we have sufficient proof.

The document that was -- is about to be approved is a document that evidences that abuse of power over and over and over again.

And it reminds me of a movie I just saw, I saw the movie Frost/Nixon that talked about the interviews of David Frost with Richard Nixon. And at the very fourth and last interview Mr. Frost cornered Mr. Nixon into saying he may have done something wrong. And then he said, "So are you admitting you've done something wrong?" And Mr. Nixon said, "When the President does it, it's not wrong."

I think that's the feeling that the Governor of the state of Illinois has about the Constitution, the
laws and the people of the state of Illinois. We must return our government to our people and we must restore the faith in our people that our government is here to serve them honestly and openly.

And I'm proud to join my colleagues in voting aye.

THE CLERK: Mautino.

REPRESENTATIVE MAUTINO: Thank you. I'd like to also add my compliments to Representative Durkin who represents the minority questions very well, and Representative Currie for her fair handling of the committee.

Over the past few weeks we have taken in thousands of pages of documents of information. I think the report has been fairly presented and qualified by hours of testimony and documents that we'll forward to the Senate.

This has been a particularly difficult process for the reason that we have had not only the impeachment process going on but simultaneously a criminal case, which sometimes impeded the ability to get information that we would have liked to have. Because there are some members who would like to have those tapes. Further down the road we may actually be
able to produce those.

But the report itself contains volumes which are qualified and which give a strength and a confidence to go forward with the move of impeaching the Governor in the state of Illinois. And with that I vote aye.

THE CLERK: Rose.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSE: Thank you. I, too, share a fondness and a warm thanks to all the staff and everyone who has participated in this. And before I begin I just want to say I find it wonderful that we've had so many citizens come here and sit and listen and watch online. We've seen families bring their kids here. And I hope no matter what happens in the next couple days, that that level of interest in all of state government stays where it has been.

With that said, I had hoped that Mr. Adam would have stuck around, because Representative Howard made a note that is not lost on me. Mr. Adam raised the issue of health care at one point in time in the debate.

And while the report speaks for itself, it mentions many, many, many acts of the Governor that I find, and it sounds like most of my colleagues on this committee find, rise to the level of impeachment
conducted.

Those acts have very real consequences on the people of Illinois, and quite frankly have jeopardized the health and safety of the citizens of our state. And whether it's the conduct related to the Health Facilities Planning Board, the decisions about where medical care will be made available or not available, the false promises of flu vaccine, pharmacy inspections that were conducted by people who weren't even licensed to conduct pharmacy inspections in Illinois, it all goes to the heart of what we do as elected officials, and that's to protect citizens.

I need not mention as well the repugnance of holding funding for Children's Memorial Hospital hostage in return for campaign contributions. It all goes to that level, the fundamental level of what we do, which is to protect citizens.

Before I conclude I want to touch briefly on something Representative Lang mentioned, and that is that we are free to adopt whatever standards and rules we wish as individual members of this committee and the House.

I want to specifically note that while Mr. Genson advocated for a particular standard, he himself in
testimony throughout the testimony has indicated that we're free to do whatever we want. "It's up to each and every one of you", quoting him now, "to decide whether it's enough and whether it's time, and decide whether in fact it is a basis for impeachment and whether in fact what the standard you have to look at is not a visceral standard but a standard you have to determine." He makes other comments like that throughout the record.

He's also asked us in defense of the Governor to look at unsworn documents. I reject that election. We have sworn documents to look at. We have sworn testimony to look at. I'm not sure why we would want to look at things that aren't sworn.

To this point in time the Governor's office and Mr. Genson and Mr. Adam, Jr. have failed to produce a document that I've requested related to the downgrading of the state's debt service and -- or excuse me, the state's bond rating.

The bottom line is this. They've asked us to do and listen to them. I have listened to them but I don't find them frankly credible.

And I'll close with one last fact from the testimony, and this is from the sworn affidavit which
goes right to the -- Mr. Genson who urged our
committee to reject the wiretap evidence as just
jabbering. I don't know if that's a direct quote, but
it's pretty close.

Page 66 of the affidavit, paragraph 104. On
November 11th, 2008, Rod Blagojevich talked with John
Harris about the Senate seat. Rod Blagojevich
suggested starting a 501(c)(4) organization and
going his, and this is a parenthetical reference to
his belief to be the President-elect's friend Warren
Buffett or some of those guys to help on something
like that. Mr. Harris, the Governor's chief of staff,
said, "What, for you?" Governor Blagojevich replied,
"Yeah."

It frankly doesn't get much clearer than that,
hardly jabbering.

So with that I will simply conclude by stating
that the evidence is overwhelmingly damning. And with
that I vote aye.

THE CLERK: Sacia.

REPRESENTATIVE SACIA: Thank you, Madam
Chairman.

Ladies and gentlemen, when your last name begins
with S and you vote alphabetically, anything and
everything I had to say has been said, in some cases several times. And so it is with profound respect and admiration for all of you, and certainly for staff, that I vote aye. Thank you.

THE CLERK: Tracy.

REPRESENTATIVE TRACY: As always, Representative Sacia's a tough act to follow, and I'm even further down the line. I think we mentioned that we had great respect for all of our colleagues when we began this process, and I must say my level of respect for each and every one of our representatives and our staff that have helped so much in generating reams of information and reams of volume, I think perhaps we generated about a thousand pages worth of print per day of our hearings. I mean it's just been volumes and volumes.

And of course it was a unique timeframe because with the holidays and all, while we wanted to move thoroughly and expeditiously, and we had problems with getting people to come testify and the like with the way the holidays fell and all that.

So we've tried to move as well as we could, and as I said, it's just been incredible the amount of information. Most of us carry the reams of paper in a
portable running wheeled case these days. But we have been thorough and we have been fair and it has been an honor to serve with all of these colleagues.

And I must admit when Representative Franks coined the phrase that we’re on a financial abyss in the state, while we were going to hearings and listening to testimony and during breaks, we would answer phone calls. And like many of my colleagues I have gotten calls from the financial straits of nursing homes and dentists who are waiting Medicaid reimbursement.

And after listening to the volumes of testimony about the abuse of money spent within this state, it was just -- it's extremely disheartening. But certainly we have seen vast and pervasive acts across so many different agencies.

But I must say that this state government is so much more than one person. It's the people of the state of Illinois, the 13 million people that we all of us, the constitutional officers and us legislators, we legislators, took an oath to uphold the Constitution of Illinois and to serve the citizens of Illinois to the best of our ability.

And I don't believe this one person, our
Governor, has done this. The pervasive acts of misconduct are so overwhelmingly and so pervasive that we can’t hardly reach any other conclusion. And we’ve reached out, we’ve allowed the Governor to be present, we’ve bent over backwards to make this a fair process, and we’ve had no evidence to the contrary brought before us.

And that’s -- it’s a very sad thing that there’s nothing to offer in defense of these acts.

And but I must say that when I visited with staff of this state and in the different agencies, when you’re trying to work with them to figure out, whether it be the Comptroller’s office or Public Health and the rank and file workers of this state are trying very hard to make this state continue to operate.

And with that I know that there will be a brighter day for the state of Illinois. I appreciate the indulgence of the committee chair in allowing us to bring in Mr. Roland Burris, General Burris, who will most likely be our United States Senator.

Because we can’t ignore the fact that the appointment of this U.S. Senate seat was so intertwined with the reason that we’re here to try to see if there’s cause for impeachment, that I think the
people of Illinois want very much everything answered. They want answers. They want to believe that we are above reproach and that their U.S. Senator is above reproach.

And so I appreciate that indulgence, because I think it completes so much of our process, because it was so intertwined.

And with that as I said, it's overwhelmingly in my mind that we should vote aye for this report. And I join in my colleagues in voting aye.

THE CLERK: Turner.

REPRESENTATIVE TURNER: Thank you, Madam Chairman, and Co-chair Durkin. To the staff, I like other speakers mentioned, I'm proud of you, the work that you've done. You're to be complimented for the long hours that have been involved here.

28 years ago when I was elected to the General Assembly, at that time I had a record that I used to walk around the state saying that I was the youngest African American male elected to serve the state government. It was a record that stood for a few years, and then Cook County President Todd Stroger broke that record.

And so records are meant to be broken. It
happens all the time in the NFL, it happens in the NBA. To be 28 years later serving on this committee, I'm hoping that this is a record that does not get broken, that we do not have to have another impeachment committee. And I can only pray that Art Turner's name will be here with the other 20 people. But 177 years from now there will be no need for an impeachment committee.

I was concerned in this process as some of the members have said earlier in terms of the vagueness of the process, there is no clear definition. One of the things that concerned me were the issues that we're looking at in terms of the abuse of power. It starts back I think looking at some of the documentation we're talking about 2003. We're in 2009 now.

So my question to my colleagues is that hopefully we will do something, and I think Representative Fritchey was on the right track with House Bill 1 in terms of trying to bring about some transparency, try to make us a much more ethical body. Not to say that we're not, but just to make certain that the public at least felt that we were doing the right thing.

I would hope that the legislature, that we make certain that this thing doesn't go five years. Five
years of abuse in this state has led to four billion dollars worth of debt sitting on the Comptroller's desk today, which means there are a number of people in this state who can't pay their mortgage because we have not been able to do our work.

There are people who are unemployed, there's substance abuse providers who are not being able to do their duties, mental health providers who are not able to do it. And I can go on and on in terms of the social service arena. Even businesses in this state have suffered as a result of these abuses that have been brought out over the last couple of weeks.

I would only hope that the legislature would not wait five years to address these abuses. Because in the long run, it's the people of this state who have suffered, and I can only tell you because I represent some of the poorest of them. They have truly been victimized by this process.

But I want to assure them that the members of this committee have done a great job, that the facts are there, and we can only say that it will be a better day, it has been a better day, hopefully it will start today. And I vote aye.

CHAIRWOMAN CURRIE: On a vote of 21 voting
yes, none voting no, none voting present, the motion is adopted and we will enter it into the record as Committee Exhibit Number 71, the final report of the committee with the resolution, including the articles, and Representation Durkin now moves that the committee stand adjourned. All in favor say aye, opposed no. The ayes have it and the committee stands adjourned.
CERTIFICATE

I, Susan Freeman, affiliated with Capitol Reporting Service, Inc., do hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the foregoing proceedings; and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.

I further certify that I am in no way associated with or related to any of the parties or attorneys involved herein, nor am I financially interested in the action.

/S/ Susan Freeman
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 084-001342
Registered Professional Reporter
and Notary Public

Dated this 9th day of January, A.D., 2009,
at Springfield, Illinois.