139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports following committee action taken on Mav 21, recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1692, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3279, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3386, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bull 3576, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3621; approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is House Bill 4193, House Bill 4251, Senate Bill 2378, Senate Bill 2409, Senate Bill Senate Bill 2443, Senate Bill 2454, Senate Bill 2474: recommends be adopted are the Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 222, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4029, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4129, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4145, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4190, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4479, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4598."

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Rabbi Ora Schnitzer who is with the Highland Park Hospital in Highland Park, Illinois. Rabbi Schnitzer is the guest of Representative May. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, please turn on all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Rabbi Schnitzer."

Rabbi Schnitzer: "Dear God of us all, we ask for Your blessings upon the Speaker of the House, its Leaders and upon its Members. May You bless them with Your guidance, insight,

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

and wisdom to do their work for the good and benefit of the people of our state. May all the Members work together and have the heart and the mind to accomplish Your will to make our state a better place. So may it be Your will and let us say, Amen."

- Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Moffitt."
- Moffitt 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, Spe... thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect the excused absences of Representatives Arroyo, Chapa LaVia, DeLuca, and Greg Harris."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representatives Cavaletto, Durkin, Mulligan and Senger are excused on the Republican side of the aisle today."
- Speaker Lang: "Please take the record. There are 109 Members present. The House does have a quorum; we're prepared to do our business. Mr. Clerk. Members we're going to begin with the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, near the bottom of page 8 of the Calendar. Please be ready when your Bill is called. Senate Bill 275, Mr. Pritchard. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 275, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No

139th Legislative Day

- Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 281, Representative Mussman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 409, Representative Cassidy. Representative Cassidy. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 409, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Cassidy, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."
- Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 409 removes language concerning a... an unrelated portion of the Bill. This Bill deals with special service area tax reform and the... there was language related to energy efficiency bonding that... that was unrelated and needs to be removed. So, this Amendment will remove that language. And I ask your favorable... I ask that it be adopted."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment.

 Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill... I'm sorry. Senate Bill 679, Mr. Saviano. Out of the record. Senate Bill 968, Dan Burke. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1034, Representative Soto. Out of the record. Oh, you're ready to go. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1034, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment

139th Legislative Day

- #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Returning to Senate Bill 1034, was there an Amendment, Mr. Clerk, that was not called?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor
 Amendment #3 is in the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you. And you want the Bill on Third, Representative? Bill remains on the Order of Third Reading. Senate Bill 1692, Representative Zalewski. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1692, a Bill for an Act concerning business. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Zalewski, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #4. It simply clarifies some language for the realtors and deals with some advertising language that the Attorney General approved of. I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1900, Mr. Sullivan.

 Mr. Sullivan. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2494, Mr.

 Brauer. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2494, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No

139th Legislative Day

- Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2545, Representative Mussman. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2545, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Mussman, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman on the Amendment."
- Mussman: "The Amendment to 2545 is simply the agreed upon language by all parties which removes opposition. And I request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Returning to page 9 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 679, Mr. Saviano. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 679, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1673, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1673, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

139th Legislative Day

- No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2559, Representative Howard. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2559, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2761, Mr. Jackson. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2761, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. A state mandates, Home Rule, and fiscal note has been requested but not filed on this Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, what were those notes?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Notes requested on Senate Bill 2761 are a state mandates, Home Rule, and fiscal."
- Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 2885, Representative May. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2885, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3216, Representative Nekritz. Representative Nekritz. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3146. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3146, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No

139th Legislative Day

- Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 3252, Mr. Mathias. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3257, Mr. Jefferson. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3261, Representative Cassidy. Representative Cassidy. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3314, Mr. Zalewski. Mr. Zalewski. Out of the record. Mr. Zalewski is right there and I missed him. Yeah... Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3314, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Zalewski, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "I move for the adoption of... Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1."
- Speaker Lang: "Do you have any interest in telling us what it does, Sir?"
- Zalewski: "It... it simply adds language dealing with the fact that... this is merely a clarification and doesn't do anything to preexisting rights under the law."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3349, Representative du Buclet. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3349, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment

139th Legislative Day

- #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative du Buclet, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative on the Amendment."
- du Buclet: "I move to have the House amend Floor... adoption House Amendment #1."
- Speaker Lang: "I believe this is Amendment #2, Representative."
- du Buclet: "Amendment #2. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "And can you tell us briefly what the Amendment does?"
- du Buclet: "Amendment 2 clears up a discrepancy between the 710

 Amendment and the original Amendment which had probation at 24 months which brings it now to 12 months."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment.

 Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3415, Representative Will Davis. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3433, Representative Cassidy. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3442, Mr. Tryon. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3458, Representative Hernandez. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3513, Representative Dan Burke. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3513, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3518, Mr. Moffitt.

 Please read the Bill."

139th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3518, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3572, Leader Cross.

 Mr. Reboletti, do you want to move it? Out of the record.

 Senate Bill 3576, Mr. Fortner. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3576, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Fortner, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Floor Amendment #1 simply removes a provision in the Bill that came over from the Senate. There was an attempt to deal with municipalities electing in new wards. For those communities that have staggered elections, there's some confusion about how to operate that. So, this simply returns things back to the current statutory form."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3718, Representative Bellock. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3718, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by

139th Legislative Day

- Representative Bellock, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. With this Senate Bill 3718, we're adding Floor Amendment #1 which is agreed upon with all the… between all the parties. And what this does is it just means that the department has to submit the criteria to JCAR within 90 days."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. Those 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3764, Mr. Zalewski.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3764, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3798, Mr. Mathias. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3810, Mr. Lyons. Out of the record. On page 14 of the Calendar, under the Order of Postponed Consideration, there appears Senate Bill 1967. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1967 is on the Order of Consideration Postponed. A Floor Amendment has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "The Bill shall be moved to the Order of Second Reading and held. Leader Currie on a Motion."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to suspend the posting notice re... requirements so that Senate Bill 1338, 2958,

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

- 3280, 3397, 3802 may be heard in Executive Committee; Senate Bill 171 (sic-3171) in Judiciary I; Senate Bill 3629 in Personnel & Pensions; House Bill 5192 in Revenue and also House Bill 5457 and Senate Bill 3241 also in the Revenue & Finance Committee and as well Senate Bill 3497. I know of no opposition. And I'd appreciate your support for the Motion."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative, just to make sure I heard you correctly, you referred the Senate Bill 3171, is that correct? It's in the middle of page 1."
- Currie: "Yes. And for Judiciary I."
- Speaker Lang: "I thought I heard you say a different number. Thank you. Is there Leave? Leave is granted and the Lady's Motion to suspend is adopted. On the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading appears Senate Bill 3252, Mr. Mathias. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3252, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. On page 11 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 3386, Mr. Mathias. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3386, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Mathias, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mathias."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

- Mathias: "Yes. This makes a technical change to the Bill and we can discuss it on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3798, Mr. Mathias.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3798, a Bill for an Act to revise the law by combining multiple enactments and making technical corrections. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Under the Order of Concurrence, on page 14 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 222, Mr. Franks. You proc... ready to proceed on the Concurrence Motion? Mr... Mr. Franks."
- Franks: "We don't have the analysis, but I'll move to concur with the Senate Amendment to House Bill 222."
- Speaker Lang: "I think you're going to have to tell us something about it, Mr. Franks."

Franks: "It's a pa..."

Speaker Lang: "Make up something."

- Franks: "It's a page and line Amendment. It inserts that each county, township or municipality is responsible for the accuracy of the information it gives to the state. So, it just clarifies the intent."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentlemen's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Dunkin. Please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment 1... #1 to House Bill 222. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Jefferson."

- Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege, please."
- Speaker Lang: "Please state your point, Sir."
- Jefferson: "I just want to take this opportunity to recognize one of my great constituents from the great city of Rockford, Illinois, Miss Tanya King, right here. Please give a warm welcome."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Thank you for joining us. House Bill 3188, Representative Gabel. Please proceed."
- Gabel: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, the Amendments...

 I ask for an adoption of Amendment 1 and Amendment 5.

 Amendment 5 becomes the Bill. This Amendment keeps the per diem reduction at \$111 per day, the travel reimbursement at 39 cents per mile on Session days, prohibits cost of living increases for Members of the General Assembly, Constitutional Officers, agency directors and members of boards and commissions and it continues the requirement that we take 12 furlough days per fiscal year."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady's moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 5 to House Bill 3188. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, what is the standard mileage calculation... the reimbursement for mileage currently, if it wasn't reduced to 39 cents? What is the standard rate?"

Gabel: "Fifty cents per mile."

Reboletti: "Fifty? I thought it was a little bit higher than that, but 50 cents. So, we're reducing it 11 cents a mile?"

Gabel: "Pardon."

Reboletti: "It's reducing it... you said 50 cents or 80 cents?"

Gabel: "I believe it's 50... 50 cents. I'm not sure."

Reboletti: "Fifty-five cents is what I'm being told over here.

Is... how is that different from last year's Bill that did
basically the same thing?"

Gabel: "It's the same as last year's Bill."

Reboletti: "Does this change the... the reimbursement rate for committee mileage reimbursement?"

Gabel: "I believe so. It changes all our mileage."

Reboletti: "And as far as the furlough days are concerned, how is that contemplated? Is that based on a 5-day work week, 50 weeks in a year?"

Gabel: "It's 12 a day... it's 12 furlough days per fiscal year."

Reboletti: "And I understand, that but is that based off a wor...

a work year is 365 days or is that based off of 52 weeks at

5 days a week, so that's a higher number than a lower
number."

Gabel: "I'm not sure. I'm not sure it really matters. It's 12 furlough days a year."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

Reboletti: "Well, it does... it does really matter because if you're working 5 days a week based on a salary versus taking it every day, there's a difference in how much you would make every day. So, by that amount you would change the amount that you would be reimbursed. It would be a lesser amount. So, this was actually more is what I'm... as I'm trying to get that point across to the media who... and those who are listening."

Gabel: "It's the same as it was last year."

Reboletti: "Same as last year. Is the COLA the same as last year? Is it as well?"

Gabel: "Prohibiting it? Yes."

Reboletti: "Yes. And what's the amount of the COLA?"

Gabel: "We're not having a COLA this year."

Reboletti: "I understand. What would the COLA be, if we were to have one?"

Gabel: "I think that would be decided by CMS."

Reboletti: "Well, I would assume... it's usually 3 percent and so I'm trying to... I want to lay this out so that all the Members understand as well as those who are watching and listening that it's 3 percent based on a salary and I believe it's... some Members are at 65 thousand, thereabouts. So, you're looking at about 3 percent of that as part of the COLA that we are giving up. That you're giving up about 16 cents a mile as well as the fact that you're giving up furlough days that are calculated on a regular work week, a Monday through Friday work week and that... that is a large number. It saves the state about \$640 thousand-plus and I think that about each one of us, depending on

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

how far you live away from the Capitol, probably gives back about 4 to 7 thousand dollars a year, which I think is significant. And the reason for that is because when I'm back in the district, people have asked me what are you giving up, what have you given back. And when I tell them what I've... what we have given up is that they said they hadn't heard about it. So, I hope that the media picks this up so that people realize that we are trying to do our fair share as well, as we're making cutbacks in other areas. So, thank you very much."

Gabel: "Thank you. I appreciate..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Representative, I... I want to continue down..."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Bost: "...the same... I'm sorry. Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "That's all right, Sir. Please proceed."

Bost: "Maybe I wonder because, you know, I'm... I'm hoping she understands what we're trying to do here. Do you... have you been asked in your district what we are giving up? Have you been asked that?"

Gabel: "On occasion, I am."

Bost: "Yeah. And when you tell your constituents that over the last four years we have taken 12 furlough days, which if you calculate that out, what percentage does the come up to be as far our salary's concerned?"

Gabel: "For me, it's about \$3 thousand a year."

Bost: "All right. And then as far as when we start talking about travel and reduction in travel and per diem and these

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

other items, not taking a COLA. What is the normal response from your constituents?"

Gabel: "They're pleased. They feel that we show that..."

I... I would that they are and I think that they... Bost: they should be, that know that we should take the lead on something like this. But unfortunately here's what I get. Your lying, you don't really do that. You know and that bothers me because whenever I... and let me tell you I'm hoping the media listens. We... we are making decisions here to move first to show the lead to the rest of the players in the state as we try to do what's right. And we've done this for four years now. And many of my own constituents never get the word back in their... in our own districts that this is serious. That we have a serious budget problem and that we here in the State of Illinois, we, as Legislators, are taking the lead, not just this year but over the last four years. I'm a little concerned that quite often we do this and people don't understand the importance of ... of how we have to take the lead. Folks, I have no problem in making this vote and trying to save the state money at a time when we're in desperate need, but I do want to know... for the people to know whether state employees or not state employees, that we are doing this. We're showing, we're... we're leading by example. And I would hope that they're paying attention to this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

Harris, D.: "Representative, we're taking... this... this Bill would require furlough days, correct? And it addresses salary, it addresses mileage and per diem."

Gabel: "COLA."

Harris, D.: "Does it address district office allowances?"

Gabel: "No, it does not."

Harris, D.: "Any reason why?"

Gabel: "Not that I know of."

Harris, D.: "Any reason why, no, just it's not in there. May I ask you this..."

Gabel: "This is a Senate Amendment."

Harris, D.: "Yeah, the Senate never gets anything right, do they? Is... is... would you consider this a pay rai... a pay cut?"

Gabel: "I do."

Harris, D.: "Would you consider it a salary cut?"

Gabel: "It's not a salary cut, but we... it is a... we get... we have less in our paychecks at the end of the day."

Harris, D.: "Did you say it is not a salary cut? Is that what you said?"

Gabel: "This is a suspension in the cost of living adjustment."

Harris, D.: "Right. It is not a salary cut. So, our salary isn't changing, we are taking some furlough days, correct?"

Gabel: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "So, yes, we are inconvenienced, but we are not taking a salary cut. And what is our pension based on? The furlough day figure or the higher figure without the furlough days?"

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

- Gabel: "Our pension is considered on our salary... is based on our salary."
- Harris, D.: "Correct, correct. So when the press picks this up and says, oh, the Legislators have done all these wonderful things and they're taking some pain themselves. Well, guess what, the pain isn't that great because it's not a salary cut. Our pensions, which so many of us and state employees are so concerned about, is based on a higher figure. Yes, little bit of inconvenience but don't cry for us here in the General Assembly. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

- Dunkin: "Representative, this Bill here... who brought this Bill to you? I missed all the extra action. But... so, can you enlighten me on where this Bill came from."
- Gabel: "This is a Bill… this is an Amendment that came from the Senate."
- Dunkin: "Okay. You picked the Bill up. I'm trying to figure out sort of what inspired you to get this Bill, to get it from the Senate."
- Gabel: "You know, I... I'm involved in... in both the Medicaid Committee and the Human Services Committee. And we are in the process of reducing budgets and I feel that it's our responsibility as leaders of this state to take a pay cut ourselves."
- Dunkin: "Really. So, you're speaking now on behalf of every State Legislator in the House and Senate."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

- Gabel: "The Bill's on the floor. You can vote 'yes'; you can vote 'no'."
- Dunkin: "No. I'm just asking you a simple question, Representative. Since when did this new responsibility come?"
- Gabel: "I'm carrying the Bill. I... I believe in the Bill."
- Dunkin: "Now are you aware that we can, today, without legislation, reduce our salary... or actually refuse to take a red or copper cent of any of our state salary, of any of our cost of living adjustment of, well, mileage, per diem. Are you aware of that, Representative?"

Gabel: "Yes."

- Dunkin: "So, you think... you think we needed legislation for this type of action to be taken?"
- Gabel: "I think this sends a clear message to the public that we are willing to take... that we are willing to make sacrifices as well as they are."
- Dunkin: "So, Representative, you would admit that this is pretty much... this is for the media or certain groups that... that really think the best and the worst of us, this legislation?"
- Gabel: "This is... this is the fourth year that we're addressing this matter."
- Dunkin: "So, Rep... I'm just trying to figure out... since you're very conscious of what it is that we need to do in reducing our cost of living and furlough days added, is... is there an opportunity for you, if you're willing to at least reduce your salary by 80 percent? Are you interested with that,

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

Representative? You don't need any legislation for it, but you sure can do it, if you wo... if you like."

Gabel: "Well, I appreciate the information."

Dunkin: "Well, Rep... so, that means you're really... you're ready to pull your Bill and exercise your own fiscal austerity as it relates..."

Gabel: "Representative, if..."

Dunkin: "...to it is what you want to do, right?"

Gabel: "...If you don't agree with the Bill, you are... you can vote against it."

Dunkin: "I'm... I'm curious about you, the Sponsor, since you have the Bill up here on the board and you got a couple of Sponsors I understand. So, are you willing to make a major reduction in your salary and really sort of supersede this... this political posturing here with this Bill?"

Gabel: "I'm willing to make the reductions that are in this Bill."

Dunkin: "Now, does this Bill make you look good in front of the newspapers or your constituents?"

Gabel: "I think this is the responsible thing to do."

Dunkin: "For who, Representative, who?"

Gabel: "For us, as Legislators."

Dunkin: "Oh, really now, Representative, really. Thank God, I...

I, you know, I have the utmost respect for my friend and colleague. I certainly see what you're trying to do. I hope you get all the support from our good friends in the media and... you know, as a matter of fact, do you mind if I become a cosponsor, Representative?"

Gabel: "That would be wonderful."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

Dunkin: "All right. And so should I vote for it or against it or vote 'present'."

Gabel: "You should vote for it."

Dunkin: "All right. And should I take some additional salary out of my own... cut out of my own salary?"

Gabel: "No. You can make the same sacrifices that everybody else is making."

Dunkin: "Yeah, 'cause I need my constituents to really feel the way that... the way that, you know..."

Gabel: "I appreciate your leadership."

Dunkin: "My leadership, huh? I'm following your lead, Representative. So, I should vote what, now? I mean, this is a good political Bill here, you know, those good... those do-good political groups will look at me and say, wow, Robyn Gabel and Ken Dunkin actually did the right thing. We put some skin in the game and had a cost of living adjustment. You know, us politicians here. So, now this doesn't address the Medicaid or the... oh, hey, there you go. I was looking at you on the screen. You look great on the screen and in person. All right, Representative, I'm going to follow your lead and do the right thing because you think this is good public what?"

Gabel: "Policy."

Dunkin: "Good public policy. And what's good for... good public policy is good for me."

Gabel: "Thank you."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Gabel: "Thank you."

139th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion to Concur will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Members, record yourselves. Mayfield. Please take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 5 to House Bill 3188. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 3798?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3798 is on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Please... would you move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3798, a Bill for an Act to revise the law by combining multiple enactments and making technical corrections. This is the Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is one of... one Bill based on our new rules that require that three-fifths of each side of the aisle vote for it. So, we'll need to take a Roll Call vote on this Amendment. Those... or this Bill at this time just to move it... Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Monique Davis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And three-fifths of each

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

side of the aisle approving, this Bill will go to Third Reading. Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have a parliamentary inquiry?"

Speaker Lang: "Please state your inquiry, Sir."

Franks: "The reason I'm asking is the first time that I recall that on a Second Reading we require three-fifths vote and perhaps the parliamentarian can enlighten the Members of the reason. Because as I understand this was a technical correction and not a substantive correction and yet it still required the three-fifths, so perhaps we could have the parliamentarian..."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair..."

Franks: "...explain."

Speaker Lang: "...would be happy to answer your question, Sir. We passed a rule that states that any Bill that amends the Income Tax Act needs a three-fifths vote from each side of the aisle to go to Third Reading. It's the first time, I think, we've had to do that, but we did have to do that."

Franks: "I... I knew you knew that and I appreciate you passing the quiz. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. I..."

Franks: "Keep... keep it up. Keep up the good work."

Speaker Lang: "I appreciate that very much. The next item would be House Bill 3810, Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. And I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3810. Amendment #1 provides that the Minority Leader of the Senate and the House will appoint two Members each to the Tuition and Fee

139th Legislative Day

- Waiver Task Force which is created in Amendment #1. And Senate Amendment #1 abolishes the tuition waiver after September 1, 2012, instead of June 1, 2012, that was originally in the Bill, and creates the Tuition and Fee Waiver Task Force."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3810. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Will Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."
- Davis, W.: "Representative, can you go back over what Amendments #1 and 2 do again, please?"
- Crespo: "Let me start with Senate Amendment #1. This changes the… the date when we terminate the tuition waiver program. Instead of June 1, as we originally had it in the Bill, it moves it to September 1, 2012, and secondly, creates the Tuition and Fee Waiver Task Force."
- Davis, W.: "And what is... and that's in Amendment #1?"
- Crespo: "Amendment #1. Amendment #2 pretty much as... makes changes to the first Amendment. It provides that the Minority Leader of the Senate and the House will appoint two Members each to the task force; previously, they only had one Member each."
- Davis, W.: "So, the task force is charged to do what?"
- Crespo: "It will conduct a thorough review of the tuition and fee waiver programs offered by all the state institutions."
- Davis, W.: "I mean, is this every tuition and fee waiver program that's at an institution that would include athletic programs as well."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

- Crespo: "All discretionary and mandatory tuition waivers, correct. All of them."
- Davis, W.: "Oh. And so it will review them to ultimately determine what?"
- Crespo: "Well, they'll file a report to the General Assembly and the Governor and the State Board of Higher Education and based on that report, it's up to us whether we take action or not."
- Davis, W.: "So, it's possible that we could move to eliminate every opportunity that a student will have to attend a state university be it academic or athletic?"
- Crespo: "The task force doesn't do that."
- Davis, W.: "No. I said they may... they may make a re... make... they may make a recommendation..."
- Crespo: "They can make a recommendation."
- Davis, W.: "...and so it's possible that they can recommend that we eliminate all of those opportunities, correct?"
- Crespo: "I... I can't venture a guess what they're going to say, but right now anyone... anyone can do that."
- Davis, W.: "Well, then... then tell me... then tell me what the task force is supposed to do. I mean, what are they charged with doing other than reviewing them..."
- Crespo: "Yeah."
- Davis, W.: "...reviewing them to determine what?"
- Crespo: "To review to determine the merit of each and every program."
- Davis, W.: "The merit of each and every program."

Crespo: "Right."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

- Davis, W.: "Okay. Is there anything in the... in the Bill that speaks to what merit there... are they looking at... for the academic side? Are they looking at the grade point averages of the students that have received them in the past? For the athletic programs, are they looking at the records of the teams to determine whether or not these are good athletes or not? I mean, what can you tell me about what this task force is supposed to do."
- Crespo: "You know, Davi... I would imagine they will take a very objective look at each and every one of them and report to the General Assembly and the Governor and the State Board of Higher Education. It's up to us then to decide based on those recommendations, for or against, what to do."
- Davis, W.: "So... so, the Bill really doesn't set forth what they're supposed to do, ultimately, or what they're supposed to find. It just says review them."

Crespo: "Right."

Davis, W.: "That's it. Nothing more, nothing less."

Crespo: "Correct."

- Davis, W.: "Okay. So, do you have any in... inclination why the Bill doesn't go into a little bit more detail in terms of what they're supposed to ultimately try to find?"
- Crespo: "Representative, I believe, as the Senate President felt, after talking to his caucus, this is something they needed to do. They figured, hey, you know, we've had... we've had that discussion on this House Floor before. We had a Representative who wanted to abolish the tuition waivers that they give out to the sons and daughters of employees at the state institutions. We can do that now. We don't

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

need a task force. The task force will just give us a thorough review of what they do what... what's in each... what's the mission of each and every tuition waiver and report back to us."

- Davis, W.: "Okay. Is that something... I believe this is your Bill, this year, so, is that something that you would just personally recommend, in light of everything that's come about in terms of tuition waivers, that we move to eliminate opportunities for university employees?"
- Crespo: "No. The end game here, from the get-go, was to eliminate the legislative tuition waiver. This gets us there. I am not recommending that we abolish any other tuition waivers. To say... or to imply that a tuition waiver, the legislative tuition waivers is the same as all the other tuition waivers, Representative, is like saying that donkeys and elephants are the same animal because the four legs... four legs and a tail. They're two different animals. So, we'll take a thorough review of each and every one and make a recommendation."
- Davis, W.: "Well, if you call them both tuition waivers then what's the distinction that you're making between them? You just said they were two different animals, but if it's a tuition waiver, whether for university employees or for students that live in legislative districts, is it not a tuition waiver? I think that's the same thing, correct? So, then what distinction are you making between the two?"
- Crespo: "Oh, there's lot of distinctions Representative. For one..."

Davis, W.: "But..."

139th Legislative Day

- Crespo: "...for one, a legislative tuition waiver, we give nothing in return to give that out. When you look at the employees of these state institutions and the tuition waivers they get, someone could argue at least there's a quid pro quo. They are giving something... getting something in return. Secondly, as far as I know, I've been in... I've been in office, 5 years, I have not heard, not even once there's any tuition waiver out there legislative tuition waiv... waiver where folks are abusing it, where some of the conduct, you know, borders almost on a criminal. I haven't heard that about the other tuition waivers. I have heard that about the legislative tuition So, there are distinct differences between the waiver. legislative tuition waivers and all the other, whether discretionary or mandatory tuition waivers. There are some differences."
- Davis, W.: "So, because you haven't heard it, in your mind, it doesn't exist then?"
- Crespo: "Oh, I never said that. May... maybe the task force will let us know. Maybe the task force will uncover something that we do not know."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. Well, I guess, in light of the Bill the fact that the task force… the Bill that en… I guess engages this task force really doesn't say much about what it's supposed to do other than review. How often they supposed to meet? Well, how… how many Members are on the task force? Let me start there."
- Crespo: "Okay. One second. There... yes, Sir, the... the task force will... the way it will be appointed, Representative, the

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

President of the Senate and the Speaker appoint two Members each, the Minority Leader of the Senate and the House also appoint two Members each, the President and the Speaker designate cochairs and the Board of Higher Education provides administrative support."

Davis, W.: "So, is that eight people?"

Crespo: "I believe so, yeah."

Davis, W.: "I'm sorry."

Crespo: "It... it's, I think, whatever we have on the analysis. I believe it is eight."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

Crespo: "Each Leader appoints two."

Davis, W.: "Okay. So, since the Bill also, I guess, moves the effective date... so, as I'm going through my scholarship process right now, where I have an independent committee that reviews all the applications and ultimately makes the decisions and that I don't even know who applies until they hand me the list of the eight finalists and the four alternates. Considering that I go through this process, the eight people that they ultimately choose, what happens to them? Are you telling me that they don't benefit from a waiver this year or they do, or what's going... what's going to happen?"

Crespo: "They... they... if you have... those that you've given out already, get it. And the fact that it was extended to September 1, you have another round."

Davis, W.: "Okay. So, these students that may be awarded this year, as long as it's before September 1..."

Crespo: "Correct."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

Davis, W.: "...they will be afforded that opportunity to complete the entire year?"

Crespo: "Right."

Davis, W.: "The entire year?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "All right. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti. Yes, the Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, you're looking very dashing today.

Doing a great job up there. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "I just said that. Yes, the Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "I will... I want to... its formality, Sir. Mr. Crespo, why are we waiting until September 1 to abolish this program when we... why couldn't we do it effective immediately upon the Governor's signature?"

Crespo: "Representative, that was the intent, originally. My understanding is that there were some Members of the Senate and maybe the House, already had some folks in the pipeline and that's where the… President Cullerton had to do to get the support."

Reboletti: "With respect to the Tuition and Fee Waiver Task Force, would this also include them reviewing any military waivers for veterans returning home from combat in Iraq and Afghanistan?"

Crespo: "Yes. All mandatory and discretionary, all tuition waivers will be reviewed."

Reboletti: "Do we have a total number on what those waivers cost the State of Illinois right now?"

Crespo: "The total amount of..."

Reboletti: "Looking at all fee... look..."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

Crespo: "...of the waivers, Representative, I believe is \$414 million, out of which 13 million are legislative tuition waivers."

Reboletti: "And as... and piggybacking on the previous speaker's questioning, there isn't a conclusion in this task force that we're trying to accomplish, is there? Some of these task forces already have a conclusion that we then... we write the report to meet the conclusion. Just as, lets all the Members of the task force simply review how we have fee waivers, how we have tuition waivers, if they're effective, can we do it better, should we cut them, should we tax them. It could be any of those things, but they'll have a report for us next year. Is that right?"

Crespo: "They'll have a report next year and after that, the task force just goes away."

Reboletti: "What's the date the report is due?"

Crespo: "April 15, 2013."

Reboletti: "It's due on Tax Day. That's a..."

Crespo: "How about that."

Reboletti: "...an interesting time. I'm not sure if the task force will be able to meet that... that deadline. That's... it's some pretty heavy lifting. But, are all the... all the tuition waivers, do we have a breakdown on... on per university what those waivers cost? Is there somewhere where you could get that on a website? 'Cause I know obviously U of I will have a lot more waivers than Eastern might have."

Crespo: "Representative, I believe when I first introduced the Bill, that there were some fiscal notes and I believe the

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

fiscal notes, the State Board of Education did contact the universities to get a breakdown. My understanding is that all the universities came through except one, did not give us... give us the numbers. But I don't have them before me right now."

Reboletti: "And my expertise is not the Higher Ed. budget, but what percentage of our Higher Ed. budget does this make up?"

Speaker Lang: "Excuse me, Mr. Reboletti, please..."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "...please hang on a second. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's a very important piece of legislation. Could we please hold the noise down. If you have to talk, move yourselves to the rear of the chamber. Mr. Reboletti, please proceed."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. My question, Representative Crespo is, what percentage of our Higher Ed. budget do these waivers make up?"

Crespo: "Representative, that's a very good question. All I know is that currently it's \$414 million a year in tuition waivers. What percent that represents of the total budget, I don't have that with me."

Reboletti: "And as far as these tuition and fee waivers, does the State of Illinois, do we, the General Assembly, make those universities and colleges whole by providing that money from GRF or is that just money that they have to deal with not having that much more money in their coffers?"

Crespo: "That's something that they... they have to figure out.

The... our Bill, the legislative tuition waivers, as I said,

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

last month, they don't charge the students for tuition, but for anyone to imply that they're losing money, believe me when I tell you, they have all the other students subsidized the cost for those students who are taking those... those spots."

Reboletti: "And I... and I assume then that the universities have to raise tuition or other fee cost to subsidize some of those waivers. Is that fair to say?"

Crespo: "That's correct."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Listening to my learned colleague, who, sits two seats behind me, you would think this was a wonderful thing that we're accomplishing here. I thank Representative Will Davis for his words and his support for the legislative scholarships and I think several good questions have been asked. You know, there's little doubt that over the years, there have been many abuses of the legislative scholarship program, but it is so unfortunate, so unfortunate when the young people in our districts that we try so hard to give them a footing to go to college and to have it crushed because we make this sound like some huge money saving endeavor. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I could have your attention, this is a red herring of the worst type. This Bill is a sham. I am in my 10th year, I have given out 72 scholarships, every one of them, I have a letter in my file profusely thanking me, every one of them. Eight superintendants met every year and chose those young people. They chose them based on merit,

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

they chose them based on ability, they chose them based on the simple knowledge that we were selecting them in the right way. And then we hear... we listen here today, oh well, we have all these other scholarships that are far more meritorious, far more meritorious to give scholarship to somebody's child that works at a university and probably makes two, three, four hundred thousand. I know there are many there making under six figures, but think this thing through, Ladies and Gentlemen. Legislative Scholarship Program has simply been abused, fix abuse, don't get rid of the program. tremendously great program that we desperately need. This isn't a Republican issue, it's not a Democrat issue, it's a commonsense, help our young people issue. To take this away from them is just an absolute shame. We have an opportunity here today to kill something that needs to be killed. Our greatest ally over the past 10 years, since I've been here, has been President Cullerton and the Senate, and why he folded this year, I will never understand. This is a program that is good for Illinois. It creates future young people that are able to get into the workplace. They're motivated to go to school; they're motivated to work. They're not down protesting on... in downtown Chicago. These are the kids that want to go to work. Don't let this Bill pass. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could... To the Bill. There... I don't know what I can add to what the previous speaker said. I... I believe he's correct. The one

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

thing I do want to add is that whenever we... and understand, I represent a university... when we claim that this is a cost to the university, I think that's a false claim. And it's a false claim because we're not creating new classrooms; we're putting people in existing classrooms. But one thing we do still get from the students is... the fact is, this is just a tuition waiver. It is not a student fee waiver; it is not a housing waiver. All of those things are still paid for at our universities. I believe that this is a detriment if we get rid of this. I believed that when it passed here before and this Amendment that was passed in the Senate, rather than... if ... if the Senate could have amended and just simply put quidelines in place so that Legislators could have clear quidelines, I would love to work with them to write those guidelines because, like the previous speaker, we have certain things in place so no one can question what we do and how we hand it out. We put people in place that are from both Parties, from several counties, that were educators and business people, who understand what the importance of these scholarships are and what the important needs of the particular families that are effected. If they would have put rules in there, that would have been fine, but that's not what they did. They came back with Amendments that say we're going to look at other scholarships, veteran's scholarships, all of the other scholarships that are out there, to determine whether or not and what their costs are. Folks, the Bill itself... I don't know what the Senate was trying to do. If we have a problem and an abuse of this system, then let's fix the

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

problem and the abuse. Don't sacrifice these students that are getting the opportunity to maybe have an education that they wouldn't have that opportunity to have."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the noise level is unbearable in the chamber. Ladies and Gentlemen, please.

Mr. David Harris."

"Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Ladies and Harris, D.: Gentlemen, to the Bill. My distinguished colleagues from Stevenson County and Williamson County and Cook County that have... have questioned the need for this Bill, as a cosponsor, I will tell you that I was uncomfortable with what the Senate did. They put two Amendments on this Bill. One of the Amendments as was discussed creates a task force and there's probably some good logic to that task force. It talks about looking at all of the tuition waivers, which cost, as we've stated, \$415 million, but they laid out and the Bill lays out what they should use as a criteria in looking at these waivers, such as the institution's justification for the need, the program's intended purposes, the program's eligibility and selection, its costs, its benefits resulting from the program and whether or not it serves the public interest. That's a good thing. I commend the Senate on what they did. Quite frankly, I was troubled by Amendment #1; however, we, in the House, I think, s... did the right thing. We sent this out of here saying it's going to end as of June the 30th this year. The Senate said, no, we're going to extend it. folks who give scholarships have another opportunity to give another round of scholarships in the new fiscal year.

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

And what was said previously about the need, as we stated when we passed House Bill 3810 initially, the overwhelming majority of those who give the scholarships both here in the House and in the Senate, do it correctly. they do it with a selection committee. They do it the right way and they don't abuse the system. But I'll say what I said when we sent 3810 out of here, unfortunately, the program itself... has brought this Body into disrepute. I move Concurrence... or I support Concurrence in these two Amendments."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, if this Bill does not pass does that mean that this Bill will conclude the legislative scholarships in June of this year?"

Crespo: "If this Bill does not pass, Representative, I'll...
we're back to the status quo. Nothing changes."

Dunkin: "Wait, say that again."

Crespo: "If this Bill does not pass, with the Concurrences, the Bill just dies."

Dunkin: "Okay. Okay. So, we need... so we vote 'no', the Bill is dead, right?"

Crespo: "I got you."

Dunkin: "All right, Representative, I'm not sure if you were really taking heed to what's been said by a number of your colleagues, our colleagues, in terms of some of us having a very responsible Legislative Scholarship Committee. Did any of that resonate with you at all?"

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

Crespo: "Representative, the... there's a fundamental flaw with this program, notwithstanding all the other issues, and this unfunded mandate to the state universities, there's no money behind it. Consequently, all the other students are subsidizing the cost. That's a fundamental flaw, Representative. And please, keep in mind, we've had this program for close to a hundred years."

Dunkin: "So you're saying there's no cost to this program?"

Crespo: "There's cost to the universities, Representative."

Dunkin: "So, there's no cost to this, yes or no?"

Crespo: "I... no, I never said that."

Dunkin: "Okay."

Crespo: "The cost... the... the cost is being paid off by the other students who attend the state universities."

Dunkin: "The… what cost is… are there… there's either a cost or there's not a cost, Representative. There's no cost. Do you know who chair the Appropriations for Higher Education?"

Crespo: "No."

Dunkin: "Really. Do you know who, in this chamber, who chairs the Appropriations Committee for Higher Education for the House of Representatives in the State of Illinois?"

Crespo: "People are pointing at you, Representative. I don't understand the connection though."

Dunkin: "The connection is, I have at least a... a modest understanding of higher education cost here in the state. Would you agree, maybe? There is no cost..."

Crespo: "You said very modest, maybe..."

Dunkin: "...Representative, there is no cost. So, let's speak to what this Bill is. You may have a handful out of 177

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

Members, Representative, who abuse or have been accused of abusing this particular program. But I bet you the lion's share of us here in this chamber and the other chamber, including myself and my committee, where I haven't made a choice in years. I have a very respected and noted committee of Legislative Scholarship Committee members and they go through a thorough meritorious selection process, Representative. So, we had two Governors... two Governors convicted, they're in jail right now. Should we abolish that Office, also? That's the pattern of the Governor's office right? The last two. So, we should throw the baby out with the bathwater or is this what it really is, Representative. Is this for a nice, press pop for you with some newspaper or some field..."

Crespo: "Stop right there. Stop right there."

Dunkin: "What is it then?"

Crespo: "It has nothing to do with a press pop. This is the right thing to do. We need to do it now. We've been trying to do this for many, many years..."

Dunkin: "You are slighting every Member in here, who has been responsible for years."

Crespo: "...so don't make it personal, Representative. Do not make it personal. Do not make it personal."

Dunkin: "You are... you are slighting Members who have been respected... respecting this process and this legislative scholarship initiative by saying what you feel and what we should do. This is..."

Crespo: "That's not what I feel, Representative."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

Dunkin: "...this is not a constituent issue, this is a media This is a media issue for you. You're telling me and my colleagues that we've been disrespecting this process or our committees that go through a meritorious process should be thrown out because of what you feel. That's what this legislation speaks to. Are you saying that my committee members lie... that if we trade something for political benefit. What are you saying, Representative? That's a popularity contest that you're trying to adhere to. That's how I look at it. I'll take it personal too. The people who are selected to sit on my committee and others are highly respectable people who donate their time and instead it's so easy for us to send a young person to prison downstate then it is to send them to college and become meaningful and responsible taxpayers. So, you can't tell me this legislation doesn't have any political benefit for some of us here in this chamber."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "I've been patient with time with you, but if we could... can you... can you address the Bill now, Sir."

Dunkin: "Representative, I hear you loud and clear. This... this Bill here has been politically footballed back and forth for years based off of a handful of individuals, maybe, who have not adhered to this process of fairness within their respective districts. I feel very, very proud of the committee that has selected students to go to school, to go to medical school, law school, undergrad, where there's zero cost, not a red cent. So, I guess the compromise is to

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

look at all the scholarships, all the waivers. By the way, Ladies and Gentlemen, a waiver is a waiver, there is no economic impact. There is no cost. So, this has to be what I just said it is, it's political pandering. And I hope you get everything you want from this legislation because my folk on my committee are highly offended that the insinuation of them utilizing this for political purposes is highly offensive. So, they're offended and I'm offended. And so, you're saying that what I've been utilizing for the last 10 years should be thrown out because this is some feel good, knee jerk reaction because it's in the media and we want to adhere to the media. We want to really get those big endorsements at the end of our political year here so we can be successful at running for office again. Well, this is not it, Representative. You know what will be it? When we can deal with our budget deficient, when we can deal with our pension issues, the Medicaid problems that we have here. When some of the problems that we have been spending... by the way, not even paying into our pension, taking pension holidays. And so what we do is we cut people, who've been here for 35, 40, health care. We mess with their pensions. Even though we know damn well, 20, 30 years ago we said we going to do one thing and we flip the script on them at this time. So, let's find something of more substance to argue and to present on this floor other than some of this political pandering and not slight and disrespect other Members process in their district who respects this legislative scholarship process. So, I'll be voting 'no' on this, Representative. I don't mean to offend

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

you personally, but you and I know how I feel about this and you know that this is disingenuous at best. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

Riley: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

"Representative, I... I think that we had some pretty Rilev: intense debate when the original Bill came up. And I think that, you know, there's points on... on both sides of this issue. But as you can see from some of the testimony, a lot of ill will still exists because, again, and I'm not going to try... you know, I... I've argued my points before. And all of my points, I think, we're very well-taken. Folks can vote the way they want, but I brought up the fact that all of these other waivers took pl... you know, there were people in the original testimony when I brought up there was \$414 million of other waivers given, they didn't know it. You know, we've... we've heard unfortunately a lot of silly thing... and I... deal the cards up straight everybody. You know, if you don't like it, vote against it, vote for it. But, you know, things like folks who sit Appropriations Committees, you know, who are making determinations of ... worth billions of dollars, then had to say to the ... you know, had to go out publically and say, well, I'm not qualified to give out a scholarship. Then what are you doing on Appropriations Committee. You know, frankly, I'm tired of this because I haven't heard a lot of really intense analysis done on this. You know, again, there's a lot of people in this chamber who have taught on

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

the collegiate level, I have. And essentially, it's a lit... few more papers to grade. If we came into a classroom and said, have you guys pay, all of a sudden, okay, you know what, we're going to give you your money back. That's some fiscal impact. Two or three or four more people in the class means the professor has to grade more papers. You know, so that's kind of, frankly, you know, excuse me for saying, that's the silliness that we've been involved in on this whole issue. It probably will get the votes. Fine and we'll be done with it, but I think some very intelligent people really had to dumb themselves down chivalrous that I... you know, that I've been hearing over the past year or so regarding these scholarships. Let me just ask a question. Part of the one... part of the things that are going to be looked at is gender equity. Don't you feel that at least with that particular one, that flies in the face of some of requirements of Title IX?"

Crespo: "Representative, you have to repeat the question."

Riley: "All right. Repeat... repeat the question."

Crespo: "I only heard Title IX."

Riley: "Gender equity is one of the waivers that we give presently and it's one of the waivers that's going to be examined in the task force. And I'm saying, doesn't that fly in the face of some of the requirements that we have to do under Title IX."

Crespo: "And I would imagine that the task force will recognize that, yes."

Riley: "I'm sorry,' cause I really can't hear."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

Crespo: "I said I recognize the task force will... will acknowledge that."

Riley: "Well, I would hope so because I think, you know, some of these… some of these are… are probably mandates."

Crespo: "Right."

Riley: "You know, that we... that we must deal with. To the Bill.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't really think this is our...

this has been one of our finest hours of the whole debate
on these waivers. And I'm going to vote 'no', a lot of
people will vote 'yes'. You know, you vote the way you
vote, but I would just hope that we can really engage
ourselves in... in the kind of good public policy and
analysis that a Bill like this need... needs to have whether
you vote 'yes' or 'no' on it because some of things that
we've done and said I don't think represent us in the best
light. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Minority Leader Cross."

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

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti. You think it'll be just as quiet for you as it was for Mr. Cross?"

Reboletti: "I certainly hope the decorum would stay the same, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think we have lost our way on this piece of legislation, which is pretty simple. But, what I've learned today, it's like bizarro world here on the House Floor. My parents taught me that there was no such thing as a free lunch, but obviously math is changed here. What if we gave everybody a waiver to go to the U of I; it wouldn't cost anything, oh, that's not right, it

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

really would cost something. It's not that simple. If you give \$14 million out in free waivers, those universities and the taxpayers have to make up the difference. It's that simple. Maybe we can give waivers to everybody from paying taxes; that won't cost us anything either. That's not true. This Bill has nothing to do about putting people in prison and fast tracking people into prison. Either you think the General Assembly Scholarship Program is meritorious or you don't. Either you think we should have a task force to review all of the waivers, we give waivers to all employees in the state that have worked for a university I think it's over five years or seven years. It doesn't matter what their job description is. And I have heard arguments that's because we're trying to put them in a competitive way, against other university professors. I don't think we have to give everybody a waiver to make that position competitive, to bring the best person to those jobs, but that's just me. I'm one out of 118 people. Let's get to the business of voting on this legislation and try to save the people of the State of Illinois \$14 million. That's it. If you want to keep the program, vote 'yes'; if you don't, vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in light of some of the Amendments, what is the vote requirement for this Bill of this juncture?"

Speaker Lang: "Sixty votes, Sir."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentlemen yields."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

Thapedi: "Representative, I've... I've had a chance to look at the language in the Bill very quickly here and I'd like for you to... if you would bear with me. I know that you've answered quite a few questions, but if you would direct your attention to the portion in the Bill that talks about the findings and declarations of the General Assembly. Do you see that in Committee Amendment #1?"

Crespo: "Okay."

Thapedi: "All right. Now, here it basically lays out the money and the percentages, correct?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Thapedi: "Okay. And in fact, it says that the total amount of tuition and fee waivers for the year 2011 is \$415 million, correct?"

Crespo: "That's correct."

Thapedi: "And of that \$415 million, 84 percent of those waivers were discretionary and that they were awarded at the discretion of each institution and were valued at over \$350 million dollars, correct?"

Crespo: "Right."

Thapedi: "Okay. But the remaining portion, which is only 16 percent, those were waivers that were done by way of statute, correct?"

Crespo: "That's correct."

Thapedi: "So, what you're talking about here with the legislative waiver program is that 16 percent, correct?"

Crespo: "Not necessarily, Representative. Sixteen percent is all encompassing. So, I mean, the..."

Thapedi: "Well... no ... well..."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

- Crespo: "...legislative tuition waivers is just a part of the 16 point."
- Thapedi: "Okay. Well, help me understand. The 84 percent that are discretionary, what types of waivers are those? Are those for football players, basketball players, scientists, et cetera? Is that who that's for?"
- Crespo: "Those are the ones given to employees, civil service, academic or talent, athletic, gender equity and athletics, foreign exchange students, out-of-state students, foreign students and financial aid and science."
- Thapedi: "And that's the lion's sha... you said financial aid?"

Crespo: "Correct."

- Thapedi: "What kind of financial aid is a waiver?"
- Crespo: "Well, each school might give financial aid not backed by any scholarship money. So, it's a waiver instead of a scholarship, where scholarships are normally funded."
- Thapedi: "Okay. So, you're saying that waivers and scholarships are the same thing. Is that what you're saying?"
- Crespo: "Tuition waivers and scholarships are two different things."
- Thapedi: "Okay. So, why are you not attacking that 84 percent because that seems to be the lion's share of the money?"
- Crespo: "Well, the task force will make a recommendation, Representative. There's... I mean... and... and... we had other attempts to get rid of some of the other tuition waivers. We're working on one right now and that's the legislative tuition waiver."
- Thapedi: "No. And I certainly understand that and I understand that your point and the need for a task force. And I would

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

agree with you that there probably is a need for a task force, but don't you think that you're putting the cart before the horse. Wouldn't it be more logical to let the task force do its job and then make the determination as to where the adjustments need to be made."

Crespo: "Well, there's two things, Representative. As I've mentioned earlier, there's a fundamental flaw with our tuition waiver, there's no money behind it; coupled with the fact that lately... recently we've heard or read about many abuses. We need to do it now. Keep in mind there's a public outcry out there asking us, please get rid of these tuition waivers. We pass this Bill out of the House at least twice the last three years. We had over 30 votes and 30 Sponsors in the Senate. We have a Governor who said, give me this Bill, I want to sign it. I think the time is now."

Thapedi: "Okay. And I understand that you believe that the time is now, but we did also award a pretty large assistance package to Sears, the Board of Trade and the Mercantile Exchange, as well, correct?"

Crespo: "Yes, Sir."

Thapedi: "And that was far more than 348 million, correct?"

Crespo: "Yes."

Thapedi: "Okay. I... I guess I'm not understanding and perhaps for purposes of legislative intent, you can differentiate for me, waivers that are discretionary and waivers that are mandated by statute. Because, again, in the findings that we're going to make if we pass this Bill, these are findings that we're making that we are distinguishing

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

between discretionary waivers and statutory waivers. And if I understand correctly, the legislative scholarship provision, or at least the legislative waiver that we're discussing now in 3810, would be a waiver that would not be discretionary but would be one that is mandated by statute."

Crespo: "Correct."

Thapedi: "Okay. So that's why I'm trying to explore that. That why are you focusing in on a small number when there's a much larger number that you can be focused in on. And you identified a potential task force that will cure these wrongs but yet for some reason you don't want to let the task force do its work, you want to just eliminate the smallest portion of the whole bunch. That... that's what I'm trying to understand. I... I don't mean to quarrel with you."

Crespo: "No."

Thapedi: "I just want to make sure that I understand..."

Crespo: "Representative..."

Thapedi: "...legislative intent because there will be lawsuits if this passes."

Crespo: "...well, I'm a law school dropout. I'm not sure about the lawsuits, but... but I'll tell you dollars do not drive this piece of legislation. It is a part of the legislation. Again..."

Thapedi: "Did you say the dol..."

Crespo: "...it's an unfunded mandated, number 1 and number 2, look at all the abuses and Representative, I will suggest to you, that what we've seen so far is just the tip of the iceberg. Even those that say, hey, I have a committee; no

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

- one has taken time to review and look at the com... at the work of those committees."
- Thapedi: "Okay. Well, Mr. Speaker, if... if this Bill receives the requisite number of votes, I would ask for the vote to be verified."
- Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged, Sir. Mr. Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."
- Moffitt: "Thank you. Representative, we certainly had significant debate here. I do want to ask, what is the purpose of the task force? Isn't that to review and make recommendations?"
- Crespo: "The task force will consider each program's waivers and they'll look at the need, purpose and goals, selection criteria, the cost, resulting benefits and interest insurers, public or private."
- Moffitt: "So, wouldn't it have been better just quickly, yes...
 it seems like it'd be better to have the task force before
 you start making decisions regarding scholarships and
 tuition waivers."
- Crespo: "If... if I take away the legislative tuition waivers, I'm with you."
- Moffitt: "Okay. Let's just move on and give a couple… a few more questions. Is there anything in the new… if… if this passes, once we have a task force, is there anything that's going to ensure some geographical spread in awarding financial assistance. This is the only program I know that assures that there's geographical spread, that there's assistance to students in all parts of the state."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

- Crespo: "Representative, I believe a hundred years ago, when this program was first put in place, that was a very valid argument. You had a selected few folks who can go to state colleges. We did not have the number of state colleges we have today and it does serve good public policy. That's not the case anymore. We have MAP grants and I believe the MAP grants do take into account where these students are selected from. So, we have other avenues to address that, but this... this does not do that."
- Moffitt: "Do we get that report that shows that there's geographical representation?"
- Crespo: "My understanding, it's what I've heard, what we'll... I will have to verify that."
- Moffitt: "I would appreciate that very much. Do you see any report back on the savings? We're alleging, what, 14 million?"
- Crespo: "The cost last year was \$13.5 million in legislative scholar... waivers."
- Moffitt: "Are we going to see a report back that shows where those saving... that those savings did actually occur?"
- Crespo: "The savings, again, all it does is we have the other students will not be subsidizing that. There... is... there's an actual... keep in mind, these universities have a limit number of seats. It's not like they can just take whoever they want and they have to figure out how many seats they have and then pay whatever cost they... they incur..."

Moffitt: "Okay."

Crespo: "...to run the institution."

Moffitt: "Are they actually filled to capacity now?"

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

Crespo: "Beg your pardon?"

Moffitt: "Are they filled to capacity?"

Crespo: "Oh, I would imagine some are, Representative. I... I mean, I... I... you know..."

Moffitt: "Are you sure... you sure of that?"

Crespo: "...I can't speak for all 12."

Moffitt: "So, you're not sure that they're all full or at...
which programs are full, right? I keep seeing costs of
certain state institutions spending huge sums for searches
for... to fill positions. It seems like that is a factor
here, too, they'd have money to make huge salary increases
when they higher new positions, new coaches, bonuses, all
sorts of things. It just seems like maybe that should be
looked at, too. Would you agree?"

Crespo: "Representative, if you want to introduce a Bill to look into that, I'll be more than willing to consider that."

Moffitt: "Okay. It's been an interesting discussion. It's unfortunate that a few alleged cases have got us to this point, but it... I'm just... I'm troubled that we really didn't attack the real issue and that's that we... we go about how the selections are made to guarantee integrity of this system, have the transparency that's needed and I... I know that and I talked to some individuals at some institutions. I've had individuals that... constituents that would receive the tuition waiver and get a letter saying that's the only reason they were even able to go to that institution. And you know, that... they would not have filled that seat had it not been for the tuition waiver, so it caused them to go

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

there. And in every case that I'm aware of, they stayed and got their... their degree, probably stayed for four or five years total, so it actually brought business to the... to the university, didn't cost them, but actually brought them business. So, it's a very difficult issue... decision to make here. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Hernandez: "Representative, did you ever offer the scholarship since you've been in office?"

Crespo: "My first year."

Hernandez: "So you would say you have a choice whether to offer
the scholarship or not?"

Crespo: "I believe, currently, we have many Legislators who are exercising that option right now."

Hernandez: "But there are those who are not, correct?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Hernandez: "To the Bill. I just believe that I entered, also the Legislative Body at the same time you did and ever since then I have formed a committee and have offered the scholarship to the students within my district and found it to be incredibly, incredibly changing their lives. At some point, I... I did get some phone calls from students thanking me very, very, very much for th... this opportunity because they were seeing some of their... their friends having to pack up and go home. The fact that they had the opportunity to be there because of this... this scholarship was their way of continuing their education. So, based on that, if you do

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

it right, if you really try to correct the abuse, I think that we are giving our kids a chance, those who are vulnerable, those who would never, never be able to. So, I truly believe that we can put the time more so in trying to work on the system so this particular program can continue. And I ask all the Members to vote 'no' on this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin."

Durkin: "To the Bill. No matter how you slice it or dice it, this is a perk. This perk is indefensible. I cannot believe what I've been hearing over the past half hour. not a god given right that the Legislature should have, which they have used decade after decade. Get rid of this program. But I also got a secret to tell everybody and it's a word of advice. You don't have to award these scholarships. They will be eliminated. I don't agree with the fact that this has been pushed off 'til September, but before all of you vote... those of you who vote 'yes', send out your press releases and do your victory laps, why don't you get rid of the program first? You don't need to this. Be honest with yourself but also be honest with your constituency. Eliminate this program. We're going to eliminate it by... with our vote today. Dump it right now, for those of you who still have not done it."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Franks: "Thank you. Representative, I'm reading the analysis and the Amendments that we're asking us to concur with

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

indicate that the task force will review tuition waivers,
correct?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Franks: "Now, currently, doesn't the IBHE report each year already to the General Assembly on these tuition and fee waiver programs?"

Crespo: "I believe so. I have not seen the report."

Franks: "So, this task force will be charged with reviewing the report that's already provided, number 1 and also will consider each program's need, purpose, and goals, eligibility and selection criteria, cost, resulting benefits and interests it serves, public or private, correct?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Franks: "So, they're already doing this. You're not asking them to do something different except having an extra group review the... the reports, correct?"

Crespo: "Yeah. There not... Correct. They're not acting on anything. They're just looking at these tuition waivers, reporting back to the General Assembly, the Governor, and the State Board of Higher Education."

Franks: "Because that's what the Concurrence Motion is really about and we've heard a lot of other things. But that's not what the Concurrence Motion is, correct?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Franks: "Okay. To the Bill. I appreciate my friend standing here and... and fighting for this. And I gave these tuition scholarships for a long time. I stopped recently. You know, I gave them to the schools. I gave them to each of

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

my high schools and I asked them to choose a recipient. were never involved at all. And I said my only criteria was, really, give to a kid whose life it's going to change. And I think they did a good job of picking the children and I didn't even know about it 'til after they were announced. But as I sit back and I decided not to give these anymore, much like the previous speaker, I do believe it's an indefensible perk. You know, we aren't princlings here; we're not princesses; we're... we're public servants. We're elected by the citizens to be one of them. It's true; we're not here to create fiefdoms. I think... I don't think we're here to bestow special privileges on the anointed few who we decide should get them. I think that every kid should be able to go to college not just the ones who we choose. This is really a question of how we fund education. You know, in Georgia my nephews are able to go to college on the Hope Scholarship, because they do well enough in high school... and every kid who gets a B average in Georgia, gets to go college if they want to. We should be able to do this in Illinois. Every child should go to college who wants to. That's what the debate ought to be about. We ought to be fairly funding education. Everybody gives lip service and how it's the most important thing, but we don't fund it. So, that's what we ought to be doing, but we have to get rid of these perks. Ladies and Gentlemen, the time has passed. Let's look at the bigger picture. Let's take care of all of our children, not just the chosen few. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Monigue Davis."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

Davis, M.: "Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman yields."

Davis, M.: "Representative Crespo, how did you vote on the Sears million dollar gift from the State of Illinois?"

Crespo: "I voted for it..."

Davis, M.: "That was a scholarship."

Crespo: "...like many other Members. What was your question?"

Davis, M.: "How did you vote on the gift of millions of dollars to Sears?"

Crespo: "I'm not sure I understand. You mentioned a gift, I'm not sure I understand that."

Davis, M.: "Well, how did you vote on that Bill?"

Crespo: "Oh, we... I supported it."

Davis, M.: "You supported it. How did you vote on the bailout or the large sum of award or gift to the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, CME? How much did we give them?"

Crespo: "Represen..."

Davis, M.: "Over \$100 million. Over \$100 million. These children are living in an economic time where the interest in banks is higher than it's ever been, so if they borrow money to go school, they have the debt of a mortgage on their backs when they finish. I will not be a hypocrite and pretend that this is going to save the state money and that we're going to have a big whopping budget left to divide up with people getting grants and awards, especially if they're already wealthy. It's not fair. It is not fair. These are children who live in Illinois, who 90 percent of the time will work in Illinois, they will be productive

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

citizens and as the chairman of the Higher Ed Approp. Committee stated, they won't be going to prison. Now, I'll be so much happier when we decide we're going to cut the prison budget. I have never heard that since I've been here. No matter how much it goes up, nobody ever complains. That's just what we have to pay. We don't want to educate the people in prison, knowing they're going to back and back and forth. So, I'm not going to be a hypocrite, Ladies and Gentlemen, and with great respect for each and every one of you, what more can we take from the taxpayer? What more can we take from the little average man and woman who goes to school... goes to work every day. How much more can we take from them giving nothing in return. increase, reduction in Medicare, what more can we take from them? I don't care if you think this is noble. If you think you're doing something that's really going to get you a lot Will your heart really let you take a of votes. scholarship from a kid who's trying to get a degree in the City in State of Chi... in the State of Illinois? A kid that just wants to go to college. Tuition is how much nowadays? Over 15 thousand a year, maybe. All of them don't go to the University of Illinois, all of them do not. Some go to Eastern, some go to Chicago State, but the issue is, do we really want to take something else from the major taxpayers in the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois, do we? If another Sears comes up, how will you vote? If another CME comes up, how will you vote? How many more awards and grants to the wealthy are we going to give away as we take

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

away from the children in the State of Illinois. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sommer."

Sommer: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Sommer: "Representative Crespo, I had a question regarding Senate Amendment 1. As I read that there may be some of us who assume that nominations before September 1 will end the program in the next school year. But my reading of it says that a Legislator may grant that four-year scholarship so therefore, the program will continue for four more years. What is your take on it?"

Crespo: "It... it'll continue for the life of whatever the award was given, Representative. So, to your point, I would imagine you are correct. The program ceases to exist September 1. If students get a four-year waiver, they probably get the four-year waiver."

Sommer: "So, we shouldn't fool ourselves that this program is really ending."

Crespo: "Well, the program... if we vote this today, it will end."

Sommer: "But the public should not be fooled that it is ending now. It'll be ending in maybe four years. To the Bill. Simply put, Ladies and Gentlemen, it's time that the General Assembly get out of the legislative scholarship business."

Speaker Lang: "The last speaker is Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

- Flowers: "Representative Crespo, are there taxpayers who have to pay their state taxes who have no children in the school system at all?"
- Crespo: "If I understand your question correctly, I think you're right."
- Flowers: "Pardon me?"
- Crespo: "I think you're right, if I understand the question correctly."
- Flowers: "So, when these people pay taxes and they get nothing in return as far as tax breaks what, do we give them in return? They're paying their taxes, what do they get in return?"
- Crespo: "They get the services that their local government or State Government or Federal Government provide in lieu of the taxes."
- Flowers: "So, the students who are going to school, is it fair to say that this is an investment for those who get an education? This is an investment for the State of Illinois, for those who get an education."
- Crespo: "Representative, you need to be more specific. What you mean by an investment."
- Flowers: "By... by a student... by a student getting an education by way of what you call a perk, but it's taxpayers' money. Taxpayers who have children in the system, taxpayers who don't have children in the system, but either way it go, for every child that go to school, does not the entire State of Illinois benefit from that child's education? Because that means that that child will be educated and then have a job and possibly stay in Illinois."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

Crespo: "Generally speaking, yes, not always the case though."

Flowers: "Well, let me ask you this. Does it cost more to incarcerate than to educate?"

Crespo: "I don't have the figures before me, Representative."

Flowers: "We can assume, we can... be... because of the numbers is out there, we can assume that it does cost more and some people stay incarcerated much longer than four years or six years or eight years. So, that is a cost. That is a cost to the State of Illinois, where they get no returns on their tax dollars. But as far as education is concerned, they will see some revenue. They will see some benefits because there will be more children that's educated, more people that's working. Right now, there's lots of jobs out there but there's no one to fill them because there's no one being educated. The schools, Sir, are empty, despite the fact that when I started here years ago we had 11 prisons and 11 institutions of higher education. We have increased prisons; we have not increased our educational institutions. So, who has been the benefactors and who's been paying for these increases in prisons?"

Crespo: "Representative, you... you mentioned this before, when we talked about this Bill and I don't subscribe to the assumption that folks who don't go to school end up in prison."

Flowers: "Well, then why would you want that?"

Crespo: "There might be some correlation..."

Flowers: "There's no jobs."

Crespo: "...but just because they go to..."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

- Flowers: "Why would you want that? Why would you want someone whose... whose parents is a taxpayer because the schools have been paid for over and over and over again. Why would you not want a child to benefit from ed... from an education?"
- Crespo: "I think we all want children to benefit from education. That's not what we're talking about here, Representative."
- Flowers: "And let me ask one other question. Why is it that it would be in our best interest when the… when the people of the State of Illinois elected us, but I'm going to acquiesce my authority for the people in my district for someone else to choose who would give them an education. And they probably don't even know they exist, but because I'm closer to my constituents I know what's best. So, why would I acquiesce my authority to the State Board of Education who have not equally funded the programs that they have across the state. All you have to do is look at the numbers."
- Crespo: "Again, I'm trying to follow your logic, Representative, with all due respect. We're not saying here that we're passing this responsibility to the State Board of Education. That's how your statement came across. We're just eliminating the legislative tuition waiver. That's all this is."
- Flowers: "And what will the State of Illinois benefit by this waiver being eliminated?"

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

- Crespo: "We will have many, many students in the state colleges who won't have to subsidize this cost, at a tune of \$13.5 million."
- Flowers: "No one is subsidizing this cost now, but the people of State of Illinois."
- Crespo: "We might disagree on that. We might disagree on that."
- Flowers: "I'm a taxpayer. I'm subsidizing the cost. And other people who pay taxes whose children cannot get in school and have been denied because they can't afford it. Everybody cannot afford to send their child to school and because they can't afford it, should they be denied?"

Crespo: "No."

- Flowers: "Why should they be denied? As the other speakers have spoken and said, we have given many of billionaires from the Sox, the Cubs, the Bears, and everyone else, all kinds of tax breaks. Why can't we give our taxpayers a tax break? I would like to have an answer."
- Crespo: "This is not a tax break. Again, I'm try... with a due respect, Representative, I don't follow your logic. This is not a tax break."
- Flowers: "Excuse me. This comes from the taxpayer of the State of Illinois. They built the institutions. The taxpayers built the prisons, the taxpayers built the colleges. That is... those are their seats."
- Crespo: "Well, Representative, going back to an earlier speaker then, we should give tuition waivers to all taxpayers."
- Flowers: "Well, then, I tell you what, I'll be more than happy to help you or would you join me in sponsoring that legislation because I agree with you 100 percent. If I

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

support this, would you help pass legisl... because the taxpayer is already paying for it anyway?"

Crespo: "No."

Flowers: "Oh. Mr. Speaker, Ladies an..."

Crespo: "Vote for this first and I might consider it."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very bad Bill. The taxpayer of the State of Illinois has paid for these institutions. They've paid their taxes. They've got nothing in return. All they want is for those who can't afford it for their children to have an opportunity to be educated. They're not the working rich; they're the working poor. And a child should not be discriminated against just because of the zip code in which they live. And I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Dunkin: "My name was mentioned in debate, Representative, if I recall. First off, I'd like to..."

Speaker Lang: "I don't ... excuse me, Sir ... I don't think your ... "

Dunkin: "...I'd like to call for a verification."

Speaker Lang: "...the Chair rules your name was not mentioned in debate."

Dunkin: "You sure. Can I address... give me like two minutes, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "No... no, Sir, you may not. Mr. Crespo to close."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Let's...

let's get something... make something very clear. This is not
a scholarship; it's a tuition waiver. A scholarship
implies that there's some funding behind it; that's not the

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

case here. A hundred years ago, when this program was first put in place, it probably made a lot of sense. had a selected few who can actually attend college and can afford it. That's not the case anymore. We have more state colleges, we have MAP grants, we have a lot of other financial aid that these students can use. Folks, here's the kicker, people who keep talking about reforming this thing, folks who say we should just set more rules. We have only one rule for the tuition waivers and that basically, you have to reside in the district. We can't even do that. Can you imagine if we had more rules, now we had to police this thing, this would never work. And for those of you who... who say and I agree... listen we want to help all the folks in our district as much as we can, but Ladies and Gentlemen, please, to suggest that you only have eight students in your district that need the help. That's wrong, you have many, many more. Let's talk about a program to help those. Now, for... for those who was trying to make this personal, hey, listen, I voted for this three years and I didn't carry the Bill. And I've heard so many folks in my district saying, you know, with all corruption in this state we need to start taking a step in the right direction and this is it, it starts today. want to thank President Cullerton for passing the Bill in the Senate. I... it was a very healthy debate and I hope I get your... your vote on this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3810. Mr. Thapedi has asked for a verification. Members will be in their

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

chairs and vote their own switches. Those in favor of the Motion shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 79 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no'. Mr. Thapedi, do you persist in your Motion, Sir?"

Thapedi: "No, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw my Rule 56 request."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi withdraws his verification request.

There are 79 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no'. And the House having concurred in Senate Amendments 1 or... and 2 to House Bill 3810, this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Williams."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please state your point."

Williams: "I just want to take a moment to welcome the Korey Family to Springfield and my Pages over here who go to Burley Elementary School in my district. And wanted to make a note that Jillian is very interested in debate, so she's enjoyed her time here in Springfield."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you and welcome to Springfield. The Chair recognizes Dan Burke."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. And a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Burke, D.: "Just like to take a moment and wish my colleague, my seatmate, Dena Carli, a very happy birthday today."

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

- Speaker Lang: "Happy birthday, Officer, happy birthday. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Rel... Resolution 1052, offered by Representative Fortner. House Resolution 1062, offered by Representative Jones. House Resolution 1063, offered by Representative Mayfield. House Resolution 1064, offered by Representative Paul Evans. House Resolution 1065, offered by Representative Paul Evans. Resolution 1066, offered by Representative Paul Evans. House Resolution 1067, offered by Representative Williams. House Resolution 1068, offered by Representative William Davis. And House Resolution 1069, offered by Representative Osmond."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Lyons moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And now, Leader Lyons moved that, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House stand adjourned 'til Tuesday, May 22 at the hour of noon. Those in favor of that Motion will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. And the 'ayes' have it. And the House does stand adjourned 'til tomorrow, Tuesday, May 22 at the hour of 12 noon."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill
 6173, offered by Representative Thapedi, a Bill for an Act
 concerning public aid. This is referred to the Rules
 Committee. House Perfunctory Session will come to order.
 Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie,
 Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the

139th Legislative Day

5/21/2012

following committee actions taken on May 21, 2012: recommends be adopted are the Motions to Concur with Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 3892, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4673, and Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 4687. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."