21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on February 28, 2013: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 77, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 163 and Floor Amendments #1,2,3,4,5,6,7 and 8 to House Bill 1997."
- Speaker Turner: "The House shall come to order. All Members should be in their seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Sammy Simmons who's with the Immanuel Baptist Church in Benton, Illinois. Pastor Simmons is the guest of Representative Bradley. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Pastor Simmons: "Let us pray together. Father, we thank You, Lord, for the privilege that You have given these men and women to serve as servants of the people and servants of You. Father, I pray, that they enter this House chamber, Lord, the real sense of the great privilege that You have given them will just fall upon them. Father, I pray that You might guide them today, that You would help them, that You would strengthen them. I pray that You would be with their families. And I pray that You would be with the men and women who serve under these roofs. Father, You know the debates, You know the decisions, You know the votes that will come today and in the future days. And Father, I pray that You might grant wisdom. Father, Your word said that if

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

any of us lacks wisdom, we should ask of You and You give generously. So Father, I pray that You might generously grant wisdom. Wisdom to follow You, wisdom to do Your will, wisdom to stand strong, and boldness and courage to follow that which You... is right and honorable and true. And Father, as we come we pray that You would help us to follow the motto in our currency and to trust You. Father, I pray that You would bless this day. We thank You for the day that You have given, the life that You have given and the love that You have given to us. Father, we thank You so very much for Your love, love what You gave Your very best, what You gave Your Son for us. And Father, I pray that You would help us to love each other. Father, I pray You'd help Republicans to love Democrats, and Democrats to love the Republicans and all of us to love You. Father, guide us, help us. Father, I pray for a spirit of unity and a spirit of wisdom here. In Christ's name we pray, Amen."

- Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Fine."
- Fine 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 Turner: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that not a single House Democrat is excused today."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that all Republicans are present today."
- Speaker Turner: "A quorum is present, 118 Members being present today. Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to wish Representative Ford a happy birthday. He turned 41 today, so would you please wish him a happy birthday and cake will be served in his office. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Happy birthday, Representative Ford. Thank you, Representative Flowers. Representative D'Amico."
- D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also want to wish a happy birthday to our seatmate here, Representative Martwick."
- Speaker Turner: "Happy birthday, Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Franks, Committee Chairperson from the on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on February 27, 2013: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 1370, House Bill 1404, House Bill 1455, House Bill 1517, and House Bill 1534; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1295. Representative Jackson, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on February 28, 2013: do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill Representative Bradley, Chairperson from Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on February 28, 2013: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolution 15, House

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Resolution 16, House Joint Resolution 17, House Resolution 82, House Resolution 83, and House Resolution 84."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What are you doing up there?

Wait, wait, your seat I thought was down here. Hey,

Congratulations. Congratulations, Leader Turner."

Speaker Turner: "Better view from up here. Thank you, Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Purpose of an announcement."

Speaker Turner: "State your purpose."

Phelps: "The... just want to making sure everybody knows on March the 20th, Wednesday, the Illinois Legislative Sportsmen's Caucus, will have our 20th annual reception and auction at the State House Inn in Springfield. Reception time's at 6:00, auction at 7:00. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Rise to a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "State your point."

Moffitt: "We just heard from another colleague of an upcoming event. The Sportsmen's Caucus, something to look forward to, but I want to say thank you to the Black Caucus for an outstanding reception last night. Really appreciated that. Great job, great food, great fellowship. So, thank you to the Black Caucus. Appreciate it."

Speaker Turner: "...you, Representative Moffitt. Representative Riley, for what reason do you rise?"

Riley: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please state your point."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

- Riley: "I know information gets around. I'm not sure if Members know, but a really good friend of mine and all of ours, he was a former Member, Manny Hoffman passed away last night. I'm going to do a Resolution which I hope to present next week. But... when we talk about icons, and he belongs to all of us. Manny Hoffman was great in terms of what he did down here in Springfield, but also the community building that he did in the south suburbs. I knew Manny and his late wife for over 30 years and I just want to pass that information on. I will be doing a Death Resolution and hopefully I'll present it next week. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative Riley. Speaker Madigan is in the Chair."
- Speaker Madigan: "Got your name on the board. Ladies and Gentlemen, if everyone could please take their seat and staff please retire to the rear of the chamber. Well, we have a special guest today the representative of the Canadian Government, to the Midwest and to the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago. I'm sure we all agree that Illinois and the United States of America have enjoyed a long-time relationship, a friendship, with Canada at least since 1812, when we lost the war. And... and there's a great degree of trade relations and a great degree of cultural exchanges between the two countries and the friendship is very long-lasting. And so we're very pleased to have with us the Consul from the Canadian Government Gitane De Silva."
- Consul De Silva: "Thank you. Well, thank you, Speaker Madigan, for that kind introduction. And though you may have lost

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

the War of 1812, it did give you the Star Spangled Banner, so there is your silver lining. So, honorable Members, distinguished guests, thank you very much for your warm welcome. It is a great privilege to serve as head of this Consul General based in Chicago, but represent to Canada in the great State of Illinois, as well as Wisconsin and Missouri. And it is a tremendous honor to join you here today. I'm very grateful for your recognition of the Canada-Illinois relationship. I'd also like to take this opportunity to commend you on your commitment to public service. I understand you've had quite a challenging week here this week in Springfield and you're dealing with some very heavy issues and I don't envy you, some of the decisions you have to make this week, but whether as an elected official or as a bureaucrat, like myself, we do share a common commitment to improving the lives of our citizens. So, I do sincerely thank you for your service. Canada and the U.S. share a relationship that I would argue is the envy of many nations. We are friends, partners, neighbors and allies, at home and around the world. As President John F. Kennedy said more than 40 years ago, geography has made us neighbors, history has made us friends, economics has made us partners and necessity has made us allies. And truer words cannot be spoken today about our relationship. We do share a very unique partnership, not just a common border and a common history, but the largest trading relationship in the world. We are each others largest export markets. Last year our trade in goods and services was more than \$689 billion. That

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

translates to \$1.2 million every minute of every day of the year. And even during the economic downturn in the recent few years, trade between our two countries continued to increase in both absolute and relative terms. Canada is Illinois's No. 1 trading partner, and in fact, Illinois trades more with Canada than you do with any other state in the union. You also sell more to Canada than to your next five largest export markets combined. Fully, 30 percent of Illinois exports go to Canada. Almost 300 thousand jobs here in Illinois depend on trade with Canada, and 22 thousand people in the State of Illinois employed directly by Canadian-owned businesses operating in the state. Studies show that nationwide trade with Canada supports 8 million jobs in the United States or 1 in 23 jobs across the country depends on trade with Canada. We also have the closest energy relationship in the world. Canada is the leading, most secure, reliable, competitive energy supplier to the United States for all forms of energy including: crude oil, and refined petroleum products, natural gas, electricity, coal and uranium. Canada is your No. 1 foreign supplier of oil. Twenty-seven percent of your oil comes from Canada compared to about 13 percent from Saudi Arabia or Venezuela. We also import a significant amount of energy from the United States in the electricity and natural gas. Our energy infrastructure such as oil and gas pipelines and the electricity grid, played a key role in our North American security. We have a strong and growing energy relationship which we will continue to work together to common... to

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

afford our common objectives of achieving energy security and economic prosperity. The government of Canada believes the construction of the Keystone-Excel Pipeline Project will play a key role in that integrated pipeline network, further contribute to energy security for both the U.S. and Canada, and help meet our demand for the safe, secure and environmentally responsible delivery of oil. We do respect the U.S. permit process for this important project and are confident that it will be approved based on its merits. We also have a long and successful history of a joint stewardship of our shared environment. For more than a century, beginning with the boundary waters treaty back 1909, we've worked together through a network of cooperative arrangements to protect our resources, including our greatest shared resource the Great Lakes. The recently renewed Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement was updated to acknowledge our successes and to spur continued action to continue to protect the ecological integrity of this very important resource. It includes 10 annexes on everything from chemicals of mutual concern to combating invasive species, to working together on joint research. And we do look forward to working with the State of Illinois as we move towards implementation. Canada and the U.S. are allies at home and abroad. Working together to keep threats far from our shores and we most recently, Canadian servicemen and U.S. servicemen and women, have fought and sacrificed together in defense of our shared Afghanistan. And I'd like in to take opportunity to honor the brave military men and women from

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Illinois, both regular forces and National Guard, who have served around the world in the name of freedom and to those who have made the ultimate sacrifice, we owe a debt of eternal gratitude. The Canada-U.S. relationship is based first and foremost on people-to-people ties. I've been in the Midwest for almost a year now and everyone I meet either has a Canadian relative, has honeymooned in Canada, or has a Canadian company in their district. It seems to be closer to two degrees of separation between Canada and the Midwest, and we're very happy about that. And for those of you who haven't yet been to Canada, we look forward to welcoming you very, very soon. We share a common history, culture, commitment to liberty, democracy, free markets and free trade. And I look forward to continuing to work with you, the elected officials of Illinois, as we further grow these already very strong linkages. So, thank you very much for your time today, and for the honor that you've extended to Canada by allowing me to address you. Merci beaucoup."

Speaker Madigan: "We thank the Consul and she'll be available down in the well for greetings and picture taking, so. Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans would request an immediate caucus."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost, Room 114?"

Bost: "One fourteen. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "And when do you think you'll be back?"

Bost: "An hour."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay. Thank you. The Democrats will remain on the floor. So, the House will stand at ease."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. On page 2 of the Calendar, under the weekly order of business, appears House Bill 1154. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1154, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Speaker Madigan."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bost: "If we could have Representative Morrison excused for the rest of the afternoon, please."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Chair recognizes Representative Nekritz to handle the Amendment."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to present floom. House Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1154. We're all aware that this deals with the pension problems that we have in the State of Illinois and we're all very... all too familiar with the rapidly increasing pressure that the payment... pension payments are putting on our budget. There really is no relief in sight to that every escalating pension cost. There's been a number of proposals that have been put out there to address this issue and while they are all different, they're all also very similar. What we haven't done yet is come up with a comprehensive plan that achieves the consensus we need to move forward in this chamber. Each of us has an opportunity, starting today, to participate in building that consensus. Each of us can have a role in crafting a solution. What we can do no longer is

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

wait. I'll just give you one number. When we were trying to solve the pen... looking to come up with a solution last May, the total pension payment from between when we would pass the Bill in 2045, the total we would be obligated for was \$309 billion. By December, seven months later, that number had grown by \$88 billion to \$397 billion. In seven short months the total obligation of the state, between now and 2045, had grown by \$88 billion. Delay is not our friend. And that's \$88 billion that's not available for education funding, for Medicaid, for a group health insurance, all the very same pressures that we are facing today as we try to craft a budget for 2014. This problem is so big it requires all of us to come together to be part of the solution. As I said, all the proposals are... are very similar in some ways because that is only so many... as my colleague on the Republican side of the aisle likes to say, there's only so many levers we can pull in order to... in order to come up with a solution. And so, what we have before us today is a series of Amendments that... that deal with some of those levers and probably the most important lever. This particular one, House Floor Amendment #1, terminates the cost-of-living adjustments for everyone moving forward from the effective date of the Bill. And I get that that's a pretty heavy handed way of approaching it, but recognize that the COLA, that single benefit, is about 25 to 30 percent of the overall normal cost of the pensions and about 20 percent overall of the entire cost of the pensions including the unfunded liability. So, that single benefit is... is a big cost driver in the... in the

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

pension systems and by addressing that single cost driver, whether it's with Floor Amendment 1, Floor Amendment 2 or some other proposal, this is how we... this is the biggest step forward we can take in bringing our pension costs under control. So, again, I get that this is a... this is a... this is a solution that puts those at the lowest end of the... of the wage scale, the most at risk because this eliminates any... any inflation protection at all that they might enjoy. But other states have looked at these kinds of solutions and have enacted solutions very similar to these. And again, the COLA is the biggest cost driver. So, I would ask for your consideration of House Floor Amendment #1."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Zalewski."

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

Zalewski: "Representative, your role as chairman of the Pensions Committee... chairperson of the Pensions Committee and the... well, what many consider to be our point person on pensions. What is your current view of the cost of living as a cost driver for the pension system?"

Nekritz: "I would say, Representative, it's the single largest cost driver among all the pension benefits that we... that we provide."

Zalewski: "And without delving into specific proposals that have been out there, what... what's your view on broadly on what can be done to deal with the cost-of-living adjustments while still be... be viewed as constitutional?"

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Nekritz: "Well, Representative, I think the issue of constitutionality is a... is a larger question than what we would be addressed in this particular Amendment. In part because I think that... that the... what makes... what makes something constitutional is a comprehensive package not an individual proposal. And so, while I... but I think that in, again, in engaging Members of this chamber in coming up with a solution dealing with these one-by-one is a... is a... is a very serious way of trying to stress the... both the component parts of a solution and the depth that we have to go to in order to address the crisis."

Zalewski: "And would it be fair to characterize your position that in any scenario where we rescue the Illinois pension system that COLA still have a role, cost-of-living adjustment still have a role in the pension system in providing annuitants with a benefit that they're entitled to?"

Nekritz: "Ab... absolutely, Representative."

Zalewski: "So, to the Amendment, Mr. Mr. Speaker. Those of us who wish to see a comprehensive solution to this issue... I'm sorry... those of us who wish to see a comprehensive solution to... to this issue and wish to continue to engage, as you mentioned, even those of us who have signed on to specific proposals, I think even us, we believe that this is a bridge too far. And on the first Floor Amendment to House Bill 1154, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti. Mr. Reboletti passes. Mr. Smiddy."

Smiddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Smiddy: "The question that I have is why were only four of the five pension systems put into this particular legislation?"

Nekritz: "Representative, I can tell you that in other states where the issue of pension reform has been addressed, and where they have provisions similar to what we have in our Constitution where the judges not only have protection for pensions but also have protections for their salary... protection from reduction of their salaries, the courts have made a decision on the basis of the reduction in salaries and never addressed the pension question. And... to me the worst thing we can do is go through this very difficult exercise and then not even have the courts address the issue as to the... as to whether this passes constitutional muster and on the issue of the pension clause."

Smiddy: "What is going to be the financial impact of this legislation? What cost is it going to be to the... to the state? What are we going to save?"

Nekritz: "We've not done a full actuarial analysis on... on this particular single proposal mostly because it takes two weeks and it costs about \$30 thousand to do a full actuarial proposal. So, to do each one of these individually would be very... very timely... time intensive and costly proposition. But we do have some very, I think, good guesstimates on what this would be. And we think that the savings to the normal cost, the going forward cost for the state, would be \$550 million a year and that the overall

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

impact to the unfunded liability could be a reduction of as much as 40 billion."

Smiddy: "But that's just a guess right now, correct?"

Nekritz: "That's our best... that's our best estimate based on what we know from other actuarial studies."

Smiddy: "Okay. Will anybody... will we have a grandfather clause in this for current retirees and survivors under this plan?"

Nekritz: "No, we would not, Representative. And that's because the… the, as I said in my opening remarks, the problem has become so big that if we were to take retirees out and leave the impact only to active employees, we would have to make the reductions to active employees so severe that I think it's better that we all share in some sacrifice and… and spread the burden more evenly."

Smiddy: "I would have to say and urge my colleagues to vote 'no' on this legislation because it's hurting people that we have already said and we've... we've already given a commitment to. So, I would urge a vote of 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Ford: "Thank you, Leader, for your hard work on the pensions this year and last year. I just have one question. If this measure is adopted, will it address the underfunded pension problem and guarantee full future payments?"

Nekritz: "This particular provision does not include a funding guarantee. You know there are plenty of proposals that... out

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

there that do, but this Amendment only addresses that the… a change to the COLA."

Ford: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "I ask for your consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Amendment shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, Members, if you wish. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 2 voting 'yes', 66 voting 'no'. And the Amendment fails. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This particular Amendment is identical to something that the State of Rhode Island did. Their pension issue... their pension debt on a per capita basis was as severe as Illinois, and when they did their pension reform legislation and made the changes that they felt were necessary, this is exactly what they did to the COLAs for retirees and active employees. They... they included a trigger that said that the... that the COLA would be eliminated until such time as the pension systems are in good health, which they defined as 80 percent funding."

Speaker Lang: "Seeing no debate, those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question,

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

- there are 5 voting 'yes', 62 voting 'no'. And the Amendment fails. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 1165, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1165, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Speaker Madigan, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated earlier, there's only a handful of levers that we can utilize to address the unfunded liability and the level of payments going forward. We already talked about a couple of things that would impact the cost of living adjustment. This one has to do with the age of retirement and would require that everyone, as of the effective date of the Bill, would have to wait until they were age 67 to retire."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady's moved for the adoption of the Amendment.

 The Chair recognizes Mr. Cross."
- Cross: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm like, I think, a lot of people asking the question of what are we doing here today? Illinois politics at its finest. Another day of games. Another gamey day of waiting. Another day of putting off the inevitable on an issue that is not going away, but that it gets worse every single day we put it off. Every single day we put this off we accumulate, according to the Governor, another \$17 million in pension liability. And

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

today, we're going to go through the charade of acting like we're going to do something about it and it's nothing but a joke. It's nothing but a joke. We have, in this state, and I'm gonna repeat this, 'cause if you don't know it, you ought to, but I guess most of you do know it. We have \$9 billion in unpaid bills. That's not million, billion. And the only way we get those bills paid down is to take on the pension problem. We have the worst credit rating in the country, in the country. We used to be able to make fun of California, make fun of New York, make fun of other states. Now, 49 states point at us and say we are the worst funded pension system in the country, coupled with the worst credit rating in the country, we have become the laughing stock of the entire United States of America. One of the highest unemployment rates in the Midwest. One of the highest dropout rates for high school kids in the country. The City of Chicago is struggling with killings on a regular basis, that we all say what are we going to do about it, and we're struggling and challenged with that problem. And the list goes on and on and on. If you're a company you say, do I want to stay here, do I want to leave, do I want to expand? Our kids are now saying to us, I don't want to go to Chica... I don't want to go to school in Illinois 'cause I don't want to come back here and work. They're leaving. And what do we do? Three years into a debate on pensions, three years, we're on the third year, the year three, to discuss the issue of how we're going to solve the pension problem. And we... we throw these things out here as a game, come on, what is this about? Are we

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

serious? We claim to have the brightest... brightest, most capable Leader and Speaker in the Illinois General Assembly that plays chess while everyone else plays checkers and yet, we have all of these problems. We have all of these problems. They're not going away. And today... today, we go through this charade and I want to... I want to be very cautious and careful in what I say about this 'cause I have the utmost respect for Elaine Nekritz. I'm working with her Bill that I think solves the problem comprehensive way. She's a leader, she stood up, taking on and fighting folks that... that have been natural allies of hers, and she's to be commended for what she's done, and what she's doing and what she wants to do. But today, these Bills don't do it. A couple of these Bills don't get the job done. A couple of these Bills didn't get the support we don't even have any numbers on them. When are we going to stop this? You know, it's like we're... this is the dysfunctional family with the alcoholic, and we think if we just ignore it, it will go away, while he or she wrecks the car, destroys the family finances, causes problems at home, all kinds of angst and we think, well, it will just go away. And... and today we're trying... we're not even... we're not even addressing the problem today, and somewhere, someday, somehow we've got to accept the fact that we have a challenge on our hands and we have to do it comprehensive way. Yesterday, to the credit of 11 of your folks and 20 of ours, we filed a Bill, House Bill 3411, that would fix the problem. Now, you may not like it, you might think there's a better way to do it, but for the

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

first time in this building we had four caucus... caucuses represented at a press announcement to unveil this plan. Four caucuses that said we're tired of the games, we're tired of playing around, we're tired of waiting, we want to solve the problem. Let's get it done. People that signed on that Bill that probably don't like every part of probably struggling with it and know they're going to get some rough e-mails, but are willing to do what it takes... it's what it takes to solve this problem. We're going to start working on, someone's going to start working on, this Body's going to start working on a budget here real soon. A quarter of our budget, Ladies and Gentlemen, will be going toward pensions, eight and a half billion dollars. So, when we ignore this problem and play the games like we are today, your school folks will have less money. So, when someone comes to you and says I don't like the fact that my kids classroom size jumped from 25 to 30 or 32 or 35 you can say I'm sorry, but we didn't fix the pension problem. When the City of Chicago comes down here looking for more money for police officers and we can't help them with that, you can say this isn't happening because we didn't fix the pension problem, we decided to play games on Thursday afternoon. When that DD facility closes in your district, it's going to close because we didn't fix the pension problem, we played games on Thursday afternoon, the last day of February. Been here for two months and we haven't done a thing in a substantive comprehensive way to go toward the pension problem. When one of your social service agencies that takes care of substance abuse closes or

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

somebody has a problem from a health standpoint, you can say to them, I'm sorry, we couldn't give you more money or we had to take away your money 'cause we didn't have the guts and the strength to take on pension reform. Oh, we went through a charade the other day, we played a game, none of it was really real, we all knew it was fake. Someday we've got to guit the games. The politics of the last 10 years aren't working. Nine billion in unpaid bills, worst funded pension system in the country, worst credit rating in the country, high unemployment, dropout rate, people dying in the City of Chicago, the list goes on and on and on and we don't want to confront it. Well, we want to confront it. We're ready to take it on. It would be easy and as... for a Minority Party to say we don't want to deal with this, it's your problem. That's not the approach we've taken. We've filed a Bill with you, we're ready to act on that Bill in a way that's real, in a way of getting a Bill passed. I don't want to sit out here and... and in 5 minutes see an Amendment that incorporates that Bill and says oh, you want to pass that Bill. We need to sit down, the four Leaders with the Governor, quit the BS and get a Bill with 30... 60 votes, 30 in the Senate and 60 here, and send it to the Governor's desk. It's time to end the excuses; oh, it's not constitutional, it doesn't do this, it does this, it doesn't do that, enough, enough. Let's do it. We're ready to get it done. We've committed to that. I would think yesterday's press conference with a number... with a number of Republicans we have on it is indicative of a caucus that wants to participate in finding a solution. But we are sick

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

and tired of this gamesmanship. Do we have to play politics 365 days a year? Is that what it's become? You see what goes on at Washington, D.C., in the Capital; it's a disaster. And we're copying that and emulating that, we're going to do that and look where we are. I'm not interested in that. Neither are the folks that... that I'm working with on my side aisle, our side of the aisle, we want to solve the problem. We're tired of the games, tired of the inaction, tired of the waiting. And I would think all of you would be the same way. You can talk a big game about wanting to do it, but until you demand that we get this done, it will never get done. So, I don't know where we go from here. We are... we are getting to the point of no return. And if you're not careful and you want to keep playing the games, the bond rating gets worse, the solution gets almost impossible to solve, the young teacher or the old retired teacher sits there at night anguishing over whether or not she or he is going to have a pension down the road because we can't get it done. Is that fair to that person? No, it's not fair to that person nor is it fair to the kid that wishes there was more police protection nor is it fair to the person that wishes there was substance abuse treatment, and the list goes on and on and on. So, we're not going to participate in today's game. When you're ready sit down and have a meaningful discussion on a comprehensive approach, one like yesterday, and if there's a better one, I'm open to it, but this doesn't do it, we'll participate. But for today's purposes to those of you on your side of the aisle, you play all the games you want,

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

good luck, try to spin it that this is, you know, this was real. Everybody knows that this is anything but real. It's a tragedy. It is a tragedy, and you really ought to be ashamed of letting this play out like this. It's embarrassing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks. Mr. Franks."

"Thanks, and I'm not sure I'm going to live up to that, Franks: but that was nice of you. I... I appreciate the previous speaker's comment, and Mr. Cross, I agree with much of it. I was wrestling, too, how I would handle today when I saw these proposals and I wasn't sure if I was going to vote 'present' because I didn't think it was serious, and I saw my friends on the other side not voting, I'm like... they're probably right. Folks, it's time to get serious. shouldn't be pawns in the process. Representative Nekritz and Representative Cross, I think, are very close to getting to a solution, and we need to help them. I think the way for that to occur, and I'm going to put this out there and I hope you guys can support me. What I'd like to present is that we ask for a Committee of the Whole, and that we suspend all other business in front of the House of Representatives. We suspend deadlines, and we have hearings here on the House Floor and we do it concurrently with our already set up schedule, so it won't cost the taxpayers anything more, and we meet from 9 to 5 every day on the days that we have scheduled, right here. We bring folks in to talk to us. We have Amendments; we debate them on the floor, but we suspend everything else until we get this done. I think if we agree to do that, and we talk to our

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Leaders and if we have more than 50 percent of us, hopefully we can encourage our Leaders to do that. But there is a lot of pressing issues facing our state. All of us have a lot of Bills and the vast majority of them are very important, but nothing is more important than this because without solving this problem everything else is at peril. And with our credit rating now being the same as Botswana, there's real... there's a real concern that we will not be able to carry on the business of this state. Last night I met with one of the superintendents from my district, and there are 44 kids in the seventh-grade health clar... in the health class. Can you imagine 44 seventh-grade boys in a health class? Man, I don't know how they... how they can do it. It's like you need to have a lion tamer. So, I would ask that instead of being a pawn in the process, that instead that we take back the process. And I know this is unprecedented, but we've never faced this type of problem before. Every day that we delay it's costing our state, by some estimates, \$17 million a day. We can't afford this. Folks, what I would suggest is that we ask our Leadership to commence a Committee of the Whole starting tomorrow, bring in all the stakeholders and let's please get this done and suspend all other business. No more committees, nothing else, only this 'til we get it done. And let's send over a Bill that will pass constitutional muster and protect the fiscal solvency of the State of Illinois. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cross."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Cross: "I never thought I'd say this. Great idea,

Representative Franks, we accept."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am thrilled to have been Nekritz: working with Leader Cross and coming up with a... with what I believe is a very comprehensive solution and a solution that, unlike the Bills that were... the Amendments that we're considering today, does protect those at the low end of the wage scale and does preserve the... and does allow folks that who are closer... who are closer to retirement to continue on the course that they're on and not have to make significant changes and require those changes of folks who are further away from retirement. And it does contain a strong funding quarantee and it does add additional revenue into the pension systems. I am really thrilled to be working with Leader Cross and who has stood with 31 of ... with 30 other colleagues yesterday to do that. That being said, we don't have 60 votes on this yet, and we have to engage in a process that will get us there, and maybe this isn't the exactly... you know, exactly what we would all want, but we needed to shake things up. We needed to something a little different than we've been doing because, as Leader Cross said, we've been working for three years to get to a point where we have a Bill that can get 60 votes here. So, if, you know, we all need to find something we're for and if this is a process that can get us to something that we're for, then... then let's go ahead with it. If it's some other process, I'm open to that too, but we have to get to

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

- something that we're for and each of you has to engage in that process of... of being to getting to 'yes'. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there is 1 voting 'yes', 66 voting 'no'. And the Amendment fails. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold this Bill in the Order of Second Reading. The next Bill is House Bill 1166. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1166, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Speaker Madigan, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment deals with the… an increase in employee contributions. This would ask employees to put a… an additional 5 percent of salary in on top of what they and we are already putting into the pension system. It does… it does allow for significant savings to the state coffers and it is something that other stakeholders… it's a… it's a concept that other stakeholders in this process have put on the table although this is larger than what they've… than what they've requested."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

- Speaker Lang: "Lady moved for the adoption of the Amendment. There being no debate, those in favor of the Amendment shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 3 voting 'yes', 61 voting 'no'. And the Amendment fails. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Verschoore, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Verschoore: "Personal privilege. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

- Verschoore: "I'd like to welcome a group, there's a group of college students from Blackhawk College down here today, they're in the gallery. I'd like to give them a warm Springfield welcome, wherever they're at."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Mitchell, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of order. Under House Rule 18(g), I move to discharge from the... from the discharge of House Bill 28 from the House Rules Committee. Under House Rule 54(a)(2) all Motions are assigned Standard Debates status, and I wish to debate my Motion. Upon the conclusion of the debate I ask for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge. Under Rule 49 Article IV Section 8(c) of the Illinois Constitution, any vote shall by be by recorded vote whenever 5 Representatives shall so request. There are at least 5

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Members on my side that wish for a recorded Motion to Discharge House Bill 28 from the House Rules Committee."

Speaker Lang: "Majority Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you very much, Speaker, Members of the House. I object to the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell, the House Rules require unanimous vote to discharge the Rules Committee; therefore, your Motion is denied. Mr. Reboletti."

Mitchell, B.: "I rise on a point of order."

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

Mitchell, B.: "I requested a Roll Call on my Motion, pursuant to the rights granted in the Illinois Rules and the Illinois Constitution."

Speaker Lang: "Sir, the Rul..."

"This breach of Rules should be corrected Mitchell, B.: immediately with a Roll Call vote on my Motion Discharge. This state... House Bill... what is House Bill 28? House Bill 28 just sells the state air fleet, okay. We're spending... we just talked about the problems of pensions. We just... just the other day in my local hometown paper, the Decatur Herald & Review, state unpaid bills may hit \$22 billion. Twenty two billion dollars, yet we have the largest air fleet in the nation worth 22 million, we spend 7 million every year. The town I'm from... the town I'm from, Decatur, Illinois, we have the highest unemployment rate in the State of Illinois, 11.8. People, if they have a job, don't know if they'll have one tomorrow. And yet, when they see that the muckity mucks in Springfield have a special air fleet, they don't understand, and they shouldn't

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

understand. Let's have the… let's have the debate on House Bill 28. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Sir, the House Rules require unanimous vote to discharge Rules. The Chair rules that no Roll Call is appropriate because the request is moot. Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Please state your point."

Zalewski: "We... we just heard, a few minutes ago, a poignant, a few minutes for remarks from Leader Cross, and I have deepest amount of respects for Leader Cross. We were... we talked about playing games and how everybody needed to be serious about what we were trying to accomplish and not five minutes later we have a Bill, a Motion to Discharge on a Bill that would do little, little to solve the state's fiscal crisis. We had Amendments on the board that some of you couldn't even bring yourselves to vote for and now we're dealing with this silly, silly Bill. It's fine. We... we all agree we need to get serious about this, and we all need to tackle the serious problems we face, but to do that Bill five minutes after what we just heard, is ridiculous. So we're all willing to get serious on this side of the aisle, and have a serious discussion about what we're facing, but don't pill... put those Bills on the board after what we just went through. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "I have a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

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

Reboletti: "Well, I... after the previous speaker, I'm not really sure what's important. I have a great and profound amount

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

of respect for him. I guess my first concern is that, I don't think the people, the Leadership, need to fly around in this state plane, or anyone for that matter. I know Leader Cross drives down, he's been doing it for years. I know that's not important and it just saves a few million, no big deal, don't sell the airplanes. Let's get to the heart of the matter. I've watched the schemes and scams and shams in the last few days about guns and pensions, and now we're going to talk about somehow we've demeaned this process, seriously? Are we going to have a Committee of the Whole? I called for one on May 31. I called for the unions to put their pension plan together, it only took them about seven or eight months. And now we're going to talk about if a Representative wants to try to discharge something? You know what's a sham, Representative? The House Rules are a sham, and you voted for them. They're not my Rules. I didn't vote for them. I know in 1995 Speaker Daniels put the Rules together, and it's all his fault, seriously? You know what, the state was a hell of a lot better off when there was a Republican Governor, a Republican Senate President and а Republican Speaker. What was Representative Farnham? That's when it was. But I can tell you until 2002, when you guys took power, under your fearless Leader Rob Blagojevich, look where the state went. You want to call me out. You want to call my Party out. Let's call your Party out. When people aren't serious, forget about all their Bills. We should lay all of our Bills on the table, let's have this Committee of the Whole, let's start now. Let's call the unions up here to testify.

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Let's call retirees up here to testify. Let's call all employees up here to testify. We've done it with electrical rates, set up here for 13, 14 hours straight. You want to Let's do it now. get serious? No more Resolutions celebrating anything. No more recognizing people in the chamber. Let's get down to business. But each one of us has the opportunity to file those Motions, I do. It's not because of some stupid idea. It's not a stupid idea the Representative has. Maybe we should start a Committee of the Whole on the budget right after the pension crisis. And we can do line item, by line item. Four years ago we played that game too. We filed an Appropriation Bill for each line item, another game that was played. When is enough, enough?"

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bill Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you. Maybe this is a point to the Gentleman from Chicago. Maybe in Chicago, Illinois, \$7 million is not a lot of money, but in central Illinois it is. Let's just have a little talk about House Bill 28. I filed this Bill for years and years and years, and your Leadership never releases it. Last year, I was on that Public Safety Appropriations Committee, and I even talked to Secretary of Transportation, I said, you don't want to sell the fleet, when we're in this financial crisis, ground it. And they snickered at me. They snickered at me. I've heard the old expression imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. Representatives, your side of the file... your side of the aisle copied my legislation and one of the Members from central Illinois filed the, what you call, a silly

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Bill. The Bill saves \$7 million. That's a lot of money in our book. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Reboletti, as prosecutor to prosecutor, I'm absolutely appalled, appalled, at what you just said up there. We are a nation of laws and we respect the laws. Not everybody always likes the laws, but you stood in front of juries for eight years, based on what I've heard in the Judicial Committee, and you asked them to uphold the laws. There may have been criminal defendants up there who said I don't like the laws, I don't want to abide by the laws, I'm going to shoot people down, I'm going to gun people down, I'm going to rape people, and you upheld the law. These are the Rules of this House, you should respect them, you should abide by them, just like you asked other people to do. Now the problem is, Mr. Reboletti, you're setting a very, very dangerous precedence by telling people and condoning, not abiding by the laws of this House. All right? You like to wave around that you're a prosecutor, you should start acting like one."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a Representative from the westside, I just think about all of the budget problems that this state face, and I think about how we got there, and I think about every community that has benefited from all of the budgets that have passed. And I want to say that the roads and bridges on that side of the aisle are much better than the roads and bridges and schools in my district and on the west and south side of Chicago. So,

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

this problem is due to not just Democrats, but Republicans as well and my community suffers from your benefits as well. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Again, Mr. Speaker, I... I... to the Gentleman's remarks earlier. I never called the Bill stupid. I... I never did that. And I was in that Appropriations Committee last year, when Ann Schneider testified about the fleet. And there may be some things we can talk about. My general point to... to what was discussed was Leader Cross made substantive, responsible, good remarks about what we're up against, and he said we needed to get serious. And as a result of that, you folks weren't able to put your finger on a button. So, to do it five minutes later, to get up on a Bill that saves \$7 million, and Representative, you can... you know, you can make judgments about what I consider to be valuable, that's your prerogative, but don't put words in my mouth. That's not what I said. My point was, we got a lecture about being serious, and then we put that Bill on the board as a Motion to Discharge. So, I want to be... the record to be clear. I never called the Gentleman's Bill stupid, and I never said it was silly. My point was, we need to say what we mean, and mean what we say going forward down here. We're happy to have that discussion, but we need to do it responsibly, we need to not put words in each others' mouths. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to one of the previous speakers, after I watched his cross exa... hostile cross

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

examination of a witness in Chicago, shame on you. So let's not... let's not throw these little back and forths together. What I do know, Representative, is that there's an appeals process in this nation, and in this state, and guess what, there's an appeals process here. That's what I abore. And that's what I complain about. So, that's what the issue is here. And I can't believe you voted for the Rules without an appeals process."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Mr. Speaker, under House Rule 57(a), I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair that there be no recorded vote to discharge House Bill 28 from the House Rules Committee."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell, your Motion is out of order because there's been intervening business, and so there's nothing to appeal. Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Most of you know in this room that I am not a prosecutor. So, I don't have any beef with Mr. Drury or Mr. Reboletti, but I want to remind you of some history that maybe we've forgotten. Back in 1934 the Germans and the German Government... Oh, you don't want to listen, that's fine. The German Government was in the process of being taken over by Adolf Hitler, and there was a man there by the name of Martin Neimoller who happened to be a very influential person in the Lutheran Church. And the Lutheran Church was very powerful in Germany at that time, in fact, maybe as powerful as the Weimar Republic. But do you know what happened? They failed to do their job. The Lutheran Church failed to do their job. Well, you know,

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

so what, they're just a church. Well, Martin Neimoller recounts his life going through the takeover of Germany by Adolf Hitler. And he said first they came for socialists and I said, absolutely nothing, nothing. And he said then some time passed and the socialists were gone, and then he said they came for the unionists. And he said, I didn't say anything, the Lutheran Church didn't say anything, and they were gone. So, now, the socialists are gone, the unionists are gone, and Neimoller said nothing. Well, finally, there was nobody left beside the communists, and at that point in time, of course, the Nazis seized the communists. And Neimoller and those in the Lutheran Church, well, they said nothing. The only problem was that after a while Neimoller got the distinct problem that there was nobody left, and he was right because when they came to get him, who represented the Lutheran Church, there wasn't anybody to speak for him. Now, I don't generally get too confrontational and I didn't get up today to tell you a good old funny story, but I'm going to tell you this, as a person who manages things, and who understands some commonsense proposals, I think Elaine Nekritz and Tom Cross have made some pretty commonsense proposals. And I would say that if we don't listen, and we don't act, whether it's today or early tomorrow morning on what's been proposed, we'll have somebody come for us. And it's going to be a bankruptcy court. You think we can't go bankrupt? Think again. Maybe there's no process in place, maybe there's no formal proceeding that you think is applicable, but the possibility of failing exists. Now, we are, and I have said

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

this before, I think we have the smartest State Legislatures that I know in the Midwest, and I told some of you folks that I know Legislators in Iowa, and Wisconsin, and Indiana. The thing that separates us from them is that we either don't care for each other, or we don't know how to work well together. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we listen to the suggestions Representative Cross has made along with Representative Nekritz. I would suggest that the acrimony today is of little use; we may feel better. I would suggest it's of little use, and I would... I would think that we move down the road now with some substance. A bipartisan effort is suggested by Nekritz and Cross, let's get off blame game and let's go to work. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Cross."

Cross: "Thank you. Representative Kay, you did a very nice job. And I th... you... you took the words right out of my mouth. I... look, people are frustrated and they're angry and finding... struggling to find a way to solve this problem, and while you may think one suggestion is a game, someone on our side thinks it's real. And that's the beauty of this process, and it's also the perception in what we say to the public about trying to solve our problems. So, but at the end of the day, let's go back to what we were focusing on an hour ago, and that is a very, very huge problem, that isn't going away, that needs to be solved. Representative Franks, as I said, I thought your idea was a good one; we think it's a good one and we want to work with you. And Mr. Speaker, I see you're still on the floor, I would love to sit down with you this afternoon, and maybe we can talk

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

about some of these ideas, if your schedule permits. I think as Dwight said, it's time to kind of push everything aside, put the acrimony aside, and let's try to get this done. And I think it benefits everybody in this chamber, everybody in this state, if we can find the solution to a problem that has... has just consumed us emotionally and physically, perhaps for some and certainly financially. And again, I reiterate, Representative Nekritz, kudos to you, kudos to Daniel Biss, kudos to Darlene Senger, you're champions on an issue that in reality you were doing what you can to save a system that is imploding, and we need to take your energy and your ideas in your starting of this solution and conclude it. And we want to do that in a respectful, bipartisan way. So, we are more than willing to sit down this afternoon and try to find a... a mechanism to get that done. And I appreciate the opportunity to speak one more time, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Members, moving to page 5 on the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Third Reading, appears House Bill 61, Mr. Ford. Out of the record. House Bill 99, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 99, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 99 is an initiative of the Illinois Department of Professional... Financial Responsi... Financial and Professional Regulation. It extends the Homeowner Protection Act for three years. It's an agreed

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Bill with the financial institutions. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Davidsmeyer, Mitchell, Sims. Mr. Mitchell. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 105, Representative Chapa LaVia. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 105, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Hi, Speaker. How you doing today? You look great.

I'm putting up the computer right now, sorry. So, what it
does is it amends the Election Code. It asks universities
and colleges to e-mail enrolled students information about
how to vote... register to vote. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative, should we take this out of the record and return to it?"

Chapa LaVia: "I described it."

Speaker Lang: "Oh, we thought you were reading something."

Chapa LaVia: "No..."

Speaker Lang: "Your..."

Chapa LaVia: "I just described the Bill. Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Sullivan."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

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

Sullivan: "Representative, you and I talked briefly about it, and I know you weren't in committee to ask... for me to ask the questions and it was done in Exec. My question still remain, in your Bill, in line 10, it talks about putting forth an electronic message shall include a link to the websites for the local election authority and the State Board of Elections. So, my first question is, if I live in Lake County and I go to school at the University of Illinois, like I did, and this was to take place, your Bill would mandate that an e-mail is sent to me with a direct link to the election authority where, in my home county or in the home county of where I go to school?"

Chapa LaVia: "That would be the choice of the student, on where they'd like to register to vote. If they want to be on campus, 'cause the majority of our students support this."

Sullivan: "Representative, I just want to cut you off real quick, that wasn't the question. Your Bill would put the link to my home county or the local authority as it reads in the Bill. Is that... am I wrong in my interpretation."

Chapa LaVia: "No, you're correct on that."

Sullivan: "Okay. So, what you're asking is for a university to give an electronic message to encourage people to vote, or to register to vote, which is a noble thought. My fear, and I guess I'll... to the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. What we're asking is to get an official declaration to go vote from your university. The problem being, it gives you the link... all right, not to go vote, to go register to vote... it gives

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

you the link to go register to vote to where you go to school. It does not give you the link to go to vote... or to go register to vote... I keep getting confused... back home. This is going to cause confusion and potentially an inadvertent... inadvertent, potentially fraud. Because what if you're already registered to vote back home and now you're asked in an official document to go register to vote where you go to school, and you link on that, and you register, and you go vote, and you go vote at home. You potentially just committed fraud. It might be inadvertent, it might not be inadvertent but the problem with this Bill, Representative, is that. I don't know how you overcome that. If you would amend it to say instead of the local authority where you are going to school, you put a local authority to where you reside, I don't have a problem with it. But I think, and I don't think you're doing it on purpose, believe me. I think there is a potential for inadvertent fraud here. I don't know that you want your students to be confused by what they're reading from their university. And for that reason, until that is amended, I urge everybody to really look at this. It seems like an innocuous Bill, but has the potential for some serious problems. And I'll be voting 'no' and I urge everybody else to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, is this... whose initiative is this... is this your initiative or did somebody else..."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

- Chapa LaVia: "It was an initiative through the college, young college kids. It wasn't... it wasn't one of my genesis."
- Reboletti: "And why wouldn't we have the county clerks try to contact as many of their voters with respect to the process? Why would we use the university system to do that?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Because they have already communicated with these college students. They're already enrolled and they're already communicating through websites, different materials, whether it's federal aid, whether it's student grades, what have you. It's already a form of communication; that's what we thought would be best."
- Reboletti: "I appreciate what you're trying to accomplish here.

 I just think that it should be the county clerks office..."
- Chapa LaVia: "And... and you know, I'm sorry, 'cause Reboletti, this is really important to you, I know this. This already Federal Law. What we're doing is codifying what we have at the federal level to enforce the universities to do this. And I don't know if it was discussed with Representative Sullivan earlier in the... in the committee 'cause I didn't have a chance to go to the committee. And I... I was... I think it was Senator... I mean, Representative Burke was so gracious... Chairman Burke was so gracious to run it 'cause I was going to explain that. So, what we're actually doing is taking federal statute, that's already there and we're codifying it here because the universities here were not doing what they're supposed to be doing at the federal level."

Reboletti: "Do... and..."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

- Chapa LaVia: "So, we're just giving them another, hey, you got to be doing this, you have to inform your college students that can register to vote. They don't have to. It's just an electronic message saying, if you'd like to register to vote you can register to vote here or, if you're registered back home, you can't be registered to both. There'll be a lot of voter information. It's not going to be so flippant that they're going to try to trick the kid up, so he can register in two locations. That's... that's not the idea of the Bill."
- Reboletti: "And... and this is required of all states, all the state universities?"

Chapa LaVia: "Cor..."

- Reboletti: "And this also cover private colleges or just the state universities?"
- Chapa LaVia: "The way... the way the... it reads it's public and private. And once again, it's a federal piece of legislation or statute that we're just trying to codify at the state level."
- Reboletti: "And how long has that been a federal statute or federal mandate on the private and public colleges and universities?"
- Chapa LaVia: "I'm not sure. I'd have to get back to you on that information."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia to close."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, everybody. The... you know, we're trying to always engage our young people to be civically minded. I don't know about you all, but I know in our last election

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

and in the township we had 3.7 percent turnout. So, as many people as we can get engaged in the process, it's better for the whole entire state, which is better for the whole entire United States. So, I'd... I'd urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mell. Please take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 141, Representative Flowers. Out of the record. House Bill 167, Representative Mayfield. Out of the record. House Bill 181, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 181, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Turner in the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Good to see you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you."

Zalewski: "You, too, Representative Lang. House Bill 181 is an initiative of Illinois State Police. When a defendant is sentenced under the Child Pornography Law, there's a fine levied. The State Police finds itself in a posture of having to do most of the forensics work without being really compensated for it when a local authority has one of these cases. So, there's forensics work and computers work, they would like to siphon off some of that money for the

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

work. They'd be compensated for the work they do. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ford."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he does."

Ford: "I just want to ask you why do you have the opposition to this Bill at this time, or has it been removed?"

Zalewski: "The only opposition, Representative, I was aware of is... I'm looking at my analysis, one moment. I don't have any... I don't have any opponents. Does your analysis say something different?"

Ford: "It says the Illinois Federation of Teachers, the Illinois Education Association, Leaders Education, lots of opposition."

Zalewski: "I... I... 181, Representative?"

Ford: "One... that's what came up."

Zalewski: "I don't... I don't know why the teachers... I don't..."

Ford: "There's... hold on..."

Zalewski: "...think the teachers are opposed."

Ford: "...let me see, I'm sorry. No opposition. My computer jumped to a different deal."

Zalewski: "Okay."

Ford: "All right."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no fur... Mr. Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is,
"Shall House Bill 181 pass?' And the voting is open. Have
all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative
Reis. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question,

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

100 are voting... 117 voting 'yes', 1 voting... not voting, 0 voting 'no', 0 'present', this Bill is declared passed. Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 183. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 183, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Bill with no opposition. It would state that ATM machines are no longer required to disclose their surcharges on a sign on the outside of the machine, as long as they're disclosed electronically. We're doing this to mirror Federal Law. I would ask your support."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Thank you. Representative, I'm just trying to get some clarification on this legislation. So, you're saying that automatic teller... ATMs are no longer required to disclose surcharges on the visible sign or sticker on the ATM? So, you're saying for it not to be required to put it there, or just the opposite?"

Lang: "Today, the law requires there be a sign, but all of these machines already have electronic screens that give the same information. And so it's a superfluous law. The Federal Law has changed, so this Bill will mirror the new Federal Law. And the Federal Law changed for two reasons: first, because it's already on the machine in the electronic display, and second, because people were

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

actually creating lawsuits by stealing the signs and then suing the company that didn't have the sign for not having the sign. So, we're doing... mirroring Federal Law and trying to keep people from filing ridiculous lawsuits."

Dunkin: "Thanks for the clarification."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brauer."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This Bill be... came before the Financial Institution Committee. And at first I had some real concerns, but after hearing the eloquence that Mr. Lang brought forth to the committee, and the fact that it would actually create a lot... clear up a lot of the confusion that's created by some of the misplaced signs, I decided it was a good Bill. And urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Parliamentary inquiry, Sir. You look very distinguished up there. You're a newly minted lawyer in the State of Illinois. The question I have, does this Bill preempt Home Rule?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative, the answer is no."

Durkin: "Could you pri... please provide a basis for your denial?"

Speaker Turner: "The Bill does not include spec... specific language preempting Home Rule."

Durkin: "Well, I haven't tallied the counties, nor the municipalities, to see whether or not they have requirements which will allow for the posting. So... so, within what degree of certainty do you believe that your prior statement is correct?"

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Speaker Turner: "Pretty certain it's correct."

Durkin: "Want to give me a percentage, please?"

Speaker Turner: "No, Sir."

Durkin: "All right. Well, that's the way the business is going to be conducted from here through the balance of the Session, Sir, I would assume that you... I'll just highly recommend that you be prepared."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative Durkin.

Representative Lang to close."

Lang: "I appreciated the questions of Mr. Dunkin and the comments of Mr. Brauer, and the questioning of Mr. Durkin of the Chair. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 183 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Kirk, please... Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 102 'ayes', 13 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mayfield, House Bill 167. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 167, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I present House Bill 167, which is for the creation of a license plate for the Prince Hall Masons, here in the State of Illinois. The Secretary of State's Office has requested a minimum of 850 individuals who would be willing to sign up for the plates, in order to establish the plate. The break-even point for

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

the plate would be approximately \$36,100. We have over 4 thousand Prince Hall Masons who have already signed up and said they want these plates, so we will more than break even when we actually make money. And I would just like to point out that our Secretary of State, Jesse White, is a Prince Hall Mason. There is no opposition to this Bill. And I would urge a 'yes' vote."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 167 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mayfield, do you want to vote for your Bill? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 106 'yeas', 11 'nays', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 188?"
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 188, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Gabel. Out of the record.

 Representative Jackson on House Bill 192. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 192, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Jackson."
- Jackson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, House
 Bill 192 amends the debt limit... limitation of Smithton
 Community Consolidated School District 130. Smithton
 Community Consolidated School District 130 may issue bonds

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

with an aggregate principal amount not to exceed 15 million and that the bonds must mature within 25 years. The conditions for the bonds are: the voters of the district must approve a proposition for the bond issuance at an election held on or after April the 9, 2013; the School Board must determine, by resolution, that the building and equipping of a new middle school building and the alteration and repair and equipping of an existing elementary school are required as the result of a limited capacity, age and condition of the existing school building. I ask for an 'aye' vote. And would entertain any questions that anyone would have."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, is Smithton in your district? You had kind of given everybody an idea where this is at."

Jackson: "Yes, it is. It's in the... it's in my district. It's in the southern part of Illinois."

Reis: "Okay."

Jackson: "Okav."

Reis: "Now, you said this is only for renovations to buildings.

This is not for..."

Jackson: "No, it's for the re... it's..."

Reis: "...operational money."

Jackson: "It's going to build a middle school and repair and add to an elementary school."

Reis: "Okay. Now, is there been any local referendums where the… the folks have had a say in this?"

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Jackson: "There... for this to occur there must be a referendum."

Reis: "So, this will... the referendum will take place after this vote?"

Jackson: "Yes, it will."

Reis: "And why is this vote necessary?"

Jackson: "This vote is necessary so that if they pass a referendum, we would be prepared to issue the school, and have them issue the bonds to the building of the middle school, and the repair of the elementary school."

Reis: "Is there any state collateral being attached to this where we would take over their payments if..."

Jackson: "No, there isn't."

Reis: "...they couldn't make the payments?"

Jackson: "No."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative, what type of referendum are... is required under this Bill, a front-door or back-door referendum?"

Jackson: "Now, you just hit me with a question. Frontal referendum or back door referendum."

Durkin: "Right."

Jackson: "Could you explain the difference?"

Durkin: "Well, that's why I'm asking you."

Jackson: "Yeah."

Durkin: "Front-door referendum is that the question is posed on the ballot. The back-door referendum is that the referendum

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

passes unless there's a petition drive after the ordinance has been passed by the school board."

Jackson: "It's a frontal referendum."

Durkin: "Okay. The next question I have is periodically we do have these types of Bills which come across us, why do we need to have an act of the Legislature to be approved in order for the school to be able to issue the debt?"

Jackson: "Because their debt limitation is at 6 million, and they wanted to exceed that to 15 million."

Durkin: "Right. Yeah. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, and... that was my question, but I... I just want to make sure. Your school has at their maximum debt limit capacity correct?"

Jackson: "That is correct."

Sullivan: "So, because you have needs, you're coming to the General Assembly to go over that debt limit and then exclude it from the debt limit in that sense?"

Jackson: "That's correct."

Sullivan: "To do this though, you are going to have a front-door referendum?"

Jackson: "That's correct."

Sullivan: "Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, whether you believe a school district should go beyond their debt or not, we all know that we have local issues where you will have, and has on both sides of the aisle, come to the General Assembly and say I have a local issue that needs to be solved, and

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

we help solve those. The Gentleman has a problem in his school district, and if we were to ask them to go over the debt limit without us or without a referendum, I would be opposed to this, but what we're asking is, let the voters in his district decide the needs of their community and tax themselves for it. That's fine with me. I will support the Gentleman's Motion based on those results. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he does."

Kay: "Thank you. Representative, has there been any referendum
on an occupational sales tax?"

Jackson: "Not to my knowledge."

Kay: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Jackson to close."

Jackson: "I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 192 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have... have all voted who wish? Representative Will Davis, Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a vote of 80 voting 'aye', 37 'nay', 0 voting 'present', this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 194."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 194, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. How you doing today?"

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Speaker Turner: "Wonderful, Representative, thank you."

Chapa LaVia: "It's good to see you up there. You remind me of your father, who I have highest esteem for him, and you are right on that path, honey, and I'm very, very proud of you. So, House Bill 192 is something that I have been ca... looking to do for the last four years. I've been working with ISAC. They sent me to Indiana to go through the training, and they were called 'Promise Zones'. And what we've done is we've created a program, it's going to be a pilot program, there's no cost to the state in this, but why we want it in legislation, as far as statute, opposed to House Resolutions, because there could be possible dollars coming our way for creating these programs throughout the State of Illinois. Aurora, Illinois, Rockford and East St. Louis will be the three piloted program areas. I'll be working with Representative Flowers on something in Chicago too, but what it would look like is that the city itself that it resides in, in every school district, the children could be eligible to have and... a two- year... two-year scholarship to go to any state community college or university in the State of Illinois. We tried to come up with some ideas so we don't go back to the colleges due to the General Assembly scholarships that hurt districts like mine, and a lot of other districts that have high... high poverty, very amazing kids that want to go to college but have no idea how to get there. So, what these piloted programs would do is put together a private foundation within the community; they'd work together, raise dollars themselves. So, from a child going in in

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

freshman year to they... they receive the degree in senior year, for four years if they get a C or better, that they'd be eligible to get a two... two-year scholarships based on academics every year that they're in a college. But also, it's... it's... it's an economic engine for companies to move into these three cities, because we'll have an educated workforce ready to go, ready to work their trades. And the money it brings back into the communities is amazing. You can see the... anybody here who has children, one of the first things you think of when they're born is how am I going to put money aside for my... my kid to go to college. There's a lot of foreclosures in Aurora, and what I think this will do, not only to Aurora, Rockford, and East St. Louis, is bring people back to those amazing cities; they want to live there. If they know the city is going to partner with them to get their college... their kids through at least two years of college, we're looking at hopefully, expanding this to four years of college. But once again, it's a pilot program. I'm honored that our two colleagues here, Representative Jefferson and Representative Jackson, are so willing to be a part of this. In fact, it was a big push by Mayor Morrissey in Rockford to get on top of this, and I really appreciate him. Although, Chuck, you guys are still number 3, I think, and we're still number 2 in Aurora. So, I'd be more than happy to answer any questions. This is pretty expansive pilot program, but I'm here at your please."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis."

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

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, I miss being on the Education Committee this year and certainly something like this comes along intrigues me. I have a question on the review committee. Can you explain a little bit what the re... duties of the review committee are going to be?"

"Well, the review... review committee here in the Chapa LaVia: state or are you talking about ones the locally there and at the city levels? 'Cause there's going to be... there's going to be... there won't be oversight by us but ISAC will be intimately involved in this and in any moneys that we do gain, there will be helping us. Case in point, if the kid qualifies for MAP or FAFSA, that money will be utilized first before these dollars go. But if you're talking about locally, we would form a consortium with the city, with the colleges, with the school districts and private partners to raise dollars for this money. Back here, we'll make sure that the General Assembly is engaged in what's going on in those three pilot programs just in case they want to do one. Peoria has Peoria Promise; they already have something going. And someone asked once, why do we have to put it in statute? The reason why we're putting it in statute is so we're in position to receive any dollars that the Federal Government might want to do to place in programs like promise zones throughout the United States. President Obama was in town a couple of weeks back, and one of the points he hit was about how encouraged he is that promise zones are being created throughout the United States, and it's not coming from state or federal dollars in a sense, it's

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

being worked at at a local level with private partnerships to raise dollars for these scholarships for these students. So, there's two: there's one locally in the city that would be working together in conjunction with all the entities that want to be a part of the Lincoln's Promise, and then one back here with ISAC communicating documenting all data to make sure that we're on the right path. If there... and we're not just... we're not just... we're not going to be denying any student the ability to secure these dollars. We were once thinking about free and reduced lunch, or things like that, poverty level, things like that, but what we don't want is to discourage any child from going to college. So, I hope that answered some of your question because part of the process, Represent Reis, is to develop this, so."

Reis: "Well, I seen it in our analysis and I also found it in the Bill text on page 9, where you form a review committee. And I guess most specifically I noticed that there're, on this review committee, the chairman of the Senate Higher Education Committee, and the chairman of the Senate Education Committee are on, but only one Minority Spokesperson from the Senate is on, and that same thing happens in the House. So, in total there are four Majority are chairpersons on this review board and only two Minority Party."

Chapa LaVia: "Yeah. I..."

Reis: "And then I also noticed that there's no School Board Alliance..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right, right. Well..."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Reis: "...representation."

Chapa LaVia: "...we don't want to make it too big. We want to make it more familiar to the location of the city and what they feel that they're going to create. And I understand your issue there, I didn't really pay a lot of attention to that because it's a pilot program and I'm hoping, if there's issues in the next four years, that we're able to come back and tweak it. But the idea is to try to produce something, some pilot programs, that might be able to fit into your area, or fit into Danville, or wherever in the State of Illinois where they can take what we've been successful or failed at and manipulate that and make it into a better program. I've already spoke..."

Reis: "No, no problem with that at all. I think maybe if you would like to amend it and include the mi... the other two Minority Spokespersons. But I really think that someone from the School Board Alliance should be on and see how this incorporates into, you know, unfunded mandates, I mean, the whole host of issues."

Chapa LaVia: "Well, no... it's not unfunded... it's not unfunded mandates."

Reis: "No, I know... I know, but just someone from the School Board Alliance would be a good representative on this review board. So, I ask... I ask that you consider that."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. I will..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

- Sullivan: "Representative, I'm quickly trying to read through the Bill, and the previous speaker asked a lot of the questions. The last one that I have is, you abolish the authority on January 31, 2018 and repeal the Act on the same day. Can you go into a little bit further why you would want to establish these things for four years and then repeal it suddenly?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Well, it's not suddenly. You know, we need to see if they're going to work and if our state's, you know, if our state's willing to do what they need to do. A lot of people sometimes don't like to give money to education, for whatever strange reason. So, we don't want to put it in to tie the hands of future General Assembly Members, but we want to create something that's... it should be eventually self-reliant where each city can take care of its own. The only reason, once again, that we put in statute now is there could be possibilities there could be funding or funders that are looking at this at a United States wide thing, that they'd like to give dollars into this. I'd like to see this be, every city who wants it, can have it, and it's on their own to create. But we want to... we wanted to put some parameters here so at least it looks official."
- Sullivan: "So, is there a reason why you would have to abolish it though? Because what I see here is the potential of a student getting money to go to for an associate's degree, which is a two-year thing and in 2018 they are allowed to go to school, but in 2019 the funding's not there."
- Chapa LaVia: "Right. Well, that's not our purpose of it. It's more that the local municipality that has it, will then

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

continue on. It could abolish at the state level, but that... it's still going to continue on within the program itself and..."

Sullivan: "Would they then have to adopt regulations so like we have in place here to have people oversee it and so forth?"

Chapa LaVia: "No. The only reason why we have ISAC involved is because they're partnering with us 'cause they want to see kids succeed and go on to postsecondary."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Chapa LaVia: "And they're... they're instructed that that's their job, right, and they have to teach kids how to fill out FAFSA, and they want to collect data from us. But the intent is not to cut off dollars, it's to raise dollars, but..."

Sullivan: "Right."

Chapa LaVia: "...ISAC wants oversight so they can hel... right now, to help us grow that foundation so it could be self-reliant and... and self-autonomous so the city can dictate how that looks 'cause right now we have it as a community college. But I just talked to Aurora University earlier, Dr. Sherry Eagle, and I said there's no reason why you can't get also the associate's at Aurora University..."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Chapa LaVia: "...so it's not just specific community college. So, we're going to be catering it..."

Sullivan: "Sure."

Chapa LaVia: "...hopefully other colleagues can learn from it and they can input it in their districts..."

Sullivan: "Right."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

- Chapa LaVia: "...and maybe they won't need legislation. So, we didn't want to tie it past a certain time, and if in three years we get more people on board and people are liking it, and they want it in legislation, we can extend it and then add more cities in. So..."
- Sullivan: "So, standing here today, looking out four years, do you have an intention, 'cause I see ISAC's part of this, when this is sunsetted, potentially rolling this into ISAC and using governmental sources?"
- Chapa LaVia: "That... that would... no, the intent is to be an economic engine for a community that... that has issues.

 Like, if you look at why our casinos were created, they were created in economic..."

Sullivan: "Sure."

Chapa LaVia: "...economic depressed areas, right? And if we're looking at East St. Louis, Rockford and Aurora, we're still not getting the people that we need to move into our districts and the businesses and what have you."

Sullivan: "Yeah."

Chapa LaVia: "This is like... this is enticing somebody, not only to move their business..."

Sullivan: "Sure."

- Chapa LaVia: "...but their home and their family to our districts, fill up the foreclosures, pay taxes, money gets in the system. The idea here is truly more entrepreneurish than it is governmentalish, you know, is that..."
- Sullivan: "Well, Representative, what I'll… well, I'll explain that a little further. I... I understand your legislation, I

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

don't disagree with you. If you can bring private donations to certain area to help boost up..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Sullivan: "...some depressed areas, that's great. The fear though is that this turns into a governmental program..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Sullivan: "...where we're directing governmental dollars through ISAC..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Sullivan: "...at an individual community..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Sullivan: "...as opposed to statewide."

Chapa LaVia: "No. That's not my intent of this piece of legislation."

Sullivan: "Okay. That's all I wanted to hear."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you."

Sullivan: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Well, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Does anything prevent private companies from investing
 in education right now in this same way, offering
 scholarships?"

Chapa LaVia: "There are issues through CM... CMS, in different dollars that a school district or university entities can take in this state. They have to run through a standard operational procedure. So, it's, you know, like donations... what booster clubs, it's totally different and different

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

elements and how much money is going into the school district. But what... what's your point from that to..."

Ives: "My... my point is, is that Ι believe private organizations, private companies can invest in education, can provide a scholarship to a needy kid, and certainly do that already by offering scholarships to high schoolers moving on to colleges, that happens all the time. And I see no need to then set up a very comprehensive board, a board that's going to go away in four years, a board that possibly, I mean, has the county board people agreed to sit on these boards, and to oversee them?"

Chapa LaVia: "Yeah."

Ives: "I mean, a lot of them will tell you that they're tapped
 out and I just don't see the need for it."

Chapa LaVia: "I understand what you're saying, Ma'am, but we picked specifically locations that have foundations, that already give scholarships into the communities, and they're very large, I mean, nothing stops them from doing that. Maybe you didn't hear the first part of this, the reason why we're setting it up this way is that there is a federal push to do more promise zones throughout the United States, and we want to make sure that we have something in statute, just in case something does come through. ISAC already goes into the schools and helps kids, but they want to do more. And there's been a pro… a proclamation at the Governor's level and the President's level, that by the year 2045 or 2040, 60 percent… we want 60 percent of the population to have a postsecondary degree. So, with ISAC on board on this, that's what we're trying to push, is the idea that in

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

areas where there is no generations going to college, I'm fifth generation American Mexican, the first to go to college in my area, that there is a program translated into those communities at their level that education is obtainable; you can fill out the FAFSA, you can do certain things. So, I understand what you're saying, but this is in areas that are predominately right now, the three pilot programs, are predominately areas that kids aren't first generation, they're going to be coll... first generation college students, but don't even know what that means 'cause there's been nobody in their fu... their past that's gotten a college education. So, I really understand what you're saying, but this is..."

Ives: "Well, the other question I have for you is that, quite frankly, there's a lot of these educational programs at community colleges that don't actually provide technical degrees for our workforce in the future. There's a number of other more technical degrees that they can get in the area of manufacturing, equipment maintenance, things like that, trade schools that we should really be promoting instead of some of these certain degrees that are just not specific at the... at the community college level. And so, you're... you're taking very much a segmented program here, you're applying it to a segmented part of Illinois, you're abolishing it in four years, and the private sector can already do this. So, I will be a 'no' vote on this. Thank you."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you. I'm glad you are, you don't understand it."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Ives: "Yeah."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. I... I appreciate what you're trying to do here. I was a cochair of the Jacksonville Promise in Jacksonville, Illinois. I know Peoria has a promise zone... or promise as well. My concern is what will this Bill do to put these three promise zones on a better footing than the promise zone in my hometown or the promise in Peoria, for example?"

Chapa LaVia: "I... I don't know how to answer that. I know... I know Peoria, we've visited them, and they're real excited that we're creating this and we're going to get some more recognition throughout the state on... on what's going on. The reason why these three areas were selected, not only what I've explained already about, you know, trying to get kids understanding that they have the possibility of college, is that we already have funders lined up in these cities that will do that. And I'm sure with your Promise Zone you have local funders. And I want to say it started out at of your municipality, right?"

Davidsmeyer: "Mmm..."

Chapa LaVia: "Did it start from your mayor?"

Davidsmeyer: "It... it actually started from a group of concerned

citizens, businessmen..."

Chapa LaVia: "Great."

Davidsmeyer: "...as well as the... the three local colleges that we

have."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Chapa LaVia: "Great. Great, great. I don't ... I don't see this ... we're not ... we don't want to detract from your program. I don't want to detract from anybody's program, that's not our intent. Our intent is to produce a pilot program in those areas to help them get started, and part of the reason why we want... you know, in four years if more of you want to be added, great; if more people don't, that's great. It just gives the structure to get it up and running quicker and we can exchange information between the cities to see how's it's running. Peoria was very gracious. They gave us a lot of information, a lot of statistics on how well it was working with ISAC. I think that's... that's a key component, not only to find funders in your area, and I have to acknowledge that's... that's great that you guys are doing that and the citizens got up and did that, but it's not happening all throughout the state. What we'd like to do eventually is the whole entire state be linked to the promise; every child that wants to go to college should be able to. I'm just hoping other people in other cities can learn from our mistakes and our successes and create those things... those programs."

Davidsmeyer: "Is... is it possible for us to take a look at Michigan and what they've done? They've created zones throughout the state, not just in specific pockets and... and use those to our advantage to..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right..."

Davidsmeyer: "...to allow current programs to..."

Chapa LaVia: "Correct. I understand what..."

Davidsmeyer: "...to take part."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Chapa LaVia: "...you're saying, we learned a lot from Michigan's Promise already."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm sure."

Chapa LaVia: "I mean, the initial onslaught was a billionaire that put all the money and didn't have any regulations on grade point average, or what school in the United States they go to and stuff like that. So, we've learned a lot from them. Our state is so large and as you know now being down here as many months as you have, very diverse..."

Davidsmeyer: "Yes."

Chapa LaVia: "...and local control is a very important thing in this state, extremely important. So, I don't want to force them, in a district that doesn't want to partake or doesn't have the resources to do it, that... that don't have forward thinking business people to say, the reason why I have to get involved in education is 'cause those are my future workers. As a business owner, we've had kids come apply for jobs and they don't even know how to fill out an application. I don't know if you have the same issue in your area..."

Davidsmeyer: "Yes."

Chapa LaVia: "...but you realize at a time that as a business owner, I'm going to fail 'cause I'm not going to have any good customers 'cause they can't... they can't even come in and buy the stuff 'cause they don't have a good paying job, right."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Chapa LaVia: "So, the purpose of this was to have structure so we can learn from each other, ISAC be part of... a strong

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

part of this, give us information. If they get more federal dollars 'cause we have more kids qua... trying to fill out the applications and stuff, then we can get more kids with FAFSA and MAP grants, and what have you. But the intention, Representative, was... is not to detract from yours, and maybe you can learn... or we can learn more from you, vice versa."

Davidsmeyer: "So... so, does this limit local control in these... in these Promise Zones?"

Chapa LaVia: "Yes, this is local control."

Davidsmeyer: "I mean, does it limit local control?"

Chapa LaVia: "It limits it to the city limit. So, in our City of Aurora, being the second largest city, we have... I want to say... six school districts. We barely have Kaneland in it, but we have six school districts, and if they want to participate they can. But it will be for every child in Aurora that meets certain criteria, as long as we have funding there, and that takes and you know... it takes usually like three years before you get money in the bank and then we're going to do an endowment and then watch that... those dollars roll in. Now, you were talking about Michigan, 'cause I've gone throughout this, you know, state and learned about other promise zone programs, some have TIFs, some have private vend... private parties, some have more involvement at the state level, et cetera, et cetera, but we felt it best to have local control, local control 'cause they know their kids the most and the best. And the businesses are interested in this. Like I said, we have funders that are ready to support this in a big way, local...

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

locally 'cause your district probably doesn't look like my district. So you know, my university, my community college, they're on board. The school districts, like I said, they're really excited about this and I hope that we can learn more from your project out there too."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. I just...my... my main concern on this is that it puts these three areas at an advantage over my Promise area or say, Peoria's or somebody else's, for any dollars that can come whether it be tax incentives or something like that to contribute to these programs."

Chapa LaVia: "Right. I don't..."

Davidsmeyer: "My concern is that we would not be in a place to accept those... those benefits."

Chapa LaVia: "And my... my commitment to you is that you're aware of what's going on in our promise zones, and maybe we're partnering in the future. Okay? So, I'll make sure... I'll make sure that you... whoever's running your entity knows exactly what... what's going on with our... our three locations."

Davidsmeyer: "But it... So..."

Chapa LaVia: "I mean, that's what I can do. I don't, you know, we're... I don't foresee us taking any state dollars, we don't have any state dollars..."

Davidsmeyer: "And I understand that."

Chapa LaVia: "...to cut, right?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yes."

Chapa LaVia: "And we got rid of our state General Assembly scholarships, right?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Chapa LaVia: "So we have to come up with creative ideas, as business people, to start driving money into education because we get less and less every year and if you ask me that's like child abuse, 'cause what we're doing is we're putting a nail in their coffin. But what I give to you as my word, is that your group will be involved in what's going on, if they want monthly reports on what... how we're doing and where would the money come from, what have you. It's going to be a very open process, in fact, we'll be receiving a white paper, if you will, to the General Assembly, all of our Members will see what's going on."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. So... so, specifically what... what benefits does this allow for these three areas that my Promise would not be..."

Chapa LaVia: "Once again..."

Davidsmeyer: "...allowed?"

Chapa LaVia: "...the only reason I'm putting this in statute...
otherwise we'd be doing exactly what you're doing... is that
there is a push at the state... at the federal level on
promise zones, just an awareness. And when you put in an
awareness to it, I mean, you could do a PR campaign on what
you have already. But what... when you put an awareness
together on that throughout the United States, what you
find is groups like Gates Foundation, you find McCarthy all
the foundations that give dollars to education for
thoughtful, forward people want to partner with you,
right?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Chapa LaVia: "So, the benefit at the federal level is yet to be unseen, and there might not be any benefit for us doing this other than collaborating between the three cities and every promise zone that's created and how we're going to take that throughout the state where cities need it. So, that's yet to be foreseen, what benefits are going to come from the federal level, this is just in case, but you start to get an exposure. You know, I don't know if you guys have, but you start get businesses excited about what you're doing and... and citizens excited, and property values go up, right?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Chapa LaVia: "People paying taxes, so more money goes into the school. So, I don't know if they'll be any benefits in the future from the federal level, but we want to make sure if there are that they're there. But like I said, we, as a General Assembly are going to be informed every year, I think it's in the stat that... in the statute every year we receive a report. But specific promise zones and you have my word on this, 'cause I can't put it into legislation, that we will make sure that we inform every promise zone in the state that's in existence what's going on and what our steps have been and maybe you can add to what we have or we can give you information. You know, I want it to be a winwin for the whole entire state. I just started with three... these three cities because 1) Rockford's Mayor, Rockford Morrissey, came to me with his superintendent and said, we see that you've been working on a promise zone piece of legislation, two years ago or a year ago. We'd like to do

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

something with you, but we don't want to do what you were going to do. 'Cause I was going to involve TIF, and it was just... it's a mess, right?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Chapa LaVia: "So, I want to make it so it's local businesses that are contributing to this, local foundations that already give scholarships away, schools, you know the pride in the community being able to give kids scholarships is pretty phenomenal. So, like I said, I commend you in what you guys have been able to do."

Davidsmeyer: "So, with... without doing this, they can still...

these groups can still get together and provide these opportunities. My..."

Chapa LaVia: "Well, it's not as organized 'cause ISAC is involved and they're a state entity. Right? And ISAC is not... I mean, they're just... they want to help us succeed just like, I'm sure, they've been in your promise zone. Have you been working with ISAC, do you know?"

Davidsmeyer: "No. We have not."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. Well, that's one thing that's coming out of this discussion, you need to really work for... with ISAC on it, because what they would do is the kids that come and fill out the applications they would make sure to see, there might be dollars that they already qualify for and freeing up dollars for other kids that don't qualify for FAFSA or MAP or what have you, right? So that's one good thing. But it's just the communications, it's the resources that we could have from this city... this state that would help that process, you know, expand. Who just spoke?

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Representative Reis was saying, you know... you know, you should add in Statewide Alliance, I think that's what he said, I can't remember, but because being chair of Education in the House, in Elementary & Secondary, I have resources and people we can talk to, to say, well, how do you feel about this, how's this translate there. So, there's a structure that helps us, with the institutional knowledge that we have here, to create a really good promise zone or a Lincoln's Promise. And I'd be more than happy to sit down with you, and your people, on your promise zone and give you the information I already have. Right?"

- Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. And... and I'd love to do that. But I go back to Michigan where they set up, my understanding is, they have promise zones throughout the state so everyone has a promise zone available to them. This would set up promise Zones specifically for three cities in Illinois and not allow for everyone the opportunities that that may bring."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you. I want to... I want to... I misspoke on one thing. I said it would be an annual report. It's a report that we're going to be giving the General Assembly in 2017, so I want to make sure I get that on the record. That's the correct answer of which you asked earlier. Could you repeat your last question, I apologize."
- Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. My... my concern I... I said that Michigan, my understanding is, that they're set up in zones where a zone is available to anyone who decided to start up a new program. So, my question is why the State of Illinois couldn't be set up in zones..."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Davidsmeyer: "...rather than just these three cities."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Davidsmeyer: "And I understand the pilot program..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Davidsmeyer: "...for these three cities, but creating a zone for everybody to have the opportunity for possible benefits that this could bring in the future."

Chapa LaVia: "It... it's a... it's an interesting idea. I wouldn't be closed to it in the see... to see how these programs are rolling out. I mean, once again, my sole purpose is that kids can have scholarships to go to college if they need a..."

Davidsmeyer: "And I agree, mine too."

Chapa LaVia: "...if they need assistance, right, for the whole entire state. But here in Illinois we're so large, the 13 million of us, and we come from so many different areas and some people have funding, and some people don't have funders, and some people get scholarships. Some people have community colleges, some don't, some have universities. I mean, I can go on and on from the tip of this state all the way to the tip of Chicago, and side to side. So, eventually, yes, we'd like to produce something like that. And I understand, everyone of them is going be... have to be catered totally differently, okay? I'm just hoping that from the three pilot programs that we're able to TIF this off and spread it throughout the state and we have to start somewhere. So, that's the reason, and I understand you want

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

to do zones, but that... it could come extremely complex and I can't get my arms around that. I can't study that."

Davidsmeyer: "So, is this... is this a cost to the state?"

Chapa LaVia: "No, Sir. There's no cost to the state. It's all private dollars. We already have funders lined up to pay for those certain areas to help us start these programs."

Davidsmeyer: "So, if it doesn't cost anything, I don't understand why we can't cut out the MAP to... to create these zones..."

Chapa LaVia: "Because the funders are only for..."

Davidsmeyer: "...and then use three pilot programs."

Chapa LaVia: "...those areas right now. Because it's a pilot program they want to see proven data and track record that these programs work..."

Davidsmeyer: "Peoria already..."

Chapa LaVia: "...before they can actually pay, you know, make it a larger program throughout the state. I don't know about you, but if I'm going to put money into something, I'm going to make sure we get the data and it's going to do what it needs to do..."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Chapa LaVia: "...and then you can convince me on why I need to do it in more areas. I mean, I'd be more than happy to go anywhere to help people sell that, once we get these pilot programs going and we can show that the investment is worth it to get our kids educated and get their degrees."

Davidsmeyer: "So... so, why was a program like Peoria not included since they do have..."

Chapa LaVia: "Because Peoria is already up and running..."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Chapa LaVia: "...and we went to go see them and they didn't ask...
they didn't say they wanted to be a part of this program.
They're already doing it with their community college. And
they already have a program that's running very well. And
they're getting... I think they do annual fundraisers, they
work closely with their community college, they work with
ISAC. So, it wasn't something that they were really
interested in partnering with us on."

Davidsmeyer: "And... and just one last comment to the Bill. Once again, my comment or my... my concern is that this puts three areas in the state at a... at an advantage over my area or... or some other areas rather than just creating these three as pilot programs and creating zones for everyone to take advantage of. So, I appreciate what you're trying to do. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Thank you. Representative, did I understand that this is
 all private money that will fund the program?"

Chapa LaVia: "Yes, Representative Kay. We're going to be courting... we do have some funders in line once it's... it's put into play and quite a few foundations that are interested in getting together at the same table and helping to give as many scholarships out to as many kids as they can."

Kay: "So... so, why... why wasn't it... why would... why would we need legislation when we just set up..."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Chapa LaVia: "Once again..."

Kay: "...why would... just a second... because wouldn't it be simpler to just set up a not-for-profit, have the contributors place the money in there, with a board of directors that disperse that money and... and take the results of the... the project as opposed to making another State Law?"

Chapa LaVia: "Representative Kay, it's to create a program that we are... it's reflective of other promise programs, promise zone programs throughout the United States. And the President of the United States has said this is one of the things he wants to concentrate on, and he's promoting these throughout the United States. Illinois has a couple of them, but what we want to do is coordinate with these states to gather data, to work with ISAC, 'cause this is one of ISAC's very... one of their top priorities is to educate as many of the citizens of the State of Illinois with a postsecondary degree as they can..."

Kay: "Okay."

Chapa LaVia: "...by 2025, or 2045, I can't remember now..."

Kay: "Let me... let me ask a..."

Chapa LaVia: "...I'm thinking about pension."

Kay: "...let me ask a separate question."

Chapa LaVia: "But it... ISAC component needs to be there in order to gain information from us."

Kay: "Okay. I'm not sure that this can't be handled on a private basis. But let me... supposing this passes, are you... are you representing today that all of the money that would go into this... this project would be for education, strictly education?"

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Chapa LaVia: "Strictly... strictly education. The only dollars that would be foreseen to go anywhere else, Sir, would be if there... and that would by the foundation whoever sets it up in their bylaws, if they had a volunteer, executive director or if they had somebody, they want to do parttime, like they do in Peoria. But it's through that... everything is volunteer at the level of the foundation, putting together..."

Kay: "Okay. Can you..."

Chapa LaVia: "...in building the bylaws."

Kay: "Yeah. Okay. Can you... can you set out today and tell me specifically, without any equivocation, that no money will be spent for so-called safe zones within East St. Louis?"

Chapa LaVia: "Are you now talking about the school district that's having a lot of financial problems?"

Kay: "No. I'm talking about your program."

Chapa LaVia: "No. You said something about East St. Louis, I don't..."

Kay: "Well, you're talking about a zone though in East St.
Louis, correct?"

Chapa LaVia: "Well, Lincoln's Promise will be the entire City of East St. Louis."

Kay: "Let me rephrase my question. Can you tell me that within the three zones that you have no money will be spent for safe zones?"

Chapa LaVia: "I... I don't know what a safe zone is."

Kay: "Well, that's to protect the area where the educational process will be going on, where the money will be spent to educate the kids."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Chapa LaVia: "Representative Kay, I really don't understand your question. This... I..."

Kay: "Well..."

Chapa LaVia: "...I don't understand how the correlation is there."

Kay: "No. I'm simply asking, you said all money will be spent
for..."

Chapa LaVia: "Be spent for scholarships..."

Kay: "...scholarships..."

Chapa LaVia: "... either scholarships for the kids..."

Kay: "Right."

Chapa LaVia: "...or if... if the foundation, whatever they choose, to help, to make, facilitate, those scholarships available to the kids."

Kay: "So, a safe zone though is typically an area where we need to make it safe to protect the people involved, okay?"

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Kay: "You're saying that there will be absolutely no money spent for what I just designated as a safe zone?"

Chapa LaVia: "Sir, I... I don't know how that connects with promise zone scholarship dollars, that's what I'm trying to get from you, a very logical question of trying to answer your question, I can't. Because this is to create Lincoln's Promise, a scholarship program, for kids in those three cities to help them go to college. So, I don't know what you're trying to get at."

Kay: "Thank you, Representative. I... I'm not sure I got all the
answers I was looking for, but I know you did your best and
I appreciate that. Thank you."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Chapa LaVia: "I'll come over and talk to you after this,

Representative Kay, I don't understand."

Kay: "Okay."

Speaker Turner: "Representative D'Amico."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move their previous question."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Representative Chapa LaVia to close."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you for all the interesting debate today. And I understand some concerns, others I don't. I will end up talking to some of the Members on the other side of the aisle, and try to get their concerns and work best with this. My intention is to educate the kids in the State of Illinois, and help get them scholarships so they can go on and be the best we can get them to be. So, I'd really appreciate a lot of support on this to show our kids, we might take away their General Assembly scholarships, but we believe in them. And this is the first step to create these Lincoln's Promises throughout the State of Illinois for every child regardless of where they live. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 194 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. 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 95 'ayes', 22 'nays', 0 voting 'present'. And this

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 956."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 956, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 956 is a trailer Bill to one that we passed last year, which was Senate Bill 3518, 3518, that was one of the major Bills for the Associated Firefighters. I hope all of you are familiar with their annual campaign called 'Fill the Boot', raises money for a great cause for kids. I'm sure many of your communities have that where they have the Fill the Boot Campaign. One of the concerns that was raised last year was by the Illinois Association of County Engineers, and they wanted to make sure that when the fire department applied for a permit, in a community where they had made restrictions, that they would have to submit a list of alternative locations. And that's what this trailer Bill does, that they have to have these additional locations listed, and this has... be in communities that... that have ... where they had to seek an exemption for the prohibition on charitable... charitable solicitation. Again, I think all of you are familiar with Fill the Boot. It's a great cause. It's for the Associated Firefighters of Illinois, and they simply would list alternative choices that they might want to go to, if their first choice was deemed as... as not safe. With this, the... the only objections that were listed last year was the Illinois Association of County Engineers; they are a proponent of this Bill now. I have a statement from

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

them thanking us for the Bill and following up on the agreement that we made last year. Be happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Sullivan: Gentlemen, we have firefighters that decide to take a little time out of their day to go raise money for a lot of the charities that we'd like to support more even through this Body. I cannot think of more... a finer piece of legislation and something that should get 118 votes, than this Bill right now. We all know that Representative Moffitt has done a wonderful job supporting firefighters of this state. Today he brings forth a way to make previous legislation better, to protect communities, to protect our firemen, and to raise money through the great efforts of our local first responders. I hope all of us, all of us in this room, can step up, vote 'yes', and move this Bill over to the Senate. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. I want to reiterate what Representative Sullivan just said, and commend Representative Verschoore and especially Representative Moffitt for putting this together. Firefighters all across this state have raised millions and millions amends for the charities and they ought to be thanked. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 956 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Representative Davis. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 117 'ayes', 0 'nays', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 958."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 958, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McAsey."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 958 is legislation designed to affect repeat domestic battery offenses. Under current law, a first offense is a Class A misdemeanor, second, third, fourth, tenth offense are Class IV Felonies. What this legislation does is to put in a graduated scale so that a first offense remains a Class A misdemeanor, second or third offense is a Class IV Felony, fourth offense is a Class III Felony and a fifth is a Class II Felony. This is intended to go after the cyclical nature of domestic batterers and has been developed in conjunction with the Will County State's Attorneys Office. It's also supported by other state's attorneys. I ask for the support of the Body."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 958 pass?'
All in favor will vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The
voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
wish? Representative Monique Davis, you wish to be
recorded? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this
question, there are 117 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0
voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative DeLuca, for what reason do you rise?"

DeLuca: "Personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "State your point."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you could please give a warm Springfield welcome. They're not all here right now, they're out throughout the Capitol. There's 112 students from Governor's State University, which is in my district. Thank you for being here."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Hi, Speaker, how are you?"

Speaker Turner: "Doing well, Representative, how are you?"

Reboletti: "I've been waiting anxiously for this moment since I heard that you were in Leadership would be on the a... up there on the podium. I have a question, an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "State your question, Representative."

Reboletti: "Because we talked about the House Rules today, usually each of the Members are given a copy of the House Rules. And I wondered when we would receive that copy?"

Speaker Turner: "Actually, waiting on copies to come back from print, you should receive them soon."

Reboletti: "Representative Bost asks if they're hardbound or will they because he has an issue with paperwork. So, will they be paper or hardbound?"

Speaker Turner: "Paper. I saved the state some money."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Sir."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Speaker Turner: "Representative Marcus Evans, for what reason do you rise?"

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to provide the little known African-American History fact for the day, so listen up all you golf enthusiasts. So all the golf enthusiasts and the rest of you, who painfully hacked through 18 holes of golf, did you know that the process of teeing up the ball use to involve pinching moist sand to fashion what we now know as a tee. An African-American gentleman named George Grant, born in Oswego, New York, in 1847, who was also a successful dentist and Harvard graduate, became frustrated with performing this process 18 times in a round, so he came up with an invention that would forever have an impact and that we currently use. On December 12, 1899, he received a U.S. patent number 638,920 creating the world's first patent for a golf tee. Grant was an inventor, not a businessman, and he never marketed his golf innovation. It would have been hard to imagine that any piece of sporting equipment has been used more often than the golf tee, but Dr. Grant had then manufactured them locally and simply gave them out to friends by the handfuls for recreation. His daughters recall playing with tees as children. And Dr. Grant died of liver cancer in 1810. Yet, because his invention reached such small audiences at the time, he was not recognized for its appeal. dentist, Dr. William Lowe of Maplewood, New popularized the tee in 18... in 1921 and he manufactured the 'reddy tee', which was painted red. In 1991, Dr. Grant received his just due. Nearly a century after his patent,

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

the United States Golf Association finally gave his... him the recognition for creating this, a great product. So all you golf guys, make sure you thank Dr. George Grant for creating that tee."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee announcements. The following committees has been canceled this afternoon: the Adoption Reform Committee was canceled and the Business Growth & Incentives Committee was canceled. Tomorrow morning the following committees have been canceled: Protection has been canceled and Financial Institutions have been canceled. Meeting this afternoon at 3:00 is Mass Transit in Room 114, Personnel & Pensions in Room D-1, Museums Arts & Cultural Enhancement in Room 115. At 4:00, the Public Safety Police & Fire Committee is meeting in Room 114, the Restorative Justice Committee is meeting in Room 413."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 85, offered by Speaker Madigan. House Resolution 108, offered by Representative Reboletti. House Resolution 109, offered by Representative McAuliffe. And House Resolution 110, offered by Representative Gabel."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Representative Flowers."

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to announce that Health Care Availability and Access will be canceled for tomorrow morning as well."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative."

Flowers: Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Point of personal privilege. I don't see my buddy Representative Pritchard over there, so I'm going to mention it. Tonight the Education Caucus, Education 101 Seminar is being held. If anybody wants to know where it is, come talk to me, if they don't already have it. It's an extremely important issue that people understand education at the foundation level. When I say foundation, the base level. So, please, if you get an opportunity to, please come by; you will learn a lot. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sente."

Sente: "Thank you, Speaker. I just wanted to confirm that our first meeting of the Business Growth & Incentives Committee will be taking place tomorrow, subject matter only at 10 a.m."

Speaker Turner: "Allowing for perpunct... perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House will adjourn 'til Friday, March 1 at 11 a.m. Thank you."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 2... First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 26, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid is offered by Representative Feigenholtz. This is referred to the Rules Committee. First

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

Reading of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #31.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this resolution a proposition to amend Article V of the Illinois Constitution by changing Sections 1, 3, 7, and 18 and by repealing Section 17 as follows:

ARTICLE V

THE EXECUTIVE

SECTION 1. OFFICERS

The Executive Branch shall include a Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Secretary of State, and Comptroller of the Treasury elected by the electors of the State. They shall keep the public records and maintain a residence at the seat of government during their terms of office.

SECTION 3. ELIGIBILITY

To be eligible to hold the office of Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Secretary of State, or Comptroller of the Treasury, a person must be a United States citizen, at least 25 years old, and a resident of this State for the three years preceding his or her election.

SECTION 7. VACANCIES IN OTHER ELECTIVE OFFICES

If the Attorney General, Secretary of State, or Comptroller of the Treasury fails to qualify or if the office becomes

21st Legislative Day

2/28/2013

vacant, the Governor shall fill the office by appointment. The appointee shall hold office until the elected officer qualifies or until a successor is elected and qualified as may be provided by law and shall not be subject to removal by the Governor. If the Lieutenant Governor fails to qualify or if the office becomes vacant, it shall remain vacant until the end of the term.

SECTION 17. COMPTROLLER - DUTIES (REPEALED)

SECTION 18. COMPTROLLER OF THE TREASURY - DUTIES

The Comptroller of the Treasury, in accordance with law, shall (i) maintain the State's central fiscal accounts, and order payments into and out of the funds held by him or her, (ii) be responsible for the safekeeping and investment of monies and securities deposited with him or her, and for their disbursement upon his or her order, and (iii) have the duties and powers that may be prescribed by law.

SCHEDULE

A Comptroller of the Treasury, but not a Comptroller or Treasurer, shall be elected in 2018 and thereafter. This Constitutional Amendment otherwise takes effect upon the conclusion of the terms of the Comptroller and the Treasurer elected in 2014. This was the First Reading of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #31. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."