

What You Don't Know Will Shock You!

The Other Side of Bruce Rauner

- ▶ Why his failure to reform the Illinois pension system will leave retirees cold — and *very hungry* . . .
- ▶ His quiet deal with Rahm Emanuel that made both men *very rich* . . .
- ▶ The *real* reason he forced you to pay for abortions in Illinois . . .
- ▶ How declaring Illinois a “sanctuary state” for our 450,000 illegal aliens threatens your neighborhood . . .
- ▶ How the “Mayor Rahm–Gov. Bruce” Chicago public school bailout took money from your children’s (and grandchildren’s) schools . . . *and raised your property taxes!*
- ▶ His poor leadership raised your state income taxes by almost a third. Your property taxes are out of control.
- ▶ Why he simply can’t win in the general election—against *any Democrat* . . .
- ▶ Can Jeanne Ives — a mom, a soldier, a state legislator — beat him in the primary? Why Democrats fear Jeanne Ives in the fall while they only laugh at Rauner.



ISBN 978-0-89803-183-6



9 780898 031836

\$1.95

Paid for by Ives For Illinois – Governor.

P.O. Box 1504, Wheaton, IL 60187 • <http://ivesforillinois.com>

The Governor You Don't Know

THE OTHER SIDE OF BRUCE RAUNER



by Chris Cleveland

Chairman, Chicago Republican Party

Foreword by State Representative Tom Morrison

The Governor You Don't Know

The Governor You Don't Know

The Other Side of Bruce Rauner

by

Chris Cleveland

Jameson Books, Inc.
Ottawa, Illinois

Contents

Foreword	vii
by Tom Morrison	
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: The Rauner Promise	3
Chapter 2: Rahm and Bill . . . and Bruce: The Deal That Made Them All Rich	6
Chapter 3: Conservatives Are Out and the Wife Is In.	9
Chapter 4: The Chicago Schools Bailout Hurt Your Kids	16
Chapter 5: Sanctuary State and Your New Neighbors.	19
Chapter 6: No Budget for You	23
Chapter 7: Arrogance	28
Chapter 8: Money Can't Buy You Love	32
Chapter 9: The Way Forward.	36

Permission is hereby granted to reproduce any part or all of this book until March 31, 2018

Copyright © 2018 by Chris Cleveland

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means after March 31, 2018, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

For information and other requests please write:

Jameson Books, Inc.
722 Columbus Street
P.O. Box 738, Ottawa
Illinois 61350

815-434-7905
800-426-1357 for mail and bulk orders.

Printed in the United States of America.

ISBN: 978-0-89803-183-6
0-89803-183-4

Foreword

by Tom Morrison,
Republican State Representative, 54th District

In the fall of 2014, I endorsed Bruce Rauner for governor because I believed that the alternative, another four years with Pat Quinn at the helm, would be unthinkable bad for Illinois. Some individuals inside and outside our party gave warnings about Bruce Rauner that should have been heeded. I reluctantly overlooked those red flags, tried to see some good in him and his positions with which I agreed, and hoped for the best. A lot of us did.

The candidate's rhetoric and campaign commercials then and now can be appealing to some who want to see a better Illinois; however, three years later, Rauner's own record has persuaded me conclusively that our party and the state must choose a much better leader—and now we can.

I've had a fairly close-up view to Governor Rauner—his handling of our state's agencies, budget and bill review, his relationships with legislative leaders along with rank-and-file General Assembly members, and his executive branch staff. In this book, you'll be taken behind the scenes as the author reviews the salient events that explain in detail why we are taking the extremely rare step of unseating an incumbent governor from our own party.

His challenger, whom I am fully supporting, is State Representative Jeanne Ives. She is a West Point graduate, economics major, former Army officer, suburban mother of five, former city council member, and three-term member of the Illinois General Assembly.

For the past five years, I've fought alongside Rep. Jeanne Ives in Springfield, Chicago, the suburbs and

Introduction

downstate as she has consistently and vigorously defended Illinois families, taxpayers and businesses—especially those who’ve been abused and ignored by Illinois’ bipartisan ruling class.

Both in and out of the public limelight, she has an unparalleled work ethic and unmatched commitment to an independent, conservative, reform-minded agenda.

Jeanne’s experience, capabilities, and character have made her a standout leader. Her deep knowledge and firm grasp of policy and its consequences put her head and shoulders above all of the other gubernatorial candidates. I’ve seen her defeat bad policies in the House of Representatives by preparing well and probing the right issues during floor debates. I’ve seen her work amicably on difficult issues with colleagues across the ideological spectrum—but without compromising on conservative principles.

As a Hillsdale College undergraduate, I had the privilege and pleasure of hearing many excellent speakers on campus. One really stood out: Lady Margaret Thatcher, former British Prime Minister, spoke on “The Moral Foundations of Society.” A transformational conservative leader and personal friend to President Ronald Reagan, Thatcher answered crises at home and abroad with integrity and resolve. The so-called “Iron Lady” earned the name because, as noted by historian Paul Johnson, “she was a ‘conviction’ politician, as opposed to a consensus one.”

We are fortunate to have our own “Iron Lady” here in Illinois. She will tell the truth and provide real leadership on the solutions that will transform our beloved but beleaguered state. For such a time as this Illinois needs Jeanne Ives as our next governor.

Please read this book and join our fight to save Illinois.

The lunch was at Nookies, a small diner in Lincoln Park. Bruce Rauner’s guy sat across the table from me doing the hard sell.

It was the spring of 2014, shortly before the Republican primary. Bruce was running for governor against three others. Bruce had the money and the others didn’t. He was saying the right things.

He wanted my endorsement and the backing of the Chicago Republican Party. Bruce’s guy, who was tough, intense and hyper-intelligent, wanted it bad. I said that Bruce should confront Mike Madigan, the state’s most important Democrat. Bruce’s guy agreed, strongly.

Still, I was troubled.

You see, Bruce was uncomfortably close to Rahm Emanuel, mayor of Chicago. He had nothing but liberal Republicans on his staff. His wife was a prominent Democrat. He wouldn’t talk about some conservative issues.

But along with many others, I set my concerns aside and backed Bruce full force. At that time I was running the operations of the Chicago Republican Party. Our team recruited a slate of candidates to run in the worst districts in the city, with one goal: to generate Republican volunteers to knock on doors and make calls.

And we did. We worked with the Rauner campaign to knock on a massive 263,000 doors in the city of Chicago alone. The effort bought us 15,000 more votes. And Bruce won.

I have never, ever, worked harder for a candidate than I did for Bruce Rauner.

And I have never, ever, made a bigger mistake.

This book tells the story of Bruce’s transformation from conservative to liberal. How he betrayed his own

Republican Party. How he became the first Republican governor to back taxpayer-subsidized abortions, a sanctuary state law, massive bailouts for Chicago public schools and big corporations. And how we got a 32 percent income tax increase because he couldn't hold his own party together.

Bruce now claims it's all Mike Madigan's fault. But no one forced him to sign all those bills. It's important for you to know the truth.

If you weren't aware of this, you are to be forgiven. If you're retired, working hard to support your family or just exhausted by the attacks on all Republicans today, how could you know what Gov. Rauner has done to us . . . to our party . . . to our beliefs?

My name is on this book, but its writing was a collaborative effort by conservative elected officials, activists and researchers. It expresses our disappointment with what Bruce Rauner has become, and our hope for what could be: a genuine conservative, Jeanne Ives, as governor of the State of Illinois.

Read this book and vote . . . *before it's too late.*

—Chris Cleveland
Chairman, Chicago Republican Party

Chapter 1: The Rauner Promise

Bruce Rauner was the first Republican elected as Illinois governor in 16 years because he offered fed-up voters a conservative agenda for true reform.

Sure, voters had had enough of Democrats with their never-ending corruption and failures, enough of the bungling incumbent, Pat Quinn, and enough of a state that was racing toward fiscal and economic blowout.

What Rauner seemed to offer was a clear, attractive and real path to fiscal responsibility, a friendlier business climate, a property tax freeze, and lower income taxes. He promised to lift the cap on charter schools and limit payouts on personal injury lawsuits. He promised a host of reforms for sales and gas taxes, education, workers' compensation, pensions, and on and on. The promises consisted of a 44-point "turnaround agenda," pledged in writing—a conservative's dream.

We were all so excited. Here was the antidote to the reckless spending and crippling regulations of the liberal agenda. He would, in short, shake up Springfield, bringing to bear his acumen as a successful businessman and as an outsider determined to at last challenge and overturn the old ways, the Illinois Way.

And the result? Failure. Stagnation. A state in more perilous shape than when Rauner first took office. None of those promises were fulfilled. Does any other elected official come to mind who has demonstrated such a long streak of unending losses? Of batting .000?

The writing was on the wall two years into his term. Because of the embarrassing failures, Rauner junked the 44-point agenda. In 2016, it had shrunk to a 5-point agenda. By then it included only workers' compensation reform, property tax freeze, education reform, pension reform and term limits.

We're still waiting.

In fact, we're even witnessing the opposite of some of the promises: Property taxes are growing six times faster than household incomes from 2008 to 2015, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. That's one reason for the continuing exodus of Illinois families. In fact, Rauner looked on helplessly as some members of his own party voted to override his veto of a Democrat-inspired income tax increase. This demonstrates, one can suppose, that Rauner was correct when he admitted that he wasn't in charge—not even of his own party, as the governor traditionally is.

Could any Republican governor have done any better? Rauner came into office as a political rookie, and he has been slow to learn the realities of governing a state of almost 13 million people. Can the people, especially the taxpayers, of Illinois afford to wait any longer as Rauner slowly climbs the learning curve?

National Review, a leading conservative magazine, seems to think not. It recently declared Rauner to be the “Worst Republican governor in America.” The magazine encapsulated it:

This much is clear: Illinois hardly could do worse. It suffers from one of the weakest economies in the nation, with the slowest personal-income growth, low labor-force participation, and distressing levels of manufacturing-job losses. Its tax burden is among the heaviest in the country. It has the lowest credit rating of any state (just a notch above junk-bond status) and the highest level of unfunded pension liabilities (about \$250 billion, according to Moody's).

Nor should we forget that the state has lost population in every year since 2014 due to economic issues. We can now add to that Rauner's multiple betrayals of

the conservative social agenda and his repudiation of conservative opposition to sanctuary cities, which I will detail later in the book.

Sure, we can blame the Democrats and their petty, controlling and stubborn House Speaker Michael Madigan for throwing roadblocks in the way of reform. That's who they are and what they do. But a skilled chief executive needs better strategies to deal with the given realities. With almost four years of failure, it's something that Rauner demonstrably lacks.

There were early signs of trouble ahead that should have tipped us off. Among them is the close and profitable relationship that Rauner had developed with two prominent Democrats, Rahm Emanuel and Bill Daley.

Chapter 2: Rahm and Bill . . . and Bruce: The Deal That Made Them All Rich

Bruce Rauner made Rahm Emanuel rich, giving Rahm the money that Emanuel needed to pocket in order to become mayor of Chicago. Every nightmare Emanuel press conference, every Emanuel stick-in-the-eye of President Trump, every Chicago public schools bailout that Emanuel takes off of Illinois taxpayer kitchen tables was only possible because of Bruce Rauner—our “Republican” governor.

The signs were there well before the 2016 election: Republican Bruce Rauner and Democratic powerhouses Rahm Emanuel and Bill Daley were joined at the hip financially. That’s not unusual in Illinois, where “bipartisan” sometimes means that Republicans ally themselves with Democrats when it suits their own needs. Money in those instances is thicker than both blood and water—or, seemingly, more important than campaign promises and the public interest.

The setup between the three turned out to be more than cozy; it was profitable, very profitable, indeed.

This all happened in the early 2000s before Rauner was elected governor and before Emanuel was Chicago mayor. After leaving his post as a senior advisor to President Bill Clinton, Emanuel came back to Chicago to look for work befitting his experience as a chief campaign money raiser, high-powered political consultant, denizen of the White House and partisan assassin, something lucrative in, say, the private equity business. It was the tail end of the 1990s’ economic prosperity, and financial entrepreneurs were cashing in big time. It was time for Emanuel to cash in too.

That was when Emanuel was introduced to Rauner, then chairman of GTCR Golder Rauner, a private venture capital firm. Rauner had different advice for

Emanuel, however. Instead of going into the venture capital business, he’d do better in investment banking where, as the Chicago Tribune and New York Times later reported, Rauner suggested that Emanuel’s political connections would be useful in making deals in government-regulated industries.

So, Emanuel joined the investment banking firm Wasserstein Perella & Co., and quickly brought in some business from . . . Bruce Rauner. Rauner’s GTCR firm wanted to take over Security Link, a struggling home security company owned by SBC Communications. Enter Bill Daley, who was the SBC boss, former Commerce secretary in the Clinton administration and brother of Chicago’s then mayor, Richard M. Daley—Democrats all.

It was a difficult and troubling deal. GTCR investors had originally poured \$135 million into Security Link and its predecessor companies, and now found that their money was in jeopardy. And the Federal Communications Commission, as a condition of SBC’s original acquisition of the security company, had earlier ordered Daley’s SBC firm to sell Security Link by early 2001 or pay a \$1 million fine. That was trouble all around.

Negotiations had been going on for months as Rauner’s firm could not find anyone to finance the acquisition. Emanuel was in contact with Rauner almost every day to try to get the deal done. And *voilà*, it was. In the end Rauner’s firm paid \$479 million for Security Link, with SBC financing all but \$100 million of the sale price. Everyone was happy. Daley dumped the troubled security company; thank you, Rahm Emanuel. Emanuel’s firm enjoyed lucrative fees for doing the deal; thank you, Bruce Rauner.

As for Rauner’s company: Less than six months later, Rauner’s GTCR sold Security Link for \$1 billion, more

than a 100 percent profit. Thank you, Rahm Emanuel. Thank you, Bill Daley. No thanks were heard from Security Link's 700 employees who were laid off after the purchase.

The deal made Emanuel a rich man. He became a managing director of Wasserstein's Chicago office, and after just two and a half years left his position \$18 million wealthier. It came in handy when he quickly re-entered politics and ran for a North Side Chicago congressional seat. He reportedly used \$450,000 of his own money to win the election, which evoked complaints from his political opponents that he was "buying his seat."

As Republicans, we don't have a problem with people making money. But how close do political friends become when they're responsible for each other making lots and lots of money? At some point, does it not create a conflict of interest?

Rauner and Emanuel remained close after the Security Link deal. When Emanuel was elected in 2011, he selected Rauner and his wife, Diana, to fill prominent advisory roles. She was on his transition team on education, and he was on the World Business Chicago's influential board—unpaid, of course. But why should it be otherwise, when you've already made each other rich?

As Illinois governor and Chicago mayor, the two—by the very nature of their positions—should often find themselves on opposite sides of issues: city versus state, urban versus rural, Democrat versus Republican, liberal versus conservative. And sometimes it appears so, but other times it certainly does not. We will explain further how their conflict of interest plays out—and not necessarily to the advantage of Illinois citizens.

Chapter 3: Conservatives Are Out and the Wife Is In

When Illinois Republicans selected their candidate to run for governor, they got two for the price of one.

Sound familiar? That's a reprise of the famous Bill and Hillary Clinton "60 Minutes" promise in 1992 . . . America was getting a "co-president." After his election, Bill Clinton assigned Hillary the job of remaking America's health care system . . . and we all know how *that* turned out. It took another 23 years to finally purge Hillary from the American political scene.

Illinois doesn't have that much time.

In fairness to the Clintons, they were honest about being from the same political party, so voters voted with their eyes open. Bruce Rauner strongly implied during his campaign that he was a Republican. Though wife Diana was a strong Democrat, it was reasonable for Illinois voters to believe that Gov. Rauner wore the pants in the marriage and would wear them in the Governor's Mansion.

There appears to have been a wardrobe change.

Illinois voters could not have known how big an influence First Lady Diana would have on policy. And it's still something of a mystery. Why? Because the pending lawsuit demanding her email exchanges with the governor and his senior staff to see exactly what influence she has wielded on actions such as last fall's controversial abortion bill is still unresolved. More on *that* in a moment.

First Lady Diana is a social activist in the progressive mode. An Ivy League graduate and venture capitalist in her own right, she is president of "Ounce of Prevention Fund," an early childhood public-private partnership that receives tens of millions of dollars in aid from the government to provide birthing services

and day care to poor single-parent families. Putting aside the wisdom or effectiveness of such programs, her presidency creates an enormous conflict of interest since her group depends upon such generous taxpayer funding.

Diana was looking ahead and was deeply involved in husband Bruce's 2014 campaign. According to Chicago Sun-Times columnist Mark Brown, Bruce "shamelessly" used her "front and center to give him political cover." She was featured in her own campaign commercial in which she, as a self-proclaimed "life-long Democrat," said the campaign "isn't about Democrat or Republican, this is about our state's future." Bruce "doesn't have a social agenda, he has an economic and education agenda," she claimed.

That made Republican social conservatives wary, but Bruce was being elected largely for his business skills and, again, "the candidate wears the pants" / "what harm could she do?" rationales ruled the day. Diana promised to focus on "education and family issues" as First Lady. She carefully didn't spell out *what* "education or family issues."

When Gov. Rauner signed legislation making it easier for the "transgendered" to change the sex listed on their birth certificates, we got a clue.

So it turns out Bruce *did* have a social agenda, just not the one that many of his conservative supporters, contributors and volunteers had hoped for. And it bears a striking resemblance to his wife's liberal progressive faddishness.

Diana's firm grasp on Bruce's agenda began during the campaign and has extended into the governor's office. The Chicago Sun-Times reported that emails obtained by its reporters show how Diana filters all forms of official communication, including speeches, social media and messaging. According to a former

staffer, she was "involved" in major speeches, including the governor's budget and his state of the state addresses. "Everything had to be run by Diana. She frequently would come back with edits and rewrites." She'd definitely let the staff know when she disagreed with what they wrote.

One of the major disagreements, the paper reported, was how to deal with House Speaker/Political Boss Madigan, who at every turn seemed to take every disagreement with the governor (or anyone) personally.

Gov. Rauner may have wanted to fight back. First Lady Diana instead argued that the governor should never mention Madigan or Democrats.

The oldest rule in politics is, "Personnel *is* policy." Diana seems to have taken this lesson to heart, influencing how her husband governs. It appears that important policy decisions were largely routed through Diana, usurping authority from others who were actually hired to manage policy.

Rauner's original gubernatorial staff consisted primarily of his campaign team. But as things deteriorated during his term (especially with conservative Republicans), he purged his original staff in favor of a team from the Illinois Policy Institute, a free-market liberty-oriented think tank. Conservatives and Republicans were optimistic!

Diana appeared horrified. She didn't see eye-to-eye with the new team and a mere three months later, the new chief of staff walked out the door with the majority of the communications department. Rauner couldn't even hold key staff in important positions. No governor in memory has lost a chief of staff less than three months after hiring her, along with much of the team that she had brought aboard.

All of these Bruce-Diana staff conflicts and internal policy contradictions culminated last fall in perhaps

the biggest and most unexpected policy betrayal of the Rauner administration—his uncalled for frontal assault on the right to life.

In April 2017, Diana Rauner had told the Chicago Sun-Times' Michael Sneed, "I consider my husband and I warriors for social justice." Bruce had told Illinois he had no social agenda. Diana told us they were social justice warriors. After three years, it became clear which Rauner was telling the truth.

Bruce Rauner never hid his pro-choice side, but he always promised he would veto proposed legislation providing taxpayer-funded abortions for Medicaid recipients and state employees in Illinois.

For many Republicans (particularly Republican primary voters), this was a touchstone issue. If Medicaid-funded abortions ever became possible (through *all* nine months of pregnancy, for *any* reason), Illinois taxpayers would be required to pay for this abhorrent procedure regardless of their personal beliefs.

Beyond the moral considerations, under Medicaid rules the number of abortions would be limitless, another entitlement required of a state that is virtually bankrupt.

Abortion has long been a controversial issue, but the one position that seems to unite constituents on both sides of the abortion debate is that *all* taxpayers should never be compelled to pay for abortions that only a handful of taxpayers support. To argue otherwise is too extreme.

Opposing taxpayer-funded abortion is hardly a radical position. U.S. federal policy, as articulated in the Hyde Amendment, bars the use of federal funds to pay for abortions except to save the life of the mother or in cases of rape or incest. A majority of Americans favor such a ban according to Gallup. And the *vast* majority of Americans would ban late-term abortions, contrary

to the wishes of Planned Parenthood and other fringe pro-choice groups.

Bruce and Diana were \$50,000 sponsors of a Planned Parenthood Illinois fundraiser and Rauner had contributed to pro-choice Democratic candidates such as Mayor Rahm Emanuel and Sen. Dick Durbin. And in response to a candidate questionnaire from Illinois' hard-core pro-abortion "Personal PAC," Rauner had pledged to support a repeal of the law prohibiting taxpayer-funded free abortions if he ever became governor.

Diana Rauner had joined with other pro-choicers to pay for a full-page, open-letter advertisement in the Chicago Tribune during the 2014 governor's race to promote Bruce Rauner's "clear consistent position" on abortion. It quoted the future governor from a GOP primary debate in which he said, "It's a decision that should be made by a woman with her physician, her family or minister, not by government."

Pro-life Republicans had been promised by Rauner that he would not act on his beliefs, but they had also been warned by all of these actions.

The day of reckoning arrived last fall.

A bill came before Rauner that Illinois Right to Life said would "force all health care providers to help a woman obtain an abortion whenever asked." The group said the bill would "undo the strong conscience protections for health care providers that Illinois currently has in place. The bill would require providers to tell patients about 'legal treatment options' and 'benefits of treatment options.'"

Reports circulated widely that Rauner, true to his campaign pledge, had promised to veto House Bill 40. Among those who received such an assurance was Chicago Catholic Cardinal Blase Cupich. Rauner more than once said he would oppose the legislation because

it was “too divisive,” especially as he was in the middle of a critical battle over the budget. Conservatives felt confident that Gov. Rauner had now promised them and effectively promised God that he wouldn’t do anything radical.

But in the end, he chose peace with Diana over the Catholic Church, and he signed the legislation.

Diana was thrilled; the cardinal was not. Cardinal Cupich issued a rare public scolding. “I reminded him of the promise and also my statement earlier thanking him for that,” Cupich said. “He did break his word. He broke his word to the people, especially those who have continued to speak on behalf of the vulnerable child in the womb.”

There was a telling anecdote of Diana’s iron grip on Gov. Rauner in the midst of this battle. Before signing the “free” taxpayer-funded abortion bill, he met with Republican leaders to explain his decision. But he wouldn’t start the meeting until Diana showed up and was seated. It appeared to those present in the room that he was not allowed to speak until Diana had arrived to ensure that he didn’t stray from the decision that they had reached together.

The Chicago Sun-Times wanted to document how short a leash Rauner was on. So the paper filed a Freedom of Information Act request asking to see the emails about the legislation that Diana had exchanged with Rauner’s staff. The Sun-Times request was denied on the grounds that the emails contained “communications strategy, draft statements, and press releases, in which policies were formulated and opinions were expressed.” That’s the standard, bogus excuse for denying access to public records that might prove to be embarrassing. As of this writing, further litigation is still pending.

But some emails leaked from other sources. In them,

Diana complained that the governor was “screwing up” by issuing a press release opposing the “free” abortion legislation. Instead, she wanted the governor to hold “press conferences, issue statements and clarifications about him being pro-choice, amid concerns from the [American Civil Liberties Union] and Personal PAC”—in other words, wanting the governor to publicly explain why his campaign promise was meaningless . . . because breaking it was important to Diana’s friends.

Rauner’s signature on House Bill 40 spurred an open revolt from fellow party members. State Rep. David McSweeney (R-Barrington Hills) called Rauner a “failed governor.” State Sen. Dan McConchie (R-Hawthorn Woods) said Rauner’s “flip-flopping on this issue raises serious questions on whether the governor’s word can be trusted on other matters.” State Rep. Allen Skillicorn (R-East Dundee) said Rauner’s signature on the abortion bill “will ensure that Rauner serves only one term.” Rep. Peter Breen, the House Republican floor leader from Lombard, said, “I’ve had a front-row seat to a governor that is unable to adequately and competently administer Illinois government. He is now lying to us. And so at that point, I can’t support someone like that.”

Noting Rauner’s broken promise to Cupich, Breen said, “Even the most corrupt Chicago machine politicians think twice before lying to a priest.”

Chapter 4: The Chicago Schools Bailout Hurt Your Kids

The job of the governor of Illinois is to ship more and more money to Chicago. That's according to Mayor Rahm Emanuel.

And so, Gov. Bruce Rauner did. Hundreds of millions of dollars went to Chicago's failing public schools. And apparently he was proud of it.

Chicago and its school system have been feeding off Illinois taxpayers seemingly forever, but in 2017, Emanuel approached the trough for even more. Because without it, we were informed, Chicago schools couldn't open, and the most deserving and neediest kids in the state would be denied a quality education. Without more, in fact, the ill-managed, inept Chicago Public Schools could face bankruptcy.

Rauner at first resisted the SOSs pouring in from Chicago, the Chicago Teachers Union and other sinking Titanics; give him credit for that. He launched rhetorical broadsides and threatened vetoes of any Chicago bailouts that the Democratic acolytes in the Legislature would dare to send him.

But eventually he caved. In August 2017 he signed legislation that gave Chicago the whole store, or as Emanuel jubilantly exulted, he got everything he asked for "and more." And what did Rauner get? As the Chicago Tribune noted: "Rauner got almost none of what he had hoped to get out of a school funding deal" (August 31, 2017). As Emanuel once famously said, "You never let a serious crisis go to waste." Emanuel knew that lesson; Rauner failed to learn it.

What Rauner wanted in exchange for a load of rescue cash was, among other things, a statewide freeze on property taxes. It seemed like a reasonable quid pro quo . . . until it wasn't (in the eyes of Rauner's good

friend and former business partner, Mayor Emanuel). As we noted earlier in describing that business relationship, money makes for strange political bedfellows.

What Illinois taxpayers got out of this "deal" was the opportunity to pay more to support Chicago's schools. Property taxes *outside* Chicago now run close to 3 percent of the sales value of a house; that's nearly three times the national average. Property taxes *in* Chicago are in the low 1 percent plus of sales value. In effect, you—suburbanites and downstaters—are forced to pay for two school systems instead of just your own because Chicago does not tax property at the same rate as in the 'burbs.

So, here's what the Chicago Public Schools and, by extension, the city wrung out of Rauner—meaning you, the taxpayer—as variously described by the Chicago Tribune and the Illinois Policy Institute:

- A secured, \$200 million block grant that will continue forever and ever. It's a grant that no other school district receives, but Chicago has been reaping it for 20 years. No more worry about it being continued.
- State aid will be locked in despite decreasing enrollment. The Chicago district lost more than 40,000 students since 2002, a loss that continues unabated. In addition to its too many underperforming schools, many are half-empty.
- At least \$215 million will be delivered to help Chicago lighten its load of unfunded teacher pensions.
- Chicago is among selected school districts that will be able to undervalue its property wealth, and thereby qualify for more state aid.

- The Chicago Board of Education will be empowered to raise city property taxes to produce another \$148 million on top of recent increases.

Rauner called it a “compromise,” but it’s hard to see what the state, a.k.a. taxpayers, got in return for bailing out Chicago schools. Among the things that Rauner wanted, but didn’t get, were: property tax freeze statewide, relief from costly unfunded state-imposed mandates and some job privatization.

Instead, he and everyone else got a new and complicated method of calculating the distribution of state aid to Illinois public schools whose implications are yet to be well understood. But it was enough for Rauner to claim to be the “education governor,” which is true only in the sense that Rahm certainly “schooled” Bruce.

What we do understand is the dubious evidence-based model the governor adopted will require higher and higher taxes to support more and more funding for schools to backfill the cash being siphoned off from the suburban and downstate schools to Chicago. Just prior to the publication of this book, Gov. Rauner’s schools chief, Tony Smith, proposed a new, \$1,500/household tax to fund schools.

To be fair, some crumbs did drop off the table, like, a tax credit for individuals and businesses that donate up to \$1 million to help pay tuition for poor students in private schools. It will help 6,000 students.

At a signing ceremony (at a Chicago public school no less) a reporter asked Rauner if he had been “bamboozled.” Rauner laughed, proclaiming that it is an “honor for me to work with Emanuel and Chicago school officials.”

Work *for* is more like it.

Oh, but there’s more.

Chapter 5: Sanctuary State and Your New Neighbors

Nothing can be more ironic than the name of the law making Illinois a sanctuary state that Rauner signed: the Trust Act.

With it, Rauner’s trust quotient with real Republicans plummeted. With it, Rauner made Illinois as lawless and dangerous as the city of San Francisco, the state of California and other Democratic strongholds passing such a law.

Rauner had once promised to veto such legislation if it came to his desk. But continuing his shift to accommodate the Democratic agenda, he didn’t. With Rauner’s signature, Illinois now cannot arrest or detain illegal aliens solely based on their immigration status. Local law enforcement cannot make an arrest even if the suspect is on the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agency’s wanted list. Nor can Illinois police notify ICE when they have a suspected criminal illegal alien detained.

Here’s your passport to walk around free. Even if you’ve robbed or raped someone in Illinois, you don’t have to worry about getting deported. Pew reports that Illinois is home to 450,000 illegal immigrants; in any population that size there are always likely to be plenty of lawbreakers lurking about.

Remember Saul Chavez, 35, the illegal alien in Chicago who allegedly got behind the wheel of his car while drunk, hit William “Dennis” McCann and dragged him to his death. A few years before, Chavez had been convicted of drunken driving for which he spent two years on probation. While he was in custody before his release, ICE requested that it be notified if Chavez was to be released. It wasn’t, because Cook County was a sanctuary for certain criminals. Arrested

again for the DUI death, he came up with \$25,000 cash for his \$250,000 bond and then jumped bail, nowhere to be found.

Or consider Juan Francisco Lopez Sanchez, an illegal alien and a seven-time felon who had been deported to Mexico five times before returning and fatally shooting Kate Steinle. A San Francisco sheriff had him in custody on a marijuana charge and ICE wanted him held. If the sheriff had complied, Sanchez wouldn't have been released and committed the . . . well, we can't call it "murder" because a jury in politically charged San Francisco acquitted him of the murder charge, convicting him only of possession of a firearm by a felon. He was "sentenced" only to time already served.

Those are just the murder cases. Who's counting, if anyone is, the number of illegal aliens who have committed lesser but still serious crimes? *Ninety-two percent of all aliens arrested by ICE in 2017 had criminal convictions or pending criminal charges, or were immigration fugitives or illegal re-entrants.* The list of deported criminals of suspects is long; among them are the likes of Elmer Hernandez-Natareno, 41, wanted in Guatemala for homicide. In fiscal year 2017, ICE removed 105,736 aliens who had known criminal convictions.

Rauner's sanctuary state actions risk billions of dollars in federal funding for Illinois. His administration recently received the same letter as did his buddy Rahm from the Department of Justice to prove up compliance with federal immigration law or risk federal funding across a range of needs and perhaps even face federal prosecution.

For some reason, backers of the Trust Act call it a good compromise. Rauner termed it "a very reasonable, decent outcome." This is a puzzle; how can it be

considered reasonable when it gives criminals the right to roam our communities?

Kyle McCarter, a Republican senator from Lebanon outside St. Louis, said, "This could be the last straw" for downstate supporters of Rauner.

Except there has been a surfeit of "last straws" from Rauner's term, with each failure (like on immigration) competing to be the most outrageous. Consider:

- Signing a voter registration measure to automatically enroll people on the voting rolls at drivers' license and other state facilities when applying for, updating or renewing a driver's license or state ID. That's after he had promised a year earlier to veto such legislation.
- Signing a law that requires every doctor, pharmacist or pro-life pregnancy center to help a woman obtain an abortion whenever asked, even if the health provider finds the service immoral. It replaced an earlier law that protected health care providers from providing services that are "morally objectionable."
- Signing legislation the Heartland Institute said would produce a subsidy to Exelon valued at \$1.6 billion and would increase electricity costs about \$300 per household. The president of Americans for Tax reform said it would lead to lost jobs and reduced economic output and competitiveness. Rauner took tens of thousands of dollars of campaign contributions from Exelon.
- Allowing the Department of Children and Family Services to become, as the Chicago Tribune said, a "national scandal."

- Responding late to the deadly outbreak of Legionnaires' disease at the Quincy veterans' facility.
- Responding late to the disclosure of serious problems with the state's property assessment system.

The list goes on. But Rauner's worst flop is his failure to make any progress on the state's two greatest problems: pension reform and property taxes. If voters are to judge by the results of his time in office, one can reasonably ask if even all his millions can (or should) save him for a second term.

Chapter 6: No Budget for You

Illinois is the only state to have gone two years without a budget. Both of those budgetless years, it should be noted, occurred on Bruce Rauner's watch as governor.

If you think that the absence of a budget is too arcane an issue to talk about and doesn't affect you, then you need to reconsider.

"No budget" means no budget reform, no budget cuts and (in Illinois) the constant pressure to raise ALL taxes, ALL the time.

Are you retired (or planning on retiring) on an Illinois pension? Good luck. The Moody's credit rating agency reports that the Illinois pension fund is about \$251 BILLION short. And getting worse. Without budget reform, Illinois retirees will be very, very hungry.

Without a property tax freeze, politicians that refuse to reform or cut state spending have the power to simply "tax you out of your home." Passing a budget can put handcuffs on politicians before the sheriff can put a padlock on your door.

The Illinois budget directly impacts the quality of education at all levels—elementary, high school and college—that you or your children attend. Don't like all those potholes that spring up after a tough winter? Check out the budget. Worried about your fellow citizens who are denied quality health care? Wondering about how long it takes to drive or take the train or bus to get to work? Worried about your safety and the quality of law enforcement? It all comes back to the budget. It's where the winners and losers are selected. It defines how much of the money goes to serve the public good and how much is wasted on spending that benefits insiders and the corrupt. And, not to forget, how much of your hard-earned money is taxed.

Yes, the Democrats who control the Illinois Legis-

lature—with their steely resolve to stifle any cures for the structural problems that have infected the state’s fiscal and economic health—have accounted for more than their share of the mess. But politics is the art of the possible, and Rauner has been artless.

As the start of new fiscal year 2018 approached on July 1, 2017, the state’s problems had reached historic proportions. Illinois owed some \$14 billion to its vendors, more than doubling during Rauner’s term. Among the suppliers getting stiffed were social service programs for homeless teens and domestic violence victims. Only a court order kept the money flowing to providers of “essential services.”

Public universities were cutting programs while enrollment was dropping and tuition was increasing. Local school districts were unsure they could open in the fall without state subsidies.

Illinois was losing jobs while neighboring states were adding them. More people and businesses were leaving Illinois every year while neighboring states were growing.

Major bond rating agencies had lowered the state’s credit warnings to near junk, the lowest credit rating of any state in the nation, and warned of further reductions without a budget. The low bond ratings led to millions and millions of dollars of higher interest payments that, in turn, squeezed out spending for education, health and other services.

Without a budget, the state wobbled through the two years with applications of assorted patches, band aids, liniments and who knows what kind of legerdemain. Previous attempts to pass a budget were squashed by unbending demands and routinely followed by fulsome exchanges of blame.

The crux of the conflict, but not its entirety, was a Democrat demand for a tax increase in return for

Rauner’s economic agenda, which had morphed from his 44-point Turnaround Agenda into a property tax freeze and term limits as well as pension, workers’ compensation and redistricting reforms.

As crunch time approached, the two leaders of the Senate—Democrat President John Cullerton and Republican Leader Christine Radogno—were working hard on a “Grand Bargain.” It variously included a cap on spending and public employee pensions, a long-anticipated change in the way state subsidies for public schools were calculated, some modest workers’ comp changes and a property tax freeze. Oh, yes, let’s not forget new revenue-generating casinos, including one for Chicago.

The Chicago Tribune reported that a Rauner source called it a “dead deal,” one that would not be accepted by Rauner or the Republican Senate caucus.

Radogno was unhappy being undercut like that. No one in the governor’s office speaks for the Senate, she said, and negotiations were continuing for a final version. There never was, she said, a take-it-or-leave-it posture. Cullerton accused Rauner of “hijacking” the negotiations.

Trust had collapsed. A Democratic negotiator, Sen. Kwame Raoul, expressed doubt over whether Rauner really wanted a deal. “I think he applies this sort-of maybe venture-capitalist approach to deal-making,” Raoul said, “where you try to squeeze every bit you can without respect to good-faith negotiations that good public policy negotiations require.”

Ironically, Rauner had presented a “balanced” budget in March that contained his economic reforms, but it would only be balanced if \$4.57 billion were generated by “working together on a grand bargain.” It was this very grand bargain that Governor Rauner had scotched.

June 1, 2017, arrived, and it looked like Illinois might enter a third year without a budget. The night before, the Senate had overwhelmingly rebuffed a \$40 billion budget plan approved by House Democrats because Rauner had promised a veto.

Finally, some serious threats forced action: one was the bond houses' warning of downgrading Illinois bonds to junk status; the other was the possibility that the state universities would lose their accreditation. Democrats in the House and Senate passed a bill that would permanently increase the personal income tax rate by 32 percent, from 3.75 percent to 4.95 percent, while the corporate tax rate would go from 5.25 percent to 7 percent. That was about what they were before a temporary, four-year increase was allowed to expire in 2015.

Rauner vetoed it because it didn't contain his reforms. The Democrat-controlled House and Senate overrode the veto, with the help of some Republicans who were feeling pressure from their constituents to get something done.

At least Illinois now had a budget. But missing was the freeze on property taxes that had been central to Rauner's agenda. Despite \$5 billion in new revenues, it was burdened with a \$1.3 billion deficit. An Illinois Policy Institute analysis found it overstated revenues by at least \$300 million; relied on an expected \$500 million in pension savings that can't happen in 2018; accelerates state payments to local governments (costing the state an additional and unaccounted for \$220 million), and it fails to fully account for \$600 million in borrowing costs to pay down \$6 billion in unpaid bills. In short, it leaves Illinoisans in worse shape than before.

That budget battle was a textbook example of how not to govern, of how politicians can dig in their heels

while neglecting the public interest. The Democrats (as usual) deserve much of the blame for spending money Illinois doesn't have. But Gov. Rauner, alleged deal maker and business genius, was simply AWOL when it came to new ideas or strategies. And his rookie political incompetence allowed a HUGE tax increase to pass. His stewardship has been a disservice to the people of Illinois.

Chapter 7: Arrogance

Bruce Rauner is unable to govern.

Regretfully, we discovered that too late, after the election. It didn't take long to find out that in the game of politics, Rauner could be pushed around so easily by his opponents that he'd disappoint his own allies and cast aside his campaign promises to give in to Democratic and liberal demands.

Winning elections is not enough. You also must win those critical policy debates, a goodly number of them—even a modest number of victories, if it comes to that. But going nearly hitless on your major policy initiatives, as Rauner has done, is not acceptable.

Not that Rauner intentionally threw the ballgame. Although it sometimes looked like he wanted to. Go back to the beginning. In the hours just after his election victory, who were among the people he first called? His good old Democratic money buddies, Rahm Emanuel and Bill Daley. Oh, and President Barack Obama.

Now, talking with your opponents by itself is no mortal sin; in some circumstances, it might even be a great idea when you are trying to lead. That's how most of us took it, anyway. (In one of his first and most famous stumbles, Rauner told reporters that he also had spoken on election night with House Speaker Michael Madigan and Senate President John Cullerton, when he hadn't. Did he think that they would let him get away with this early deception?)

Then when Rauner appointed Bill Daley to the transition team, his own supporters questioned the governor's judgment. This was Bill Daley, the guy from the thoroughly Democratic Daley clan, the guy who served as Obama's chief of staff and President Bill Clinton's commerce secretary, the guy who was going to run against incumbent Quinn in the Democrat primary, until he didn't.

Why, pray tell, invite the opposition's key player onto such an important team, one that's setting your agenda, strategy and organization?

Kristen McQueary, a Chicago Tribune editorial board member, agreed that the dysfunction started early, as evidenced by how Rauner "surrounded himself with younger, hotshot advisers—few of whom had meaningful experience working in Springfield. They were confrontational and haughty, even though they knew little about the players and the mechanics of state government. They had no institutional knowledge, and it showed." The result, she wrote, was that it only increased, not diminished, support for his two main Democratic adversaries, Madigan and Cullerton. "Even Republicans who enthusiastically support Rauner's agenda," she added, "have not appreciated his sometimes inflexible and demanding liaisons."

Handling his personnel seems to bedevil Rauner. Three years into his term he dumped his chief of staff, Richard Goldberg, replacing him with Kristina Rasmussen, former head of the Illinois Policy Institute. At least 20 employees followed Goldberg out the door. Then only 88 days later Rasmussen left, along with some of her top team, to be replaced by Rodger Heaton, the governor's public safety director and homeland security adviser. It's hard to escape the conclusion that the staff purges reflected uncertainty and turbulence in the governor's office.

Beyond his staff, the governor also found himself in sticky relations with lawmakers in his own party. Rauner thought he could buy lawmakers' loyalty by using some of his vast wealth to finance candidates of his choosing in the Republican primaries and general elections. Many, of course, were thankful to have the money as a counter to the vast sums that Madigan, chairman of the Illinois Democratic Party, was laying

on his candidates. But there was also a sense among some Republicans that Rauner acted as if *he* was the GOP. Republicans who had labored in the political vineyards for so long weren't appreciative when Rauner patted himself on the back for pouring so much money into "the party that was virtually nonexistent"—as if he had singlehandedly rejuvenated the state GOP.

He especially angered his fellow Republicans after he signed into law taxpayer payments for elective abortions. Speaking on a southern Illinois radio station, he reminded disaffected legislators that he has the money to spread around to help them win their elections, implying that they better get in line and stop their criticism of him—that campaign donations and reelection were acceptable payments for betrayal of Republican principles. That rankled Rep. David McSweeney, a suburban Chicago Republican. It's more evidence, he said, that for Rauner, "the issue is that it's all about the money again."

His unproductive battles with Madigan and Cullerton are telling. Blaming Madigan, for example, for almost everything that has gone wrong and admitting he is not in charge, not only shows weakness but also serves to demonize the men in whose hands rests Rauner's agenda.

Curiously, at one time Rauner said he was not involved in crafting attack ads against Madigan by the state Republican Party and Republican legislative campaigns. Yet, his overt battles—some call them petty at times—with Madigan often overshadowed the serious and complicated policy issues at stake. Now his battle with Madigan has become the centerpiece of his 2018 reelection campaign.

Then there was the time that Rauner tried to split Madigan and Cullerton during one of the contentious debates over the budget. Rauner had been trying to work with Cullerton separately, but the governor

squelched that by publicly telling reporters what the Senate president had confided in private. As related by Rauner, he was told by Cullerton: "'Bruce, I lived in Mike Madigan's shadow for 37 years. I'm not gonna step out now.' Can you believe that? Can you believe that? You wonder why Illinois is in such deep yogurt, ladies and gentlemen. We've got a dictatorship of one individual who cares about politics over people."

After that public unveiling, who can blame Cullerton for drawing away from working out any compromise with the governor?

We can at least give Rauner credit for trying to lead by working out a deal, even if he bungled it. But then there was the time that he adamantly turned down a leadership role. Cullerton and Senate Republican leader Christine Radogno were negotiating a budget, taxes and some items in Rauner's agenda. "I literally don't get involved in that, I don't coach it. I don't recommend," the governor said, even though some of his own agenda items were at stake.

Whether he's involved in negotiations or he stays away from them, they never seem to work.

Running a government is so different from running a private venture capital firm. Illinois, after all, is a democracy in which you're dealing with other officials who have something in common: each and every one was elected, accountable to separate constituencies. Issuing orders from on high, conducting open warfare with and hurling personal insults at opponents, these might make you feel better, but do they get you to your goal?

Chapter 8: Money Can't Buy You Love

In 2014, Bruce Rauner benefited from his deep pocket and the implosion of his political opponents to gain the governor's mansion. Rauner was a political neophyte who beat three experienced Republicans for the GOP nomination for governor and then proceeded to narrowly defeat incumbent Democrat Gov. Pat Quinn.

How did such a thing happen?

- By making promises that he could not or would not keep.
- By presenting himself as a strong leader.
- By deceptively claiming the conservative high ground.

Once in office, how did he do?

- He made 44 campaign promises but has kept none of them.
- He surrendered his policy agenda to his wife and Dem Boss Madigan and, when questioned, weakly responded, "I'm not in charge."
- His social policies are progressive left while raising taxes to record Illinois levels, despite his business background.

The only thing that hasn't changed in Rauner's world between 2014 and today is his personal wealth. The billionaire Rauner had to only spend \$6 million of his own money in his original campaign while managing to raise another \$8 million from actual donors. In an attempt to scare off primary and general election challengers, Gov. Rauner wrote his campaign a personal check for *\$70 million* last year . . . just in case.

(He privately concedes that, given his record, it will be difficult to get donations from Republicans in his re-election bid.)

So how will that work out for him? Can Rauner's money buy people's love?

It doesn't look good. The Republican Party grassroots were so infuriated by Rauner that volunteer Republicans gathered over 16,000 signatures in just four weeks last November to put State Representative Jeanne Ives (R-Wheaton) on the primary ballot. And three major Democrats—a combination of union hacks, millionaires and billionaires—have already lined up for the chance to pick the low-hanging Rauner fruit in the fall general election.

In 2014, Rauner and dozens of Republicans were swept into power across America, taking full control of Congress. Governors' mansions and state legislatures turned a deeper shade of red. The rage against corrupt Democrats and establishment Republicans culminated in Donald Trump's election to the White House in 2016.

Rauner's response to this national tidal wave? Run away from the tide—cutting deals with Illinois Democrats—and govern as if Illinois was just "California-East."

National Republicans have noticed—and abandoned Rauner. The national Republican Governors Association (RGA), usually one of the most helpful campaign organizations for deserving Republican incumbents or challengers, has simply distanced itself from him. The RGA is (shockingly) staying neutral in the primary between Rauner and Ives. There are private reports that the RGA will move "all in" if Ives wins the primary, seeing her as a star that could upset the Democrat apple cart in the general. But should Rauner squeeze out a primary victory, the RGA will simply write off the general election race.

Why? Because Rauner is *screamingly* unpopular with the Illinois general election voters and can barely be categorized as a Republican anyway. An avowed critic of President Trump, Rauner just seems out of tune with both the reforms national Republicans are demanding and the budget reforms that Illinois desperately needs.

In head-to-head matchups with either of the two likely Democratic governor nominees (Pritzker or Kennedy), Rauner trails in polls by an average margin of 70 percent (for *either* Democrat) to 30 percent for “Democrat-light” Rauner.

Rauner’s unpopularity is not a partisan reaction against a Republican—he worked hard to alienate that many Illinois voters of all parties. People, jobs and the tax base have been fleeing Illinois. From July 2016 to July 2017, Illinois experienced a net loss of almost 115,000 residents. Its population has been shrinking for four consecutive years. Only West Virginia, devastated by losses in the coal industry, is worse. Illinois lost a record \$4.75 billion in adjusted gross income to other states in the 2015 tax year alone. The state’s unemployment rate is now among the worst in the nation.

Local Republicans are not riding to Rauner’s rescue. He has not been kind to them. Rauner originally won election as a “mainstream” Republican—a conservative on fiscal matters who had no agenda on social issues. But now he’s running for re-election as a “Republican” whose fiscal agenda flopped badly and whose social agenda has been fashioned by his wife, a loyal Democrat progressive. Huge chunks of the Republican Party and Republicans in the legislature are in open revolt.

Can a Republican win in Illinois running as an “anti-Republican”?

It brings to mind Mark Kirk. He’s the former “mainstream” Republican who ran to the “moderate middle”

in his 2016 Senate bid, a fiscal conservative and social centrist. Kirk lost the Senate seat to left-wing Rep. Tammy Duckworth. And Kirk HADN’T raised Illinois income taxes by 32 percent. . . .

Why should we Republicans settle for nothing better than a repeat? If Rauner is “the Republican” with the other choice being a classic Chicago Democrat racing to the far-left wing of his party, why should we vote at all in the general election? Thus, the governorship will return to the Democratic Party and Illinois’ slow-motion swan dive over the fiscal cliff will only accelerate.

Lest any reader believe that this assessment of Gov. Rauner and his electoral chances is just sour grapes by local conservatives, this assessment is shared by national journalists left and right.

According to Politico, Rauner is at war with his own party. Early in Rauner’s term, the New York Times said he was trying to remake the GOP in his own image. (Please, Bruce, stop “helping”!) And last December, Ronald Reagan’s favorite magazine National Review featured a cover story on Rauner labeling him the “worst Republican governor in America.”

Even if you were willing to simply ignore his betrayals on virtually every Republican issue imaginable, Bruce Rauner is just a bad political bet. The governor you don’t know and, if you do, the governor you don’t vote for.

Chapter 9: The Way Forward

Jeanne Ives has served three terms in the Illinois House of Representatives and sits on the K-12 Appropriations Committee. She's seen what's behind the curtain on the state's finances and pension plan. And she is horrified.

So last November, when everyone else was panicking about what Gov. Rauner had done to the state, Jeanne courageously stepped forward and essentially said, "I'll drive." Real Republicans in 64 Illinois counties gathered over 16,000 signatures in just four weeks to put her on our primary ballot as an alternative to Bruce Rauner this March 20.

Jeanne is a pro-life Catholic mother of five, a former Army officer who's been married for 30 years to the man she met when they were both West Point cadets. She's a fighter, a wife, a mother and a daughter who wants a truly better life for everyone in Illinois. Not only is she experienced in Illinois government, she is also highly intelligent and well grounded in real life economics. And she's tough.

She's running for governor as an independent Republican—a Republican free from the cronyism of Chicago and Springfield, a true conservative alternative to the Bruce Rauner that none of us knew.

Yes, taxes in Illinois are too high (property AND income taxes). Jeanne knows it, though Rauner doesn't seem to. That's why she was recently endorsed for governor over Rauner by Tax Accountability (TA). TA Chairman Jim Tobin said Jeanne "has an impeccable tax voting record. During her tenure in the Illinois House, she has always ranked as a taxpayer friend in Taxpayers United of America's tax survey. Astoundingly, she is also the first to receive a perfect 100% in the past 34 years."

In the legislature Jeanne has consistently proven to

be a leader in fighting for taxpayers against confiscatory government schemes. But she also believes that the biggest tax all of us pay is the "corruption tax"—the cost of cronyism, union back scratching, special interest backroom deals and deals for "friends." Friends of politicians, not friends to real citizens of this great state.

Yes, she's pro-life and appalled at what Gov. Rauner and his wife have done on abortion. But she is just as concerned about the people of our state at the other end of life—our retirees who are facing ruin because Illinois governors and legislatures won't face the realities in our budget and pension system.

In short, she's running to restore the future of Illinois . . . for everyone.

Rauner says that this makes Jeanne a "fringe candidate"—a deplorable. And if *you* believe what *she* believes, he thinks you're a deplorable, too.

Jeanne has teamed up with another REAL Republican as her lieutenant governor, Rich Morthland. Rich is a member of the Rock Island County Board, a former state representative, farmer and college teacher.

Both are more in touch with rank-and-file members of their own party and the general public than is billionaire Rauner. Rauner is trying to buy himself another term in office. All Jeanne and Rich can afford is to ask you for your vote—with a promise that they'll actually *keep* their promises to you.

Jeanne graduated in the West Point Class of 1987 with a Bachelor of Science degree in economics. As a U.S. Army officer, her assignments included platoon leader, headquarters detachment commander for transportation units in Germany and ROTC instructor at Wheaton College. After fulfilling her six-year commitment, she resigned from the Army in 1993 to raise her children and at the same time worked as a tax advisor and bookkeeper for small businesses and individuals.

Jeanne and her husband, Paul, a West Point classmate, are parents of five children and live in Wheaton.

Prior to her election to the Illinois House, Jeanne served on the Wheaton City Council, where her unwavering commitment to the taxpayers' bottom line marked her as a conservative leader. Now in the Illinois Legislature, she represents the 42nd district that includes—in addition to Wheaton—Naperville, Lisle, Carol Stream, Warrenville, Winfield and West Chicago. Real Republican territory.

In her first term, she focused on bringing about genuine pension and tax reform, pursuing term limits for lawmakers, government transparency and advocating for school choice. She has refused both taxpayer-funded pension and healthcare benefits, understanding how both have contributed to the state's dismal fiscal condition.

She, like so many of her fellow Republicans who had at first supported Rauner, now opposes him because of his non-performance and his adoption of Democratic policies. Jeanne has received unprecedented support in her primary campaign from multiple current members of the state legislature, including the House Republican floor leader. Beyond that, not a single US Republican congressman from Illinois has offered support for Gov. Rauner's re-election. This is unheard of in Illinois politics.

But Jeanne's more than not-Rauner. A look at her record reveals Jeanne to be a practical-minded, fiscal and cultural conservative who hasn't shied away from her convictions.

Reviving the state's business climate is high on her list of priorities. For that, there must be reforms in the state's public employee pension system, its workers' compensation program, collective bargaining rules, and arbitration systems that fuel exorbitant property taxes causing businesses and residents to flee the state.

Illinois' burdensome taxes also are high on her list of priorities. She favors a repeal of the 34 percent individual income tax increase and promises to lighten the load of Illinois' crushing property taxes. The latter is so enormous that it amounts to a theft of property, she believes.

Of the state's economic policy she has said, "You can't love jobs and hate job creators. And that's how it is in Springfield." She criticizes the state's regulatory load and the prevailing attitude among Democrats that "we know your business better than you do."

The state apparently doesn't even know much about its own business as, she has observed, it has ignored its infrastructure, including its highways, parks and veterans homes. The state could find the money for capital improvements without another tax increase, she believes, observing that funds collected on vehicle licenses now go toward upgrades on sites that are not even owned by the state.

Jeanne believes that reforms to the Medicaid program could require able-bodied Illinoisans to get jobs.

Then there's public corruption, which is rife in Illinois yet roundly ignored by Rauner. Jeanne believes that hundreds of millions of dollars could be saved by consolidating the state's 852 school districts into unified districts of both elementary and high schools.

Jeanne would work more effectively with Senate and House leaders and the rank and file of both parties. Unlike Rauner, who badly mismanaged those relationships, she would build coalitions across party lines, something she understands how to do from her three terms in the Legislature. She recalled how Rauner publicly removed himself from negotiations over the summer when the huge tax increase was debated. He didn't make phone calls to Republican members or make any attempt to hold the caucus together on the

most important vote of his tenure—the largest permanent tax increase in state history.

Jeanne already is gaining traction among Republican voters. When they know there's an alternative to more of the same, they can't wait to vote or volunteer for her. Over 500 circulators volunteered to collect those 16,000 signatures that got her on the primary ballot.

She has won the landslide endorsement of the Wheeling Republican Party. During the last primary, Wheeling Township cast more Republican votes than in 89 of Illinois' 102 counties. The Chicago Republican Party also handed her an overwhelming victory.

In DuPage County, the second largest Republican voting bloc in Illinois, Jeanne is churning up interest as a fresh voice.

Jeanne would indeed be a refreshing change to the destructive climate in Springfield that is choking the state with record debt, horrible credit, huge unfunded pensions, outright corruption, crushing taxation, disintegrating infrastructure, good-o'-boy politics, super-rich and out-of-touch candidates, antiquated and costly work rules, special interest influence peddling and exorbitant public employee union extortion.

It's time to send investment banker Rauner a message that he'll understand: Bruce, you're fired.

And it's time to *hire* Jeanne Ives as our real Republican governor. *Before it's too late!*