1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. The Fifteenth Special Session of the house will come to order. Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Wayne Padget, the Assistant Doorkeeper. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Padget."
- Padget: "Let us pray. Dear Lord, we come before You today in sound body and mind, praying that on this day You grant us wisdom and guidance. During these hard times of negotiations, we pray that everyone can come together on one common ground and resolve the issues for the people of Illinois. We pray for the men and women in our Armed Services, both here and abroad, provide them with your protection and give them the strength to make it through these tough times. And let us also pray for the men, women, and their families who have made the ultimate sacrifice to defend our country. These things we ask in Your Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "We shall be led in the Pledge by Representative Lilly."
- Lily et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Lang: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you. Please let the record reflect that Representative Soto's daughter broke her ankle. That is to say she broke her own ankle not Representative Soto's, and

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

Representative Soto is at home taking care of her. So, she is excused today."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Fortner, McDermed, and Phillips are excused for the day."
- Speaker Lang: "Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 111 Members answering the roll and there is a quorum for the Fifteenth Special Session. Mr. Clerk, please read the legislative Leaders' proclamation."

Clerk Bolin: "Joint Proclamation.

- Whereas, Article IV, Section 5(b) of the Illinois Constitution empowers the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House to convene special sessions of the General Assembly;
- Whereas, Public Act 100-0021 provides for the Illinois State Board of Education to issue payments to school districts across Illinois pursuant to an evidence-based funding formula;
- Whereas, the Governor vetoed Senate Bill 1 which provided for an evidence-based funding formula;
- Whereas, the State has failed to issue two payments to school districts due to the veto of Senate Bill 1 and the absence of a law providing for an evidence-based funding formula;
- Whereas, the continued absence of a law providing for an evidence-based funding formula threatens public education for millions of students across Illinois;
- Whereas, a demonstrable emergency exists which requires immediate action by the General Assembly;

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

Now therefore, pursuant to Article IV, Section 5(b) of the Illinois Constitution, and in conformity with the Special Session Act, 25 ILCS 15, A Special Session of the 100th General Assembly is hereby proclaims and called as follows:

- 1. The Special Session shall convene at 11:00 a.m. on August 28, 2017, at the State Capitol in Springfield, Illinois.
- 2. The purpose of the Special Session shall be to consider legislation and legislative actions that would establish, by law, an evidenced-based funding formula to provide State funding to school districts.
- 3. The Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Clerk of the House shall take whatever reasonable steps necessary to notify the Members of the purpose and the date and time set for convening this emergency Special Session.

Issued August 26, 2017. Signed John J. Cullerton, President of the Senate, Michael J. Madigan, Speaker of the House."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, introduction of Resolutions."

Clerk Bolin: "Fifteenth Special Session House Resolution #1 and Fifteenth Special Session House Resolution #2 are offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the suspension of applicable House Rules to allow for the immediate consideration of Fifteenth Special Session House Resolutions 1 and 2. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted. Mr. Clerk, please read Fifteenth Special Session House Resolutions 1 and 2."

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

- Clerk Bolin: "Fifteenth Special Session House Resolution #1.
 - RESOLVED, that the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundredth General Assembly be adopted as the Rules of this Fifteenth Special Session, so far as the same may be applicable, and that the Committees of the House of Representatives of the One Hundredth General Assembly, and their membership, shall constitute the Committees of the House during this Fifteenth Special Session. Fifteenth Special Session House Resolution #2."
 - RESOLVED, that the Clerk inform the Senate that a majority of the House of Representatives has assembled, pursuant to the Proclamation, convening an Fifteenth Special Session of the General Assembly and are now ready for the transaction of business.
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of Fifteenth Special Session Resolutions 1 and 2. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. The Chair recognizes Mr. Martwick."
- Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Martwick: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, would you please join me in welcoming two Pages. I have two international... international students here visiting from Poland. I have Magda Czaja and Milosz Sikorski. So, if you'd please give them a warm welcome."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. We're happy to have you with us today.

 Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

Clerk Bolin: "Rules Report. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on August 28, 2017: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1947."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution #1, Fifteenth Special Session.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, AT THE FIFTEENTH SPECIAL SESSION THEREOF, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the House of Representatives adjourns Fifteenth Special Session, the House shall remain in continuous Session and stands adjourned until the call of the Speaker, and when the Senate adjourns the Fifteenth Special Session, the Senate shall remain in continuous Session and stands adjourned to the call of the President."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. The Chair recognizes Mr. Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Butler: "Next year is the Illinois Bicentennial year. One of the first official activities of the Bicentennial Commission was a craft beer competition at the just completed Illinois State Fair. About 20 brewers from Illinois competed, and I'm happy to say one of my favorites, my friends, Mike and Bree Allison, from Hand of Fate Brewing in Petersburg were selected among

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

the participants at the craft beer competition and the judges panel as the official Illinois Bicentennial craft beer, with their 'What the Fuzz' Peach Ginger Cream Ale that they will be producing for the bicentennial year. They're in the gallery today to our west on the Republican side over here. So, please, join me in welcoming our new bicentennial beer brewers, Mike and Bree Allison of Hand of Fate Brewing."

- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Happy you're here with us today. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're prepared to recess for Party caucuses. Republicans will caucus in Room 118 immediately. Democrats with caucus in Room 114 immediately. And the House of Representatives will be in recess to the call of the Chair. The House will be in order. On Supplemental Calendar #1 on Senate Bills-Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1947. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1947, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #5 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "With leave of the Body, we'll move this to Third and debate it on Third. Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1947, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

Speaker Lang: "Before you proceed, Mr. Davis, Mr. Demmer is recognized for an announcement."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Cabello is excused for the day."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Davis on the Bill on Third Reading. Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate... excuse me House Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1947, which becomes the Bill, represents a school funding reform agreement between all four Legislative Leaders and the Governor. The Amendment contains provisions of Senate Bill 1 with adjustments that I will describe momentarily. There are no changes to the following items, which Republicans had previously requested. So, the hold harmless provision is alone; third-party contracting is left alone; inflationary measures that were... are in SB1 are left alone; accounting... counting of TIF and PTELL funds within the school funding formula, no changes there; no changes to the regionalization factor, in other words there's no cap on regionalization; there's no diminishment of collective bargaining rights; CTPF legacy considerations within the formula exist; CPS Block Grant considerations are currently within the formula, exist; removal of the considerations with the formula for the remainder of the districts and removal... excuse me, not removal, but the minimum-funding level is maintained in Floor Amendment #5. With regards to changes, and again, let's go through those briefly. The minimum funding level is maintained at \$350

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

million, that... but it incorporates a provision that allows for a property tax swap for school districts that are considered to be high wealth, high tax, low wealth districts, excuse me. The CPS normal pension costs will be moved out of the education formula and instead will be provided in the Pension Code. And adjustments to CPS' local resources for the districts unfunded pension costs will be extended to all school districts if they happen to pick up legacy costs as a result of Tier 3... Tier 3 changes and the districts will receive the same deduction. With regard to mandate relief, there is a streamline waiver process in which all four of the Legislative Leaders will review school district waiver requests. If three of the Leaders flag a proposed waiver, it will go through the current General Assembly waiver process. If a waiver is not flagged by the Leaders then the waiver request is approved. We know that generally the General Assembly approves most if not all waivers, but this will create an expedited process that will deal with the vast majority of waiver requests. With regard to physical education, schools will have the ability to reduce daily PE to not less than 3 days per week. And additionally individual students in grades 7 through 10 will be able to seek an exemption from PE. Currently that waiver for students exists for grades 11 and 12, and we're extending it all the way down to grade 7. As far as driver's education is concerned, school districts would be able to use a third party to provide driver's education without going through the waiver process. Other... what we would call nonformula issues: property tax

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

referendum, reduction referendum. So, therefore if 10 percent of registered voters sign a petition, a referendum question can be brought forth at a consolidated election to reduce a school districts educational tax levy by maximum of 10 percent. This can only happen if a district is above 110 percent of adequacy and the levy reduction could not reduce a districts adequacy below the 110 percent. If a referendum is brought forth then the question cannot be posed again for the following two consolidated elections. With regard to the CTPF levy, under current law the Chicago Board of Education can levy up to .383 percent for teachers' pension costs. This proposal would increase the allowable levy to .567 percent or an additional \$120 million if fully realized. A TIF Reform Commission will be created to study and make recommendations to the General Assembly on changes to the tax increment financing that happens within municipalities. And then lastly, and I'll be more than happy to take questions after that, there will be a tax credit for scholarship donations. A tax credit would be created to incenify... incentivize donations from private school scholarships. Individuals or businesses could receive a 75 percent tax credit for each dollar donated for which they cannot receive a Federal tax dedication. A maximum of 75 million in credits may be rewarded annually and this amount will not increase. If the full 75 million in credits is realized, this program would cover less than approximately 6 thousand students and the program would operate for 5 years as a pilot program. That being said, Mr. Speaker, I would be more than happy to answer any questions."

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

Speaker Lang: "Gentlemen moves for the passage of the Bill.

Without objection we'll use the five-minute timer on each speaker. And the first to speak is Mr. McSweeney for five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

McSweeney: "First, I want to praise you, Chairman Davis, for the work you've done. You've worked on this for a long time. And I want to thank you for all of your hard work and all the efforts of many people in this chamber. But I just have one question, a clarification. I just want to confirm on page 546 of Amendment #5 that the property tax increase authorization is \$120 million. I understand that's for the pension levy; it's an authorization. Would that raise 120 or 130 million dollars?"

Davis: "According to my notes and according to James, \$120 million."

McSweeney: "Great. To the Bill. Mr. Speaker, the people of this state are facing a lot of tough times because of these tax increases that have gone into effect recently. They see the withholding on their paychecks. They're paying a soda tax in Cook County. They paid their property taxes recently in August and September, and we're losing people in this state. So, my concern is that we are going to adopt a generational change in the way that we appropriate and allocate money. We know that this will cost to meet adequate standards... adequacy standards about seven and a half billion dollars over next 10 years at the maximum, it could be a little less than that. I

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

don't know where we're going to get the money. We have \$14 billion of unpaid bills. I support the scholarship grant, but that's going to cost \$75 million a year. That's 750 million. So, I would prefer is that we somebody actually cut spending to pay for that. I don't know where this money is going to come from. And I say to my friends, who represent the great City of Chicago, and by the way, the City of Chicago is a great city. There's a lot of people running around politics criticizing Chicago, but we need to make sure that we're reforming CPS. So, I say to my friends, again, who represent the city, can your taxpayers really afford another \$130 million property tax increase? Because that's what this is. We can play games with the words that authorization. And I say to my friends on the Republican side, we've had a Governor running around for months talking about a bailout, and we're actually going to give Chicago more money. Turns out a few minutes ago, Frank Clark, the President of the Board, said it would be \$450 million more for the City of Chicago. So, I don't understand with \$580 million more what CPS is actually going to end up doing with this money to ensure that we put it in the classroom? That's the problem. It's paying for pensions. It's paying for administrative costs. So, this is a property tax increase for sure. This is a Chicago big dollar, \$450 million increase for sure. And I have other fundamental problems with the Bill. This does nothing overall to ensure under the new formula money is spent in the classroom. It does nothing to reduce administrative expenses. This doesn't even require a consolidation study by school

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

districts. And the most important part of it, is it does not require a cut in property taxes. So, while I applaud the work of many, I think our Leader Jim Durkin has done an outstanding job by dealing with a very difficult situation because, as we know, this is basically a done deal in the sense that the BIMP passed and you're stuck with a formula that's going to cost seven and a half billion dollars over the next 10 years. So, I stand for the taxpayers today and say we cannot afford seven and a half billion dollars. We cannot afford more property taxes. I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have been discussing adequacy and equity in education funding for almost 200 years. You go back to 1818, the delegates at that time were uncertain how we were going to provide for a good education for everyone. And certainly we can all agree that the current formula that we have that has been created since 1997 doesn't give us the kind of equity and adequacy that our children need to become successful in their career and in their lives. So, we need to do something different. And what has been put together and is the foundation of this Bill is the 27 elements that are proven to be best practices for educating the needs of our students. The formula also comes up with an adequacy target that for the first time tells residents in a school district how much they need to invest to get their students to an adequate level of education and to be successful. Those elements in and of themselves should direct us to say that this is a good model.

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

And when we had difficulty looking at SB1 and other Bills that have come before us, we have had partisan discussions about what's the right direction to go. So, as we look at 1947 and Amendment 5, we have a Bill that has been correct... an... crafted by our Leadership and by several of us on negotiating committees appointed by the various Leaders to try to come up with a bipartisan solution to the many issues we're facing. And by definition, a compromise includes things you like and things you don't like. We've heard some of those and certainly in the debates from those outside the chamber, we've heard about a lot of those issues some people don't like. But we have to look at what other Legislators are looking at to get their support for this Bill. And as we look together at the things that Representative Davis outlined that are in this Bill, we're finding that we're supporting local district choice to use the dollars that we're putting into the system that will move us closer to our constitutional requirement that we pay a majority... the people of Illinois pay a majority of the cost of education. If we follow this model for the next 10 years, which is the model that has been outlined, we will be at that adequacy level of 50 percent. And that's really... ought to be a driving force in our decisions on this Bill today. Is... it's moving us to provide the resources that students need. It's moving to deal with the challenges that our school districts have. It allows the school districts the independence to decide what's best for their communities. And it bring us to a better system that is more adequately funded. It provides for some choice in

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

property tax relief. Certainly it's not as much as some would like. It's more than others would like. It's what you might call a compromise. And certainly as you look at the waivers and the mandates that our side of the aisle has been talking about, because our school districts are talking about it, we move in that direction as well. So, there are plusses and minus in this Bill. And I would just ask is that we really look at how this is going to impact the resources and the education in our district. How it's going to move us more towards adequacy and an equal opportunity that builds a more educated workforce that will attract jobs, that will keep jobs in our state, and that will help grow our economy. Because as has been mentioned already, we are heavily taxed in Illinois. It's time to grow the economy, grow the revenues of the state without taking more from the residents that we have. And this Bill gives us that opportunity of a better educated workforce, some property tax relief, some benefits that both sides of the aisle have been asking for. So, I strongly advocate for a positive vote on this issue. It's going to be game-changing. And it's going to move Illinois forward. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo for five minutes."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. And to the Bill. As we set aside philosophical differences, I'm pretty sure we're going to debate that later on. I just want to give some historical perspective of what's transpired the last couple years on this Bill, going back to the Governor's Education Reform Commission and some things that have come before committees

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

as well. Let me go back to the Governor's Reform Commission and talk briefly about the mandate reliefs contained in this Bill. These mandate reliefs were debated heavily during those meetings. And we would ask the proponents to please show us the return on investment, show us the benefit of these mandate relief initiatives to no avail. These mandate reliefs Bills have come before our committee, as well, the Education Committee and they have failed each and every time. They have been vetted. There's no support. And I don't think that's the way we should pass this. Let's talk briefly about the scholarships, something that has not been vetted at least in this state. Most private schools, most parochial schools have an admission process. They can select who they're going to let in. And it has been my experience that many cases ESL students or students with some disability cannot get in. So what happens if they apply to these schools under the scholarship program? They won't get in. They're going to stay at the public schools. So, they're going to have to pay for that. And the event... in the event they do make it in to one of these private or parochial schools if there's a need for special education, they send them back to the public schools to get that. So that doesn't change. We haven't talked about the transportation issues. How do we deal with that under this program that has not been vetted? I also understand that the scholarships can go up to \$12 thousand, which I believe is what's being used as the state average, \$12 thousand. I know there's some schools downstate where you barely get \$8 thousand per student. And in this case were going to have

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

these students get \$12 thousand. Let me talk briefly about the appropriation process. And the \$350 million which everybody feels, hey, that's what we need to adequately fund education. That is not true. The way we came up with \$350 million in the Education Reform Commission, we agreed that in order to adequately fund education, we need close to \$6.5 billion. But we agreed that on the report, we were just going to say, well you know what let's use a range \$3.5-\$6.5 billion. Then arbitrarily they decided to use 3.5 as the adequate dollar amount. They divided that by ten. Why ten? I don't know. It's an arbitrary number, and that's how we came up with the \$350 million. I would submit to all of you that is not enough. We need a lot more than that. And let me tell you that that amount is not quaranteed. While we were working on the appropriation process to pass a balanced budget this year, we did look at the \$350 million during the process. And at one time during that meeting... several meetings that we had, we considered lowering that down to \$320 million because of all the pressure points that we had. Luckily we came up with the \$350 million dollars which is not guaranteed for next year; however, the \$75 million credit is quaranteed each and every year for the next five years. That does not seem fair to me. So, as we look forward and we look at Senate Bill 1... that was a tough vote for a lot of folks... I supported Senate Bill 1, and I got like 60 percent of what I wanted, not 90 percent like the Governor, 60 percent. When I talked to my superintendents in my school districts, they told me, hey, wait a second we got duped here. We remained silent. We

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

support Senate Bill 1. We get nothing. But you know what? We're good Samaritans. We want to help. But all of a sudden you see this Bill coming out of nowhere, and you're like, what happened to us? We got nothing. So, suburban Legislators think long and hard before you support this. Now, I would say we are very, very close. And I would submit that we still have more time. The Tuesday deadline is there because of the Amendatory Veto. Most schools could probably stay open for another couple of weeks, some longer than that. We're very close. I still think we need to work a little bit longer on this to get it right. And finally I'll say this, the budget Bill that we did pass came from the bottom up. We had rankand-file people working on this thing, very different from this. This comes from the top down. Those things don't seem to work. Shall we submit, please consider that. I think we have more time to get this thing right. Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford for five minutes."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to remind people that today is the 54th anniversary of the Dr. King speech in Washington. And in his speech he said, it is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. And so today were asked to vote on a Bill for education. I represent the Austin community and voting on this Bill... living and representing a community like Austin where... when Chicago made a decision to close schools, we were on the receiving end of seven. Also, representing a community that has no real community high school present for students to dream about

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

going to one day. There's no high school for the Austin community, and I've been advocating for a new high school in the Austin community since I've been here, and I've been here 11 years. And I continue to advocate. And this Bill is going to send a lot of money to Chicago, and yet Austin still doesn't have a high school in the Bill. So, only about \$70 million dollars to build a high school. And they're building high schools all over the city, but they're forgetting about the Austin community. That's not right. Also, thinking about the Austin community and you're talking about education most of our schools in the Austin community still struggle with no real plan with the Legislator that they're asking to vote on Bills to send more money to the district. So, this Bill, as the Sponsor said at the beginning, was put together by the four Leaders which means that this Leader from Austin, this advocate from the west side of Chicago for the people really did not get to put input in it from the people. My people have asked me for things and they are not in this Bill. So, my question is, if I vote this in more money that means I agree with what's going on in the City of Chicago in the State of Illinois. If I vote 'yes' that means that I want more of the same. If I vote 'no', it gives me a chance to possibly be at the table and bargain for my people. So, the question is, what would you do? Thank you, Mr. Speaker. "

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris for five minutes."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I, as others have said,
I compliment the individuals that negotiated this Bill. I
know it's not easy. It is a compromise. Some are going to

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

vote 'no', some are going to vote 'yes'. I realize that. You know I spent 30 years in the military, and I think the only thing more complicated than a military operation is the educational funding formula in the State of Illinois. But I'm not... I don't want to address the ... the complicated nature of the Bill. I want to frame my remarks using Sunday's Chicago Tribune. And Sunday's Chicago Tribune had two editorials. One was to vote for the Bill, the other was what's so great about Indiana, and all the reasons why people should leave Illinois and go to Indiana. And I want to focus on one quote, the former Secretary of Commerce in Indiana said, we don't spend money we don't have. So, you know, I'm not very bright. I'm a dumb numbers guys. And that quote to me says it all. You know I put my ass and my political career on the line to vote for a balanced budget. And now the Governor's allies are out there aggressively trying to find a Primary candidate against me. Okay. Fair enough. Let me tell you a little bit about the negotiations leading up to that budget vote. Those of us on the Republican side of the aisle worked with the lead House Democrat negotiator, and we fought over nickels and dimes. There was a tax break for biodiesel that was initially included, and we say unh-unh got to be out of there because it's worth a hundred million dollars, and we're not going to put that in the Bill. So, that came out, that was a hundred million dollars. And now we're getting ready to give away or to reduce general revenue by \$75 million plus 40 million in pensions for Chicago, new money. That's a hundred million dollars, which we fought over. Does anyone tell me

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

how we're going to make up that 75 million or that 40 million, \$115 million either in reduced expenditures or increased revenues? I mean, are we going to pass an expanded sales tax on services or a satellite tax? I don't think so. And by the way, an element of the budget Bill that we passed that doesn't get a lot of attention, but it's there, is the fact that we increased... increased the educational tax credit from \$500 to \$750, a 50 percent increase. We also gave a tax credit for teachers who spend \$250... or a tax credit of \$250, who spend school supplies that they can't get through the normal procurement process. And now we're going to add another credit. Look, I went to parochial high school. My two sons went to parochial grade school and high school. My wife and I made the choice to do that because that's the education we wanted for our kids. We struggled to pay those tuitions as well as to pay the property taxes. That was a choice that we voluntarily made. So, I understand and value parochial education and the private schools and what they can do, but I also have a responsibility to the taxpayers of the State of Illinois. And to my friends, especially on this side of the aisle, who oftentimes stand up and say, oh, the proposals, where are we going to get the money? How are we going to pay for it? I suggest that you look closely at what this Bill does by way of revenue reductions and future budgetary pressures. And I'm going to close by going back to where I started. That... the Secretary of Commerce in Indiana, we don't spend money we don't have. And some will say this doesn't blow a hole in the FY18 budget, that \$75 million. Maybe it

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

doesn't, but it certainly increases budgetary pressures in the future. And like it or not because of our two years of budget impasse and an accumulation of \$15 billion in back bills, this state needs to be on a tight fiscal diet for years to come. My humble opinion. We don't have excess money. We don't. And in my opinion... and again, I applaud the difficult negotiations that took place to get us to this compromise, but in my opinion, on the revenue angle this Bill moves us in the wrong direction from where we need to be especially for the future. And I recommend a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bourne for five minutes."

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Today we have an opportunity to vote on a piece of legislation that will fundamentally alter the way we fund public education in Illinois and will also fundamentally alter the lives of millions of school children in the State of Illinois. We, as a state, have done a disservice to generations of students in this state. Many of us came to the General Assembly hoping to provide a better future for the next generation of Illinoisans. Changing the way we fund our schools is a fundamental part of making that a reality. Twenty years ago in 1997, this Body enacted the current school funding formula. That same year, I, along with 26 other kindergarteners walked into our first day of school, at a school... public school... rural public school about 30 miles south of here. For an entire generation of students, who lived under that education funding formula and now other generations of students, we have perpetuated an education funding system that does not

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

send our state dollars to the schools who need it most first. We are past due for reforming our school funding formula. In that time, in those 20 years, there have been very few examples of such major compromised agreements on such important legislative issues. Today, though, we can end this broken system and start a new path for the next generation. This school funding agreement replaces our broken school funding plan with elements from the Governor's fun... School Funding Reform Commission and with input from bipartisan, bicameral negotiations. Embracing the spirit of bipartisan compromise, this Bill represents concessions, as have been mentioned, from lawmakers on both... from both Parties and in both chambers. We have a proposal now that will ensure that all students in Illinois receive the high quality education that they deserve. Moreover, this compromise prioritizes funding to the students and the schools who need it most. This plan is realistic. This plan is fair. This plan represents the best outcome for all students in Illinois. I want to say a quick thank you to the Sponsors of this Bill: Representative Davis, Leader Currie; to our colleagues in the Senate: Senator Manar, Senator Lightford, Senator Barickman; to Representative Pritchard, to Leader Durkin, and to the so many others in this room and on our staff, who have advocated and worked so tirelessly to see this through. I also want to say a thank you to the education champions, who are with us who aren't, the educators, the children, superintendents, the advocates, their families who have been persistent and patient with us to get to a point where we can

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

have a bipartisan compromised solution to our broken school funding system. They have long awaited for the day where we could fix the formula and hopefully today is that day. Getting school funding right is the most important thing that we can do this in this Body for our children, for their future, and for our state's future. This is a good compromise that we can pass today, get signed into law, and then continue the important work of prioritizing education in our spending as a state. This is important for the next generations of Illinoisans to get the high quality education that they deserve and that we owe to them. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McAuliffe for five minutes."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a Legislator who represents portions of the City of Chicago and surrounding suburbs, I stand in support of this Bill. This Bill is a compromise in which we've proportionately increased the funding needed for Chicago Public Schools, while leaving no other school district behind. All schools should receive the funding needed to provide an exceptional learning environment for our state's next generation. While a good portion of my constituents send their children to area of Chicago Public Schools and other public schools in the suburbs, many other send their children to local private schools. And the proposed plan provides a tax credit as precious local school resources are being preserved. This is a benefit to both taxpayers supporting the public school, and those families choosing a private education. I've heard from principals from the private schools and also from Chicago

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

Public Schools asking me to vote for this Bill. The families I represent all share a common desire and that is for their children to receive a quality education regardless... regardless of the type of school they attend. This plan is a win-win situation for our broken school funding system... and I'm ready to vote in favor of this compromise. I would like to thank the Sponsor, Representative Davis, and all those who have made this Bill a good compromise Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers for five minutes."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm proud to say that I'm a product of the Catholic Schools. I attended Our Lady of Solace, Saint Cecilia, and Saint Bernard's Elementary School, and I know the struggles that my mother had to go through in order for us to receive that education. But I want to say that that was her choice. And the fact of the matter is the Constitution says that public education is a mandate, public education is something we have to do, and that's what we haven't been doing. The State of Illinois is number 50... number 50 in regards to funding education. Now, I want to commend my colleagues for the hard work that they put into negotiation for Senate Bill 1 because this tax credit for the rich was not there. And so, as a result, I also want to take this opportunity to thank all the school superintendents... because they came out and they said that they wanted equitable education for all the children not just a select few. And unfortunately, with the tax credit for the rich in this Bill, this would cause fewer children to be able to attend a public

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

school... because with the funding for the parochial schools, private schools, and the funding of the charter schools, we've eroded... we've eroded the funding for public education; once again, it's constitutional. But the most important thing about this legislation that's missing, in my opinion, it really doesn't speak to the education of the children. It talks about the funding. It talks about the pensions. It talks about everything but the quality of life as a result of this funding being applicable. So, with that being said, I am going to be respectfully voting 'no' for this Bill because the tax credit did not have a hearing. I think the constituents in which I represent, they are entitled to ask questions to find out how and if this tax credit is going to be, how is going to affect their community and their schools. In the City of Chicago, this Mayor has closed 50 schools, and on Thursday, when it was announced that there was an agreement, he added 51. So, there is no guarantee that the students on the south or west side of the City of Chicago will have a school. To me, this issue is too important. I want to discuss funding. I want to discuss the quality of education. I want to make sure there's qualified teachers. I want to make sure there's a safe and educational environment and community. And with that being said, I respectfully request a 'no' vote on Senate Bill 1947."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons for five minutes."

Ammons: "Thank you. I'm so used to seeing the camera on us, like, am I live? Thank you. To the Sponsor of this Bill, Senate Bill 1947, thank you for working so hard and diligently to

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

try to resolve, probably the greatest crisis that the State of Illinois has experienced outside of the budget crisis, itself, and probably the entirety of its existence. I just wanted to ask a quick question to clarify something that was said a little earlier about the tax credit that is in this compromise. Is... the tax credit that's being discussed is actually to the donor not the families, correct?"

Davis: "Correct."

Ammons: "So, a family, who may or may not have access to the scholarship credit as it's being described, will not receive any actual tax credit, it will go to a donor group?"

Davis: "Yes. I'm sorry, that's my understanding."

Ammons: "And to my understanding as how that process will work, those who are receiving the tax credit, which are tax credit given by the State of Illinois, there is no public record that will be available to the public as to who these donors are?"

Davis: "No, unfortunately, that is an anonymity with regard to the donors."

Ammons: "Thank you very much."

Davis: "Privacy rights, if you will."

Ammons: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Those who have worked on Senate Bill 1, certainly in this chamber as well as in the Senate chambers, Senator Andy Manar, and every single person who represented the Education Task Force, I want to, first of all, thank you for all of your diligent research-based work that got us to this point. But a few questions still remain as difficult points for me. One of them is that... this new tax

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

credit, of which I think a couple of Members have already demonstrated that we actually don't know where this money is going to come from. That tax credit does not lend itself to a transparent public process as to who's receiving taxpayer dollars as a credit. That's the first part of my concern. But the second part that I'd like to speak to, to the Bill is that the constitutional responsibility of the General Assembly is to adequately fund its public schools. There's no discussion in the Constitution about us adequately funding our public schools if we give a tax credit for parochial schools or those who love to donate to them. Just for transparency sake, my own son went to a Christian-based school. From K through 5, my husband and I decided not to go to Italy, but to send him to this school so that we could provide for him the kind of educational foundation we thought he needed. But I do not believe that that should be at the expense of our local public schools. And so, we shouldered that responsibility. Today, this is a very difficult question on the table. The difficult question that we are facing is whether we should give property tax relief in order for us to meet our constitutional obligation to fund schools. The question is whether we should give tax credit in order for us to meet our constitutional responsibility to adequately fund our schools, and mind you, Members of the Assembly, we have not funded our schools even in this Bill according to what the actual needs of education funding in Illinois are. And so, I would ask our Members to really think about... yes, there is a compromise on the table. I believe Senate Bill 1 was

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

that adequate compromise that should be taken up by this chamber and should be given serious consideration to override the Governor's Veto because that Bill actually moves us exactly where we said we wanted to go. I just want to remind some of the colleagues on the right that we talked about putting money into our budget negotiations for improving our school funding. And many objected to putting that money in there, and it's interesting that the one way to fund public schools appropriately today hinges on whether we will provide a tax credit shelter for people who have the money to fund parochial education. That is an interesting question on the floor today. So..."

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

Ammons: "I appreciate... I appreciate all of the work of Representative Davis. At this point, I don't believe that my vote will be 'yes' on this board, but I'll continue to listen."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives for five minutes."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I find it astounding that we sit here today as we talk about redoing our education funding formula and the entire process is built on the financials of a school and what... and 27 elements that should be funded. And none of the process, to date, has been for... focused on outcomes, performance student outcomes. There's nothing in this Bill that talks about measuring student growth in order to receive more money, nor does it talk about funding the right items and showing that the outcomes actually came out of funding those right items. This is all an input-based

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

model. It is a complex, probably, 350 thousand data point model that has to be recalculated every single year. And for the taxpayers in my district, who receive very little out of this Bill, I'll be voting 'no'. And here's why, because for my taxpayers this is one huge, massive, and sustaining bailout of Chicago Teacher Pension Fund, a massive and sustaining bailout of them. And their statistics are shameful. Over the last 17 years, they have gone from nearly 100 percent funding down to about 50 percent funding. And why is that? For 13 of those 17 years, they failed to put in money for the pensions, negligible amount. Even last year, they shorted the system \$250 million. So, as you can see, this is a cycle that's never going to get fixed. And instead, what this Bill does, it demands that taxpayers around the state bail out Chicago Teacher Pension Fund. This is a very weedy type of process when you talk about their legacy pension fund and what it means. But I will tell you, I manipulated the ... formula myself, and one of the biggest metrics that changes how much more money you're going to get from the state was the legacy pension amount coming out of Chicago. And there's no guarantee that that amount is going to stay the same or any even amount. In fact, it's projected in the next 10 years that their pension debt or their pension cost is going to be \$1 billion per year. And who's going to pay for that? Through this formula, taxpayers around the state are going to pay for pensions and it's not going to the classrooms. We've got to stop this. And I'd like to talk to you a little more about it, because when I look at data around the state that I have

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

collected on all 852 school districts, I know that money's not always the answer. I'm going to give you a few examples. First of all, let's talk about Ford Heights. Ford Heights has the third largest highest spent per student. They spend \$27 thousand per kid, and their ready rate is 19 percent, 19 percent at ground level... at grade level. It's not about the money, it's about how is that money being used, and nothing in this formula says that you have to use money in a particular way. Twenty-seven thou... we've already had this experiment, spend more money, what's your results? Well, it's not very good. But let's take another example. Let's look at Rich Township High School District. They spend \$18,814 per kid. They have 9 percent of their students at grade level, 9 percent. How about Thornton, 19,830? They have 12 percent of their kids at grade level. Let's look at Homeward Flossmoor, \$18 thousand, 18,068, 14 percent at grade level. How about Marengo? Marengo spends 17,897, 16 percent of their kids are at grade level. You can go around the state, districts spending one and a half times the state average, and their results are abysmal. Nothing in this Bill is results oriented. Additionally, when we look across the state, and we find out areas where you can just do comparative studies on the same districts where they're spending \$2 thousand less and getting better results. This Bill is one massive bailout of Chicago. That's all this is. And it's on the backs of every other state taxpayer. You cannot afford this. In the next three years, we don't have another billion dollars to spend on education, and enough... and districts are going to be held harmless. Please

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

vote 'no'. We can do better work, and we can fund students not an educational monopoly controlled by lobbyists and bureaucrats."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen for five minutes."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, now when we passed SB1, it passed on a bare Majority 60 votes. At this time, we need 71 votes to get something through. And you know, it was funny you know, we... there was a Republican proposal from the Republican House and Senate Caucuses, that is counter proposal to SB1. The problem was in any negotiation the only way you're going to get to resolution is if you're not fighting over the exact same thing. And so, somehow, our Leaders were able to figure out a way to broker a compromise where we actually could fight over different things. The Chicago Public Schools have budgeted and told us they need a certain amount of money in order to get open and stay open all year long. This Bill actually gets them that amount of money. But what happens on the other side? The other districts in the state get their flexibility from certain mandates... from Springfield. Taxpayers across the state are going to get property tax relief; first property tax relief that we've have in decades on the education side. I know there have been some questions about the tax credit. So that's, you know, we've got about \$7 billion, depending on how you calculate it, \$7 billion in education funding that's hinging on this Bill, and 75 million that's 1 percent of that amount, that would go to the tax credit. And even then, the credit's not touching any of the education money. So, somehow we worked

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

through negotiation, so it out doesn't neighborhood schools at all, not one bit. As well, just as a point of information for folks, even the State of Florida has a very successful tax credit program. They've got, give or take, about 3 million school children; we've got about 2 million school children. They're spending \$600 million on their credit; we'd only be spending 75, and that's doing fine in their state. You know, the other issue... and I mean, you can hear it here today, no one's happy about this Bill. House Republicans aren't happy, House Democrats aren't happy, various folks, various caucuses, various numbers, and various places. But oftentimes, that's a sign that the Bill actually has kind of hit that middle... that sweet middle spot where folks are getting what they need, not necessarily everything they want, but they're getting what they need. You know, we've got to remember what we do here today. Today, with this compromise Bill, we have the chance to finally end the long war. We finally end the impasse. We take the school children out of the line of fire. We instead take those school districts, those superintendents, who have been harassing us, going they want to know what is their funding level going to be next year. We end that. We end the uncertainty. And finally, we come to compromise. This would be the first major education-funding compromise in decades. And the people of the State of Illinois will thank us for doing it. I think our successors in this Body will thank us for doing it, and the school children will be better off overall. So, Mr. Speaker, I urge that every Republican and I

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

urge every Democrat to please consider a 'yes' vote. And if you're leaning, please go 'yes' today, and let's end this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "We have two more seeking recognition, Mr. Demmer and Mr. Reick, and then we'll go to a vote, Ladies and Gentlemen. Mr. Demmer for five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Representative Davis, I appreciate the work that you've done on this. I know this has been a long running issue that your committees have studied. You probably heard more hours of testimony and input into this issue than probably anybody in the General Assembly, and so, I commend you for the work you've been able to do on that. I have a few questions to talk about, just to work through some of the details and some of the aspects of the Bill that we're looking at today. The first question is, I think it's important that when we're looking at a formula like this, that not only drives how dollars will be spent in this fiscal year under this appropriation that was passed last month, but also how it will affect districts and education spending in years to come. What kind of adjustment factors or escalators are included in the formula to help make this adjust and adapt to changing situations in the future?"

Davis: "In particular, teacher salaries and support staff salaries. The escalators are designed to realize what the real cost of providing education is. And those escalators are

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

designed to help measure that as the formula moves forward, as we continue to fund the formula."

- Demmer: "Okay. I appreciate that. Because it's important that a formula not just work in the time that you've designed it, but also in the future. So, I appreciate your perspective on that. Another item that's... I'm interested in is the treatment of property taxes in the City of Chicago. Could you describe for me the provisions in this Bill that relate to property taxes for individuals and commercial institutions in the City of Chicago?"
- Davis: "What it does is that it authorizes the Chicago Board...

 Board of Education to potentially raise the levy that's available for them to make payments toward their own pension system."
- Demmer: "And what's their... what's the provision in place for that?

 Is it simply a vote of the board? Is it a referendum that has
 to be approved by the city council or by voters? Or what are
 the steps in place to make that happen?"
- Davis: "It is a vote of the Chicago Board of Education that allows for that to happen."
- Demmer: "Okay. And a couple other aspects of the Bill that are...
 that were interesting to me. And had the pleasure of serving
 with the Lieutenant Governor on a commission that looked at
 unfunded mandates and local government consolidation. I
 noticed there are some provisions in this Bill that address
 mandates. Where did those ideas for mandate relief come from?
 Or why is... why is mandate relief an important part of the
 school funding proposal?"

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

"Well, presumably, mandate relief is important because Davis: school districts would like to... like to have some kind of flexibility, maybe also, a way to kind of measure or be able to control some of their costs as appropriate. During the conversation, essentially two mandates always consistently came up in the conversation and that was involving PE and driver's ed. And thanks to a conversation that I had with Representative Pritchard, another part of this conversation is a streamline process. We know that the current process is very cumbersome; it takes a long time. So, this allows for some waivers to be addressed in a more efficient manner when there can be agreement based on the four Leaders, and when there's not, we still have the same process that allows for a more lengthier, more enhanced debate on approving that waiver if it is so desired."

Demmer: "So, I appreciate that, but specifically on the mandates that are being relieved. The first would be that it would... this would allow a school district to contract with a commercial driving instructor in Driver's Education. Currently, there's... that has to go through a waiver process, and even before it's streamlined, it has to go through the waiver process. What this Bill would provide is that Driver's Education could be commercially contracted without going through the waiver process. Is that right?"

Davis: "That is correct."

Demmer: "And then the second mandate that's being relieved is on the Physical Education mandate. And is it true this would

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

- reduce the number of days that are required? Or how does this provide relief in PE?"
- Davis: "Well, currently the mandate is five days. This reduces it to three days a week, but then it also has a provision for individual students where they can petition to get out of PE if they're currently involved in some type of extracurricular activity."
- Demmer: "So, we're pretty familiar with the waiver process in the General Assembly. We usually have that Bill that comes up that's kind of a confusing report about accept the waivers, don't accept the waivers that are recommended by ISBE. So, tell me a little bit, you mentioned that this streamlines a waiver process. How do we kind of cut out some of that red tape for school districts?"
- Davis: "Well, it allows for the Leaders to be able to review all the mandates, and if there's an agreement of amongst at least three of the Leaders, that mandate can be relieved. If there's not an agreement, we still have the process and allows the waivers to move through the process. So, this is a quicker way to do that versus the way we're currently doing."
- Demmer: "The last question I have is about the property tax relief referendum. What school districts would be eligible to pursue property tax relief under this Bill?"
- Davis: "Districts that are currently above 110 percent of adequacy."
- Demmer: "And that would happen each year. If a school district went above a 110 percent of adequacy, they'd be eligible to take advantage of this property tax relief opportunity?"

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

Davis: "They would be able to reduce by 10 percent. And right now, that currently affects about 100 districts."

"Thank you, Representative, for your comments. To the Bill. I'd like to commend all the workers from both caucuses, from both chambers, who have spent so many hours trying to put together what I think is a reasonable compromise here. As many other speakers have indicated, there's never an ability and a compromise for one side to say they got everything they were looking for. Sometimes an issue that you wanted to have addressed wasn't addressed. Sometimes things don't go far enough, sometimes they go too far. The nature of legislation that we have in this General Assembly is that many times we're forced to make a decision based on a product that's happened. Given the input of all 118 Members, of those people who have negotiated in a more direct way, they're the ones who are at the tables trying to come up with an agreement that they think can pass with support from both Republicans and Democrats. I'd like to commend the Representatives on both sides who have worked on this issue. I think we have a fair compromise here. Again, it doesn't do everything that we're looking for it to do, but I think it's a step in the right direction. And I encourage support for this measure. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick for five minutes."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I've been listening to my friends from the other side talk about this Bill, and I find it highly ironic that they got a Bill that gives them 90 percent of what they want, but they're still not in favor of it. I'm not in favor of this Bill as it's written, either,

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

there's a lot of stuff in there I do not like. I don't like the idea of legacy costs being used to reduce local capacity which will give the City of Chicago's Public School system an additional \$40 million a year. I don't like that. I don't like... honestly, I don't like the tax credit program because I believe if we're going to... if we're going to provide for school choice in this state, and there is no bigger advocate for school choice in this state than I am, I believe that we ought to stand up and give school choice out of money that we have appropriated here. To blow a \$75 million hole in the budget immediately upon passage of a budget that has caused many people their careers, I cannot support that. I would much rather see something done that is being done in Arizona and Nevada where parents are given state-appropriated money and told, go educate your kid the best way you think. However, now to the Bill. There are things in the Bill that I think move us forward. The first one is the property tax swap. It's small; it's inadequate, but it's going to give districts, especially in the south suburbs Waukegan, Zion, it's going to give them a taste of what it's like to have a property tax Bill that is actually going down a cut. At the expense of state money? Yes, but that's something we're going to have to deal with because property taxes are completely out of control. This is a beginning step, and I... to Representative Davis specifically, I will say this, I think when the districts that are in your districts start to see the benefits of this, they're going to come clambering to you for further relief in that regard, and I will fully support them and I

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

will support you as you come to us and say, let's do this. The ability of the... the authorization to the City of Chicago to blow through its PTELL limit, in effect, to get more money from its property taxpayers to pay for its own pension plan. I think that's a good move, because I think that what we're doing now is we've stuck the camel's nose under the tent flap with regard to how property taxes should be assessed in this state and what limitations should or should not be places upon them. I don't agree with a lot of the things in this Bill, believe me. I spent all weekend agonizing over this. But overall, it's a bailout for the City of Chicago, yes. You're getting money that other districts are not going to get, yes. But your pensions are now going to be paid for in the Pension Code where it belongs. And the day is going to come when we're going to do a pension swap, a pension shift, and the Chicago Public Schools System is going to go to its Chicago Teachers Union instead ... and say, instead of spending 2 percent of your salary toward pension, you're now going to have to pay the same way everybody else does in this state and that's 9 percent, and they're not going to like it. But you know something? That's too damn bad. It's time that we started treating pensioners, employees who are on public pensions, the same regardless of their zip code. So, overall, this is not a good Bill. This was not a good Bill when it came back here as Senate Bill 1. I didn't like the... I didn't like the formula, the funding model to begin with. I don't. I think we can do this better, but this is the Bill we're going to have. And we're not going to ... if we blow this up ... if

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

we blow this up and Senate Bill 1 goes down and everything else goes to hell in a handbasket, we're not... we're going to have to go back and renegotiate this. And I do not have any confidence that we're going to get a better Bill than we have right now. Therefore, I reluctantly will hold my nose and vote for this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "When I said earlier we only had two speakers, I did not see Mr. Wheeler's light. So, Mr. Wheeler for five minutes will be the last speaker on this Bill."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Will, I want to thank you. You know I had some discussions online, offline about this issue. The last two times I spoke on this floor, I implored us, as a Body, to work together, to not just continue to build pressure, but rather build consensus. In some form, I think this has... what this particular Bill in front of us has done and taken that shape. So with that, I want to ask you just a few questions, so I have some clarity about how this works and the role that I might ultimately play in it. There is some questions about transparency regarding the tax credit for the scholarships. Can you answer a couple questions for me, please?"

Davis: "Please, go right ahead."

Wheeler, K.: "So, one thing that was brought up was where this money goes and how do we ever track it? Don't the SGOs have a role to play in that as far as recording and how that works within ISBE and the Department of Revenue? Can you walk me through how that... you intend that to work?"

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

- Davis: "Well, the SGOs actually will administer the program. I believe they will be the repositors of the resources. But they can only do that once they have been vetted by... initially, the Department of Revenue, to make sure that they are an organization in good standing, that they are not-for-profit that their board members don't have any other particular conflict. So, there is a high level of scrutiny that will come along with this, because I would argue that advocates want to make sure that the dollars are going to be administered appropriately."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. Will there be then based on what's in the Bill and what ultimately could become statute, would be... would it go through JCAR then for some rules that would administer exactly how those procedures would be followed within the agencies and such?"
- Davis: "Oh, I would imagine the Rules Committee or excuse me, the JCAR, Joint Committee on Administrative Rules, will have a significant role in working to try to determine exactly how this process will work."
- Wheeler, K.: "And then we would have to move relatively quickly in order for us to have this in place by the time we'd want to see these scholarships being administered and to have those who are going to invest in these programs know that their... that their money's going to get the tax credits properly, and that this process runs smoothly and effectively, but with some level of transparency."
- Davis: "Well, certainly, that's what, you know, JCAR will... will do for us. Now, mind you, this will not start until the next

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

school year, so 2018-19 school year. And I'm not saying that there's a ton of time, but there's certainly is adequate time for the JCAR to come together to make sure that the rules are appropriate and adequate for this program."

Wheeler, K.: "Well, I only say it because I know my friend, Leader Lang, does not favor emergency rules, and we want to do the rule process properly. So, I was making sure it's on the record that we intend to move this quickly, so it has a chance to take form when it should take form, and people understand before this begins. So, there is a level of transparency people are concerned about, I understand that part of it, I agree with that. Representative, is there al... does this scholarship program require any kind of results as far as what is being done with the money and who gets it and what they do with that money and the what those achievements of those students?"

Davis: "Well, at the very least, the students that participate in the program will be subject to taking... be subject to state standards. And so, we will be monitoring state standards with regards to these students as compared to students in any of the other public schools that are here in the State of Illinois as well. So, you have at least that much in terms of scrutiny and monitoring that will take place."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. I think in my analysis that's showed that that's a breakthrough. That's something that's not normally required in private education. Is that... Am I understanding that correctly?"

Davis: "That's correct."

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. With respect to the scholarship, the students who get to receive the scholarships... we're trying to drive these opportunities for kids who are part of potentially low-income families. That's what this is all about. It's not going to go to high profile, you know, high-income families, you know, that we hear about all the time that go to private school. This is a different model, right? This is going to go for low-income kids that need this kind of help to get this kind opportunity, I should say?"
- Davis: "Yes. Not only are there income requirements, but students who are in what would otherwise be classified as failing schools will also be eligible for participation as well."
- Wheeler, K.: "So, that's still in line with the thinking behind what this evidence-based model is supposed to help us do, right? It's supposed to help us drive money toward districts that have, you know, low-income concentrations. This is also another way to help low-income families, and kind of concert together, we're doing the best we can as a state to move the ball forward for those low-income families. Is that a fair and accurate representation?"

Davis: "It is."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative, I appreciate your answers to the questions. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a rare opportunity in my tenure here for us to actually look at what we could call a bipartisan success. We haven't done a lot of that lately. It's time for us to step up, help our kids, help our teachers,

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

administrators, families, and get something done for Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis to close."

Davis: "Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before I get into final comments, let me take this opportunity to thank a number of individuals and groups that participated, and ultimately getting to where we are, particularly as it relates to starting with SB1 that would include organizations like the Center for Tax and Budget Accountability, the Illinois Association of School Business Officials. Stand for Children was a very important organization relative to this discussion as well as Advance Illinois. I also want to make sure I acknowledge, particularly, two members of our staff that were very instrumental in managing this process and the conference calls and all the information. And that is, of course, Jessica Basham, our Director of Appropriations, but more importantly, the young man standing behind me to my right, Mr. James O'Brien, who has certainly proving himself to be one of the standout members of our staff here on this side, deserves a great round of applause for everything that he's done. There are a number of Members that were a part of this process and ... and going back to our negotiating... negotiate ... initial negotiating team that includes Members from both sides and chambers, particularly, Senators Barrickman McConchie, Senator Lightford, Senator Manar, especially Senator Manar, who been shepherding this process for the last two, three, four, years, who really got the ball rolling on getting us down this path. Here in the House, of course, along

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

with myself, we have our Leader, Leader Currie, Representative Bourne was a part of that. But I'd be remiss if I didn't really take an opportunity to acknowledge, again, Representative Bob Pritchard, who has been a real stalwart in trying to get the right thing done here in the State of Illinois as it relates to school funding and all of his work. The Streamline Waiver Process was his brain child, and we were able to at least get that as part of the... a part of the final... final deal. And when all else fails, of course, we have to thank our Leaders that worked together on this Bill, their compromise. However you feel about it, again, that's what sometimes it is that we've acknowledged already that sometimes compromise is when nobody necessarily walks away with everything that they want, be it 90 percent or otherwise. And we've heard back and forth about how Members feel about certain parts of this compromise. And again, you'll have to vote how you feel you should vote with regard to this. So, again, our primary objective here is to make sure that we do something different here in the State of Illinois. One Member who pointed to a number of south suburban schools and talked about how much money they're spending and their tax rates. Well, unfortunately, they don't have the benefit of the area that she has. If they were in her area, they wouldn't be spending nearly as much money. So, I don't know how you... how you chastise these districts for doing everything that they can do, when you're in a district that has plenty of wealth, plenty of business, and plenty of money in order to spend on school districts. So, let's not get too far off-base with why

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

this is important. We have talked for a very long time about an evidence based way of funding schools here in Illinois. So, Members talked about transparency. The evidence-based model is transparency, Ladies and Gentlemen. It creates a mechanism where we can track all of the dollars that are going to school districts to make sure that at the end of the day that their outcomes are being measured up against the amount of resources that they receive. That's what an evidence-based model is and that's what it does, and we are proud to have put that forward. It is the cornerstone of what we are talking about today that leads us in a direction of adequacy and equity in terms of state funding. And then of course there are the resources that go along with it, and one thing I that I'd like to say with regard to the tax credit program, is that the \$350 million that we put forward in our budget for SB1 stays intact. That program does not take anything away from our minimum-funding level that we have fought to maintain throughout this entire process. So, regardless of how you feel about the benefit that comes to some individuals and some corporations that'll contribute to that program, for those of us who have been fighting hard for SB1, SB1 remains. It remains intact and it continues to do all of the things that we wanted SB1 to do, and now we've got some additions to it as well. And... thank you. So... so, not to... again, not to prolong this, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a very tough decision that all of you will have to make. I understand that many of you based on your speeches and what I've heard have already said 'no' that you aren't going to vote for this. And

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

I guess I can understand, maybe understand why, but for those of you who may be undecided about why to do this, again, I point to the fact that we started this conversation talking about SB1, and we're going to end this conversation still talking about all of the great things that we are going to accomplish with SB1 and all the resources that are going to go to all of these schools. No school loses in this conversation that has been touted, talked about maintained throughout. No school loses in this conversation. And if there's nothing else that we can talk about back home, we can talk about how well-funded our districts are going to become, and it takes a little time to get there, but it encourages us to continue to appropriate a high level of resources, a high level of dollars to make sure that our schools get everything that they need and can produce the outcomes that all of us want here in the General Assembly. So, that being said, Mr. Speaker, again, thank all of you for your time, your attention, your questions, your thoughts, your comments, whatever they may be, let's take the vote."

Speaker Lang: "Chapa LaVia... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this quest... on this question, there are 46 voting 'yes', 61 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'. And the Bill fails. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Republicans will go to caucus in Room 118 immediately. Democrats are going to caucus in Room 114 immediately. The House of Representatives will be in recess 'til the call of the Chair. The House will be in order. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on August 28, 2017: approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is Senate Bill 444; recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 444."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, the Chair is in receipt of a Motion for Mr. Davis to override the Governor's Veto on Senate Bill 1. On Supplemental Calendar #3, under the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions, there appears a Motion on Senate Bill 1 by Representative Davis, that the House concur with the Senate and that Senate Bill 1 do pass, the Governor's specific recommendations for change notwithstanding. The Chair recognizes Mr. Davis on his Motion."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we override the Amendatory... Governor's Amendatory Veto on Senate Bill 1. Be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Motion vote 'yes'... say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'noes' have it. Mr. Breen, for another bite at the apple?"

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Not to belabor this point, but just to... one of the points that came up, I know, in looking at the compromise. It was my understanding that in 1995 this General Assembly gave the City of Chicago flexibility with what had been its pension contributions. And apparently, with what was supposed to be

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

flexibility, it turned into a zero-funding level for a decade which then severely underfunded the Chicago Teachers Pension Fund. It's my understanding then that SB1, in the same way, does not force the money that is being provided for the pensions to the Base Funding Minimum to actually go to the Chicago Teacher Pension Fund. Isn't that correct?"

Davis: "I'm sorry?"

Breen: "Okay. So, we got a..."

Davis: "Just give me the question again."

Breen: "Right, okay. So, the money... the 221 or so million dollars for the normal cost of pensions plus the cost of retiree health care that is provided under SB1 is not required to be spent on... it's not required to be deposited in the Chicago Teacher Pension Fund, correct?"

Davis: "Well, it is part of pension funding. So, when you say not required to be deposited, I mean, the purpose of providing those resources was to direct them toward pensions."

Breen: "Right, but in the same way that the block grant was not used to fund pensions, the excess block grant above what was needed, under the various formulas by the Chicago Public School system and the Chicago City Council. You know, they underfunded their pensions because we gave them flexibility from the General Assembly. And the problem is under SB1, we still are not reining in that flexibility which has been misused or was misused historically with regard to the Chicago Teacher Pension Fund."

Davis: "So, if I understand what you're asking, you're saying does... under SB1, are they required to make the payment?"

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

Breen: "Are they required to put that \$221 million into the pension fund and toward the retiree health care?"

Davis: "The 221 can be used to make their payment. It can be used to make their payment..."

Breen: "Right."

Davis: "...but the payment does have to be made. So, I guess we are trusting that if the dollars are given to them for the pension payment, and a lot has been made about the pension payment, that it would be indeed be used for the pension payment."

Breen: "And... Representative, I... I... well, and I'll go just briefly to the... to the Motion. Look, what we've highlighted here is just one of the many problems of SB1. One of the many reasons that this did not pass with a single Republican vote, save the Representative from Chicago on our side of the aisle. It's because that Bill was not ready for prime time. It was forced through, force-fed on the... the people of this state and on the Republican Minority. We need to compromise. And the compromise Bill was better than SB1 in that particular regard, again, it was not perfect as we discussed previously. But again, SB1 is not the solution for our funding problems. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Williams: "Representative, can you give me just a quick overview of the history that led up to the passage of Senate Bill 1?"

Davis: "Well, I would argue the history that led to the passage of Senate Bill 1 started 20 years ago, and that was the last

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

time that any substantive change was made to the school funding formula. So, over the years, particularly the last 15 that I've been here, it's always been about making sure that no district was harmed. So, we would provide a hold harmless, but we were prorating dollars as well. And so, the way we were doing it everyone acknowledged was bad, and we should not be doing it that way. Ergo, the need for a new way of funding schools in the State of Illinois. A group of advocates... starting with Vision 20/20 which were school business officials, many of the alliance groups, if you will, put forth an effort called the evidence-based funding model to do... to provide a different way of funding schools. They're provided transparency, they're provided a... a... a number of mechanisms that met districts where they were looking at what they needed versus just giving them money and not knowing what happened to those resources. It provides, again, a high level of transparency so we can track and follow the dollars to make sure that the outcomes are being associated with the additional resources that are being provided. So, starting a couple years ago with Senator Manar, who had a couple initial versions of what is now Senate Bill 1, we are now at Senate Bill 1 that provides a hold harmless where no district is harmed plus additional resources to try to provide the necessary tools for districts under an evidence-based funding formula, which provides 27 elements for school districts so we can measure and continue to track those outcomes."

Williams: "You know, I think your very thorough answer kind of goes to my point. And that is this... not just this issue, but

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

the model that you're discussing has been at the forefronts of the current thinking as to how most equitably fund schools and is... is really the state of the art model. I know this is taken back... taking everyone back awhile, but about twentyish years ago I was a legislative staffer for then Representative Jeff Schoenberg, and I distinctly remember getting emails and calls and ... probably not emails at the time ... but messages about supporting a change to the school funding formula because of its inequity. And here we are, years and years and years later with years and years of effort, and I remember constituents coming up to me since I've been elected saying, why can't we fix this formula? Everyone agrees it's an inequitable formula. There's got to be a better way. And my answer was because every Bill that we consider has winners and losers, just like one of my suburban colleagues might not vote for a Bill where their schools don't benefit, likewise if CPS loses money, I would have difficulty supporting it. So, that's why the inertia. But something changed last year. And what changed was the fact that we all, or a substantial majority, agreed that we needed to make the change and nobody loses, and that's the beauty, I think, of Senate Bill 1. So, just to clarify that point, can you just explain the hold harmless? So nobody losses, we've tossed that around all the time, but the reality is we have only winners under this Bill, correct?"

Davis: "Was there a question?"

Williams: "Yes. I'm..."

Davis: "I'm sorry."

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

Williams: "...just asking to just kind of explain why this is a win-win."

Davis: "Well, I would argue that the... the win-win for everyone is the fact that no district loses in this conversation. Again, every year for the past several years that I've been the Chair of the Appropriations Committee, we always walk down the path that no district should be harmed in what we do which is why we always maintained a hold harmless. Good or bad, we always maintain a hold harmless. And the unique thing about the hold harmless was that no matter which side of the aisle you were on, if your district was going to lose money, you are not supporting anything that we were trying to do in education funding move forward. So, this effort, again, starts with the premise that we don't harm any districts. So, there is a hold harmless in place to make sure that that indeed does not happen. And then on top of that, because we... I think many of us anyway, acknowledge that in order to better educate our young people, there is a need for more resources. And I understand that there's a study that could say you don't need more money as well as a study that says... suggests you do need more money. But I'd like to think that the studies that suggest that you need more money are able to take into consideration some of the mitigating factors that exist with some of the children in some of the communities. Not every child can live in a Wheaton, Illinois and have such great schools and such great communities. You know, some of our districts, some of our communities are challenged, and they need these resources in order to help our young people to

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

grow and to succeed. So, again, this is a win-win not only for the hold harmless, but also it adds a significant level of new funding for school districts that will be distributed in a way what we said a unique adequacy target for every district determining exactly what that district needs in order to educate its children, and then it supplies those dollars to the districts that are furthest away from their adequacy target, first, making sure that the districts that truly, truly need it are at the front of the line getting those recourses. And as they get closer and closer to adequacy, then we move right on down the line. Even to the extent in which some of the districts that are Tier 4 area still may have access to state dollars, and those are considered to be some of our wealthiest school districts. So, we're not trying... trying to take... we're not trying to not give money to districts that need it based on what they need resources for, but this is just a unique and a different way of providing those resources."

Williams: "Well, on that note, you spoke of the adequacy target. There has been a lot of talk... and it's been very frustrating and disheartening for me as well as many of my constituents. As you know, I represent Chicago and I represent many very strong public schools, neighborhood schools. And of course, we've heard the rhetoric that this Bill is the Chicago bailout. In my opinion, that couldn't be further from the truth, and it's because of exactly what you spoke about. It's the fact that the Bill provides an adequacy target for every district. So, what each school receives under the Bill would

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

be just enough to get it to the point where every student has access and opportunity to a high quality education. So, having the adequacy target means that nobody will be bailed out. CPS, just like any other district, will never receive more than it's entitled to. That's correct, right?"

Davis: "That's correct."

Williams: "Okay. And that's an important piece. I think people talk a lot about, well, this isn't fair because Chicago did this or Chicago didn't do that, but we're talking about educating our children. We really need to evaluate what is equity. And this has really challenged me to explore the definition of that word. And to me, equity means just that, the opportunity for every student to excel academically. And for certain schools, it requires more state funding than others. And that's basically the whole point of the Evidence-Based Model. So, if you really want true equity, and you're not worried about who gets what and what's fair and what people have done in the past, this is the Bill for you. Because beyond being responsible for our own districts, it's incumbent upon us to take care of the education of students throughout the state. On that note, Representative, isn't there a provision that we have explored over the years, but never really accommodated that requires us to provide a certain level of funding for public schools?"

Davis: "Well, absolutely. I mean, if you're taking about the constitutional provision where at the minimum we're supposed to be the primary funder of schools in the State of Illinois, but specific to SB1, we instituted something called a Minimum

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

Funding Level. Now, it was talked about in the past, about \$350 million, what does that really, really mean? I mean, I think the idea is that we would like to probably put as much money as possible into our schools, but unfortunately, we do have other budgetary pressures. But the idea that we set forth on a path toward adequacy starting at a Minimum Funding Level of \$350 million is appropriate, and again, it's a Minimum Funding Level. It doesn't mean that if we don't want to put 400, 500 million dollars or even more into education in any one given year, we, as a General Assembly, have the ability to do so. So, it's about what we think our priority is. Again, as Representative Lilly always talks about that education should be the number one priority here in the State of Illinois and that we should always be looking to provide as much resource as we can even if that means the detriment of Corrections or some of the other departments, you know. You know, you can juxtapose education and Corrections any way you want to, but never the less, it just means that if we value educa... the education of our young people as the utmost thing, then we should act as such and make sure that it is indeed the number one priority that we have here in the State of Illinois. And as much resource as we can put toward it, we should be putting toward it."

Williams: "You know, I just happened to see in the back of the chamber, we're joined by the Senate Sponsor, Senator Manar. Hello. I just wanted to make a note that if you look at who's supporting Senate Bill 1, it's not just Chicago Legislators, like myself. It's Representatives like Will Davis, who

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

represents the suburbs of Chicago; Senator Andy Manar, who represents a downstate district. And I think that underscores the point that everybody wins under Senate Bill 1. And you know, I came into this job always believing that education was a priority, but I don't think I understood how critical it was that we fund it appropriately in order for us to really fulfill our obligation. So, again, I can't say enough of how critical this Bill is not just for my district, but for students throughout the state. And for those of you who haven't been around answering notes 20 years ago, this is something that's been a long time coming. And please join me in voting a big 'yes' to override this Veto."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Skillicorn."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill and to the heart of this matter. This is about pensions, pensions, and pensions. Let's just look back in recent history. Back in 2001, Chicago Public Schools, their pension fund was almost fully funded; just a short time later, today, that is not the case. The people of Illinois have already paid their fair share into those pensions. This is the definition of not fair. This is a Chicago Pension bailout. I have said it, this a Chicago Pension bailout. And since the people of Illinois have already paid into this, they've already paid their fair share, this is also double taxation. Ladies and Gentlemen, I urge a 'no' vote on this override."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple questions to the Sponsor. Does the Sponsor yield?"

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ammons: "Thank you. Representative Davis, on Senate Bill 1, as our colleague just mentioned, this is a Chicago bailout. How much money is actually, allegedly bailing out Chicago on Senate Bill 1?"

Davis: "Of the... of the Minimum Funding Level of \$350 million, \$71 million of it, which is actually only about 19 percent of the resources."

Ammons: "I'm sorry, I cannot hear you."

Davis: "I'm sorry. About \$71 million, which is about 19 percent of the \$350 million, which speaks to the fact that Chicago educates about 19 percent of... of the school children."

Ammons: "So, under Senate Bill 1, about \$71 million would be equivalent to the 19 percent of children that are educated by CPS schools?"

Davis: "Correct."

Ammons: "And the Bill that we just voted down, was that money also represented in the previous Bill, Senate Bill 1947?"

Davis: "Yes, it was."

Ammons: "And it was represented in the tune of how many dollars in 1947?"

Davis: "Same."

Ammons: "Same amount of money. Can you tell us what the difference between Senate Bill 1 is and the Senate Bill we just voted down, 1947? What is in Senate Bill 1 that is not in 1947?"

Davis: "As I'm... as I'm reaching, Representative, to better answer your question... if you're talking about pensions, in particular, what was different was the fact that the dollars

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

were taken out and put into the Pension Code, so Chicago would still receive the resources, but they would be done in a manner that's very similar to the way that we provide the pension dollars for every other school district in the state. So, we would still do… we would still provide the resources, but they would be moved to the Pension Code."

Ammons: "And in both of those Bills was the funding level of the \$350 million guaranteed funding in the educational funding plan?"

Davis: "Yes, same Minimum Funding Level."

Ammons: "Same level of funding. Thank you. To the Bill. I listen to my colleagues on the right object to overriding the Governor's Veto on Senate Bill 1 because it is an alleged bailout for Chicago Public Schools. And I do want to draw everybody's attention to the fact that the previous Bill that just died, that will reincarnate in this chamber, is a bigger package for Chicago Public Schools. I think you guys heard that, right? So, the first Bill, we're talking about Senate Bill 1, which actually every superintendent in the state supports and support it. Now, they don't support it because we actually want to give an additional, a greater resource. I want to say for Champaign schools, Champaign and Urbana, I was willing to stand here and support what I thought was the best deal for all the children in the State of Illinois, and they sold it downstate as a bailout for Chicago Public Schools and attempted to get people to tell me to vote against it. But I knew that it was the right thing to do to support the pensions. But today, we are playing a game that is guite

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

interesting because on one hand we want to make sure we don't give them \$71 million, but Chicago Public Schools stands to gain \$400-plus million under the next Bill that you will be considering. Really? It is really all about putting in, what seems to be small, the \$75 million that seems to be small and minute in the grand scheme of things, but what are you doing ideologically to your funding of your school system? That is what this chamber has not actually dealt with. And this Bill, Senate Bill 1, gets you closer to dealing with that and equity than anything you will see in this chamber today. And when the dust settles tomorrow after the additional money, not the original \$221 million that the Republicans and the Governor was complaining about in Senate Bill 1 ... when the dust settles on the next Bill, you will really see how inequitable the school funding formula actually is. And for people who are downstate, I'm not sure what you walk away with in reality. My school district will be held harmless in either Bill, but the reality is the additional dollars that bring us even further along will not be available and will not make it downstate as it is claimed. I would hope that people actually sleep on this one. Do not vote in support of anything if this Bill override does not pass, and make us all go back to the table for a truly equitable funding Bill, not an ALEC Bill, not anything that is going to shift dollars from the public to the private, but for us to truly, truly, vote for a Bill that adequately, equitably funds our school system, and we should not play with this."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Representative Halbrook for the day."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the Bill should receive the required votes, I would like a Roll Call."

Speaker Lang: "A verification? I'm going to help you out."

Batinick: "A verification. It's been awhile."

Speaker Lang: "Yes, Sir. Your request is acknowledged. Mr. Davis to close."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Appreciate all the comments. This is a next step in trying to get to where we're trying to go. We did pass Senate Bill 1 out of both chambers, and was sent to the Governor, and the Governor issued this Amendatory Veto. And our efforts here today are an attempt to override the Amendatory Veto. We saw on the last Bill that there were some concerns about how the negotiations went and what they included. So, here's an opportunity, maybe, to try something a little different so. That... Mr. Speaker, let's take the vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House override the Governor's Amendatory Veto of Senate Bill 1. Those in favor of the Gentlemen's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no'. And the Motion fails. Chair recognizes Representative Greenwood on a

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

point of personal privilege. Did you have a point of personal privilege? Please proceed."

Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to wish the following Members a happy birthday: Andre Thapedi, Jehan Gordon-Booth, Melissa Conyears-Ervin, and Thaddeus Jones, and Deb Conroy. Happy birthday."

Speaker Lang: "Happy birthday to all. We're waiting for cake. The Chair recognizes Representative Scherer on a point of personal privilege."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr..."

Speaker Lang: "Can we ask the Members to rise, please?"

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I rise in regards to Petty Officer 3rd Class Logan Palmer. He was 23 years old from Decatur. And he was killed in a collision between the USS John McCain and an oil tanker. He went to Richland Community College. And as I think of this, some of the words that come to mind are: honor, hero, patriot, courageous. And at this moment, I'd say those words apply to his family as well. Thank you for the moment of silence."

Speaker Lang: "The Body will take a moment of silence. Thank you,

Members. Thank you, Representative. Chair recognizes

Representative Ives. For what reason do you rise?"

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise for a point of personal
 privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Ives: "So, earlier this season, we actually did a House Resolution for Cantigny and the celebration of the First Division in honor of their 100 years serving the U.S. Army. And I just

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

want everybody to... I... go out and visit Cantigny. They did their grand reopening of the First Division Museum on Saturday. It is astounding what they have done in terms of bringing the military life to civilians and interpreting that for them. So, I just encourage everybody to go to this treasure; it's... it's unbelievable. They get nearly 80 thousand visitors a year. And if you have not taken the time to visit with your family or your friends or... especially I would say older folks, who are still around from that era, you will find it fantastic what they've done in light of World War II information for people as well. So, I just encourage everybody to come out to Cantigny. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just... a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Fine: "Want to congratulate my seatmate and also the woman who sits in front of me, I'm surrounded by newlyweds, Robyn Gabel and Kelly Cassidy. And I just want the whole floor to congratulate them on their new beginnings. Oh, they..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine, did you need the microphone back?"

Fine: "Very quickly. As Representative Cassidy pointed out, they didn't marry each other. They both married different people.

Thank you."

Gabel: "This time."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bryant is recognized."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

"While we're waiting to conduct our next business, I wanted to give a shout-out to all of those who helped make the great American eclipse, which made Carbondale the hub of the universe, a great success. We had no major downfalls at all. I tell you the State Police, IDOT, Homeland Security, all of the agencies worked so well together to make it very successful. So, we saw about 50 thousand people in Carbondale and about 140 thousand people in the region. And it was a great success. This also became somewhat bipartisan at our home. So, appreciate those who traveled down to meet us at our home to watch it including Representative McDermed, Leader Durkin, and Representative Kifowit, who all made it a really great day for us. So, shout-out and thank you to all those state agencies that made it such a wonderful success and to SIU Carbondale that helped to make it a great time for everyone."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Ford: "The Speaker... Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, please join me in welcoming my State Senator of the 4th Legislative District, Senator... Leader Kimberly Ann... what's your name? Welch to the House. Welcome Senator Lightford."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome, Senator. The House will be in order. The Chair's in receipt from... of a Motion from Representative Barbara Wheeler. Pursuant to Rule 65, having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 1947 failed. Leader Currie on the Motion."

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I support the Motion, and I encourage my colleagues to vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady... To repeat... wait, we went to Leader Currie. Leader Currie is recognized."
- Currie: "I said I support the Motion and I encourage an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of Representative Wheeler's Motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 1947 failed vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 80 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And the Bill is to be reconsidered. Senate Bill 1947, Mr. Davis. We've had full debate on this Bill. So, your request is that we have a limited debate this time around. Mr. Davis."
- Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We've had a great deal of debate on this already. So, I ask for a 'yes' vote."

 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know, I really... this is fascinating to me. You know, I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle constantly scream about process. And what does it say that we're about to make a fundamental change in the way that we fund public education without ever having had any public discourse on an issue. We are a state that is dead last in funding education. We just passed a Bill... we passed a budget that cuts state agencies by 5 percent when we are already one of the lowest in terms of state employees per capita. After decimating state

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

universities for year after year, we gave them an additional 10 percent cut. We don't have enough money... we have a formula for adequacy, but we don't have enough money to put into the formula to actually create adequacy and equity. We are... we cannot pay our backlog of bills. We cannot adequately fund our pensions. We are so broke, we can't afford to pay attention. And yet, we are about to give away \$75 million. Now, whether or not this program has merit, and I imagine that there are arguments for its merit, I just don't understand how without any public discourse, without any debates, without any hearings, without any advoc... education advocates weighing in, testifying, telling us about the merits of their program, we are about to make a fundamental change to the way that we fund education. And we, as a state that is so broke, and we are... our own independent Commission Government Forecasting and Accountability predicts declining revenues year after year. We heard about that during the budget debate. And yet we are committing to giving away \$75 million a year for the next 5 years. How do we do that? does that mesh with any semblance of responsibility? How does that meet our commitment to educate our children? I'm not opposed to the concept of the program, but when you're in a state like Minnesota and you're trying to figure out what to do with all your budget surpluses, this might be something nice to explore. But this is not the way to go about it and it is certainly not the right time. And to run this Bill, a couple hours after we just got 46 votes, and

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

I know how this is going to turn out, we all do. This is silly. We should all be voting 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Durkin."

"Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been quite a... been quite a ride over the past few months and particularly the last few weeks. I feel a little bit better about where this vote's going to land... after... in a few minutes. But I'd like to begin to thank the people that have been involved with this on both sides of the aisle, who've been working on one of the most daunting and challenging issues ever to face this Body for many decades. On our side of the aisle, Bob Pritchard, who is retiring, has dedicated his lifetime to refunding... to reforming our school funding system. Thank you, Bob. Avery Bourne has led a incredible effort within the commission, as has Chris Winger, who's worked very hard to lay the foundation for what we are going to vote on. And that's important to laying the foundation to fundamentally reform Illinois's public schools funding system for the first time in many decades. But I also would be remiss if I didn't thank Representative Davis. And I know that you have put your heart and soul into this issue for many years; and thank you for the hard work that you've done. Sheri Jesiel, who's behind me, has done great work as well. She's been part of our commission, and I forgot to mention her name as we often do in elective offices and somebody whispers in our ears and says you forgot somebody. But Sheri, thank you, again, for what you've done. You've been a tremendous advocate within our caucus, someone who has really been able to flesh out the

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

issues and to discern the right issues for our caucus and to lead us... and many of us in the right direction to be able to think in a very comprehensive and a very clear matter in how we should address this issue. But... so, I've heard a lot about the Bill from both supporters and opponents; and I think it's important to set a few things straight. First, is this Bill perfect? No, absolutely not. I've been around here long enough to know that legislative perfection, especially on a issue of this magnitude, is nearly impossible to find. Take out nearly, it is impossible to find. Secondly, did both sides get everything they wanted? No, they did not. But to me that means that we have indeed reached a compromise, which given the last few years in this chamber should be viewed as a huge accomplishment in and of itself. Third, will every child in every school district in every corner of the state have access to better education because of this Bill? Yes. A resounding yes. No one loses. No one loses in this Bill. That is what's important to know, everyone gains. And I've said for the past two and a half years that we can make progress on the major issues facing our state as long as both sides respect the priorities of each other and that is precisely what is happening right now. This compromise ensures for the first time in decades that all children in Illinois will have access to education that is funded fairly and equitably. legislation also provides flexibility to school districts and relief to homeowners through lower property taxes and expands opportunities for school choice for children from low-income families throughout the State of Illinois. My hope is that

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

moving forward that this will serve as an example of what can happen when we put partisan bickering and fighting aside and negotiate in good faith to get things done for the families of Illinois. I urge my colleagues to support this measure and make historic school funding reform a reality in Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves the previous question. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is put. Mr. Davis to close."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As we have, again, debated this issue numerous times. As it relates to why this issue is important, I thought I'd mention a name of someone who I didn't mention before and that's a young lady named Jana, J-A-N-A. Last name happens to be Davis, same as mine, because this is my little daughter, who started kindergarten Friday. And today was the first day I put her on the bus, excited, eager, no fear, ready to go. And when I think about my daughter and the countless other children that are important in this conversation, it helps me to better understand why we do what we do. And I can appreciate the passion of every Member of this chamber, regardless of how you feel about where we are, the passion that exists for every Member. Because I truly believe no matter who you are, what part of the state you represent, and what your constituency is you do have the goal of making sure that children are properly educated here in the State of

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

Illinois. It's clear that we have different ways to get there: we have different avenues, you know, we feel differently about how we get there. But I just truly believe in my heart that we all have the same goal, the same desire in terms of what we want to accomplish. Well, here we are at this moment in time, an opportunity to move forward and pass a Bill that is historic in the sense that it's been 20 years since any substantive change was done to funding here in the State of Illinois. And again, as we've talked over and over about it, everybody wins in this conversation. Everybody wins. Whatever district you're in, you win. Regardless of the zip code you're in, you win. Regardless of the color of your skin, in this Bill, you win. And that's where, in my opinion, our focus needs to be. All of the great things that come about as it relates to Senate Bill 1. All of the good things that we are going to accomplish: a new way of funding, more money than we've ever had before, levels of transparency we've never seen before in any funding Bill. That's why this Bill is important. And it's important, again, because these are the tools that my five-year-old, Jana, she's going to need as she goes through her local school system in the south suburbs of Chicago. So, things that I do, while I've never mentioned her before, are for her and all other children just like her, who have no idea what this place is or what we do here. All they know is that when they go to their respective school they expect that the teachers are ready; they expect that everything is there for them to learn and to become those productive members of the State of Illinois that we desire

1st Legislative Day

8/28/2017

for them to be at some point down the road. That's why this is important. As with any legislation, once it's passed, signed into law, we'll revisit this, we'll go back and take a look at it, we'll examine the things that we need to examine, and then we'll make changes as we need to make changes. As a matter of fact, part of this Bill is a professional review panel, who will be charged with looking at what we've done in making necessary changes. They are the experts, and we'll like to charge them with making sure that as this conversation moves forward that all of the things that are necessary to make it happen indeed happen. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you again for all of your conversations, everything you've said. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a 'yes' vote." Speaker Lang: "This Bill requires 71 votes. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 73 voting 'yes', 34 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And now, pursuant to House Resolution 1 of the Fifteenth Special Session, Leader Currie moves that the House... we shall remain in continuous Session, and stands adjourned 'til the call of the Speaker. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House is adjourned 'til the call of the Speaker."