

PANEL 1

**WHAT HAVE BEEN THE PROBLEMS IN ILLINOIS
AND HOW SHOULD WE FIX THEM:
WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE? (TRANSCRIPT)**

By: Paul Green – Roosevelt University

Brian Gladstein- Illinois Campaign for Political Reform

Andy Shaw – Better Government Association

Brad McMillan – Center for Principled Leadership

Terry Pastika - Citizen Advocacy Center

September 2012

Paper Originally Presented at the

Ethics and Reform Symposium on Illinois Government

September 27-28, 2012 - Union League Club, Chicago, Illinois

Sponsored by the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute, SIUC, the Joyce Foundation, and

the Union League Club of Chicago

What Have Been the Problems in Illinois and How Should We Fix Them: Where Do We Go From Here?

By: Paul Green, Brian Gladstein, Andy Shaw, Brad McMillian, Terry Pastika

Mr. David Yepsen: Good afternoon. I'm David Yepsen, the director of the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute and welcome to our academic symposium on ethics and reform issues in Illinois government.

This institute is Senator Simon's living legacy. Those of us here today continue his lifelong work trying to improve the honesty of Illinois governments. Many people in this room have spent much of their lives working to battle corruption and unethical behavior and we thank you for their work. We will hear from many of them later.

You all know the statistics. Two governors in prison. Prosecutors saying the state is the most corrupt in the nation. Jokes on late night talk shows. And a few weeks ago, I heard an NPR announcer do a lead-in to a story about the Dixon city clerk by quipping "this is news?"

There is evidence this turmoil hurts the state for economic development. What business wants to locate here if they have to pay to play? Earlier this month, Illinois lost a \$1.5 billion fertilizer plant to Iowa, where the Governor there joined other regional governors implying Illinois was in no position to keep its promises of tax breaks because the state is "dysfunctional." He added "you know how many governors have gone to prison?" He said he tells businesses Illinois "will promise you the moon and the only problem is that then they will pull the rug out from under you". He is just the latest governor in the region to pile on.

In addition, corruption and unethical behavior drives up the cost of government at a time when Illinois' finances are among the worst in the nation.

So what do we do? In the past, many people have just laughed. "That's Illinois. That's the way business is done."

The premise here is we can't laugh about it anymore. At this gathering we'll hope to bring the scholarly community together with reform practitioners to 1) explore why we have so many ethical and corruption problems. 2) Discuss what has been done to try to correct the problems and 3) What are the options for doing something about them in the future?

These presentations and research will be compiled by the Institute in proceedings which we will publish.

Before we begin, I would like to thank our partners, the Joyce Foundation, for its financial support. We couldn't be here today without their help. And, I would like to thank the union League Club, an organization that has worked for generations on ethics and reform issues in Illinois.

Here from the club to welcome us is club president Guy Arvia.

And I want to thank the staff of the Institute: Matt Baughman, John Jackson, Charlie Leonard, Linda Baker, Emily Burke and Carol Greenlee for their hard work.

Some house-keeping announcements: Prof. Alan Rosenthal of Rutgers is listed on your program but he is under the weather and will be unable to join us. We thank Prof. Richard Winters of Dartmouth for agreeing to pinch hit.

And, earlier this month, SIU press published Dr. John Jackson's anthology of some of Paul Simon's best writings, many of which are still relevant today. It's called the Essential Paul Simon and copies of it are available for sale at the check-in counter.

Also, in your packets we've left some evaluation forms. Please take a moment to fill those out in order to help us do a better job next time.

Finally, speaking of next time, mark your calendars: On Tuesday, April 30, at The Inn in Springfield, we will host a one day symposium on legislative redistricting issues. We will be mailing details for that conference later.

To kick off our symposium, we've invited a group of people and organizations who have long been active in reform efforts to give us their thoughts about the problems and to suggest their prescriptions. I'll let the moderator, Paul Green of Roosevelt University introduce them. Paul:

Mr. Paul Green: Okay, now I think we're going to start. I am your friendly host and moderator, Paul Green from Roosevelt University. This is my 17th conference on reforming Illinois government and politics. [*Laughter.*] So I welcome all of you Illinoisans who are here, all you Chicagoans who are here, and I even welcome all you outside agitators who are coming from other places to smirk and to sneer and a few other things.

Before I introduce the panel, who will have an enlightened and terse presentation, let me just say that I would assume, looking around this crowd, with a few possible exceptions, this is pretty much a pro Barack Obama audience. Just remember, the White House, the campaign, what's going on right now is sort of an elevated version of Chicago and Illinois politics, so don't get too snarky in this room. That is the tradition they all came from, including the well-known radical reformer, David Axelrod.

So with that little thing to start the pot turning, if not boiling, let me start off in perfect alphabetical order. Brian Gladstein, the Illinois Campaign for Political Reform. Brian, you've got ten minutes. Don't push me.

Mr. Brian Gladstein: Good afternoon. I asked David what we wanted to kind of talk about today, and I started thinking about where we are today and why do we have the problems that we do, was kind of the first question that David asked. And to answer that, I think that we obviously have these issues with the bad apples, right? We have the individuals that game the system. That goes from the worker who leaves and clocks out at 3:00, but wants to get paid till 5:00. We have Blagojevich, we have the Ryans, we have the big examples. But I think the problem—we'll always have those. There will always be loopholes in the system.

The question for the Illinois Campaign for Political Reform, and I think for folks in this room, is how we create system change to not allow those opportunities to exist. And I think that part of the problem is that politicians see themselves in transaction. They see themselves in a business arrangement. They don't see themselves in the public good. So it's not only what can they get out of the system, but it's an ingrained culture that needs to change, that goes from politicians, goes to the people who elect them into office, it goes to creating civic engagement opportunities and education in our school systems that doesn't exist, to understand that politicians work for us, we don't work for them.

And I think that we can continue to push for reforms, which I'll get to in a second, but I feel like we continually take one step forward and then we take two steps back. And so how do we move beyond just pushing for reform and changing the paradigm and changing the culture that exists in this state? Of course it happens nationally, of course it happens internationally. But we have one of the more notorious corruption cases here continually in Illinois. How do we change that? Looking at Dick Simpson and his report. We'll talk about that as well. So I think we've got to think about culture and how do we change that.

For the 15 years that ICPR has been in existence, there's been a variety of significant successes that the organization has been able to achieve in Springfield, from ethics reform to pay to play reform, to the 2009 campaign finance limits law, which I think I'd actually like to spend a few minutes on as an example of kind of where we're at. So where states across the country were, after Watergate, putting in limits laws and dealing with campaign finance, really understanding that we can't have special interests, we can't have big money affecting public policy, we were late to the game because of the work of a lot of reformers, because of the work of our organization, because of working after corruption cases, right.

When Blagojevich corruption came up, it was pretty obvious that something needed to change, that the \$25,000 donations were affecting the way that the public was seeing government, and we're seeing somebody really taking over power and taking over jobs in a way that wasn't acceptable. And so the campaign finance law was put into place in 2009, and we still, there were things that—and I know that Cindi Canary

and Kent will talk tomorrow more specifically about this, but there were definitely things in there that people in this room fought really hard to make happen, like putting limits on leaders, but that bill would not have passed if that didn't happen. There was a millionaire amendment.

And then what did we just experience this last spring, is while other states were looking at ways to limit the control of super PACs and special interests, our state responded with putting together a bill, SB 3722, which, if \$100,000 goes into a local race, and \$250,000 goes into a state race, limits will come off. And I'm worried that we're going to see unprecedented amounts of money in the 2014 governor's race. We may even see something like that in the next month. We haven't even seen one cycle of limits. And they took any opportunity, which, Citizens United was a big opportunity, and we see that our legislators have responded in a very negative way compared to the way that I would hope they would.

And so we've moved forward, we moved back, and I kind of want to think through how do we change that culture. How do we create programs and projects to kind of show that there needs to—there's enough support out there to create real system change. And it has to go beyond the four leaders in Springfield. They have a lot of power, and that's where decisions are made, behind the closed doors. But we have to figure out, I think, as a reform community, working in alliances with community organizations, and social justice organizations, and unions, and businesses, how do we forge alliances that aren't the normal alliances that will push back on this system so that we can really forge for that kind of empowerment and transparency that is necessary in the state? So I have ideas about that, but I'll just stop there to kind of put that out as a question that we're trying to consider at ICPR.

Mr. Green: Very good. A good start. For those of you who aren't from Illinois, remember Rob Blagojevich, the most maligned individual, who's now resting in Colorado, he won two landslide elections for governor, so keep that just in the back of your mind. All right, Andy Shaw. I know, Andy, ten minutes for you are expandable, but go ahead.

Mr. Andy Shaw: Thanks, Paul. I was thinking, as I watched David, that one of the reasons I wanted to join this group was not just to talk about the reform effort, but to commiserate with David. We share something very much in common, which is that this is the first presidential campaign season in 30 years that neither of us is covering. David is the permanent go-to guy in the Iowa caucuses, a guy I would interview each time I went out there with ABC-7, so nice to see you, David, as we both sort of deal with our withdrawal in different ways.

It's nice to open a two-day program like this with a live panel because it does breathe a little bit of human life into it. But I will say that if you haven't—and you may not have, but you will—read the very long piece put together by Cindi Canary and Kent Redfield, "Lessons Learned: What the Successes and Failures of Recent Reform Efforts Tell us About the Prospects for Political Reform in Illinois," there's probably not a single better document that takes the challenges, the efforts, the failures and

the potential and puts them together into one paper that should basically become the Bible for all of us as we move ahead, because it's the best compendium of how this fight has played out over 40 years, and so it's must reading, and I'm sure it will be discussed at length during their presentation tomorrow.

I am by nature an optimist. Even though I spent 37 years in the news business, did a total of 15,000 TV stories, and covered a vast number of rogues and scoundrels and outright criminals, I still have a cup that's half full, and I believe that sooner or later we can actually reform government.

But as I say wherever I go to speak about the efforts of the Better Government Association, which is one of the many groups working collaboratively and independently in the same basic direction, the reason that the Better Government Association is celebrating its 90th anniversary next year with almost as much work to do as it had when it began during the Capone era is because individual groups alone, individuals, whether it's people up here or the *Tribune* editorial board, or the other groups that are toiling in the vineyard, we are all a group of disparate voices, which collectively have the effect, as I like to describe it metaphorically, it is kind of like a thunderstorm.

When we call for reform, when we reveal the results of our investigations, when we talk about the bad behavior, when we editorialize, when we are screeds or scolds or whatever, we are like thunderstorms. The skies open, the lightning flashes, the thunder rolls, everybody pays attention briefly. You put up your umbrella, you run for cover, but 30 minutes later the sun comes back out, we all go back to our busy lives, and the politicians and the public officials go back to business as usual.

What is business as usual, and why is it so hard to change? Not complicated. Government is essentially the creation of a political system that is designed to serve the interest of the political system. So politicians create a government that's going to enable them to live well and reward their friends and cronies and allies, and to make it increasingly difficult for opponents and challengers to get a foothold, and then that's basically the system they run.

Government is a business. It's not a service, it's not a calling. Government, for most of the people who are the decision-makers. The decision-makers I'm talking about, not rank and file, the people who do their jobs mostly well, nine to five, five days a week. The worker bees are not the problem. Most of them do their jobs well. It's the people who run the system. It's run for their benefit and the benefit of their family members, their friends, their cronies and their contributors. And as a result, services suffer and the cost of government increases exponentially because it's about enriching individuals and guaranteeing perpetuity.

How does it come about? The devil's bargain is so easy to explain. It's most easy to explain if you look at it from the standpoint of a machine city like Chicago or all the big cities of the Northeast and the Midwest. But you can just as easily look at the Republican machine in Downstate Illinois and in DuPage and those areas, which

essentially play by the same rules, which are quite simple, Shakman and Rutan notwithstanding. They have changed things.

But look, it's quite simple. The political machines essentially provided the jobs and the opportunities to the immigrants who came here in waves. They came here needing things for themselves and their families, and the political organizations found them jobs. And then those jobs carried with them over time and promotions, deserving or not, if you worked the precincts well. So the coin of the realm was not effective public service, it was effective political work. Those were the precinct workers.

Where does the money come from? It comes from, predominantly, the businesses that need contracts from government. What do they do in exchange for the contracts? They give campaign cash to the office holder. The contracts are let whether we need that or not. They're frequently padded. And so what basically develops is a gigantic system—this is at all levels of government—which is essentially a self-perpetuating, self-enriching structure. And the last person or the last group in the pecking order of importance is the taxpayer or the resident.

It's what I always used to say when I covered the Board of Education of the city of Chicago. What's the problem there? The problem is that kids are the last component in the equation. Education in big cities and many places is about taking care of unions, and bureaucrats, and contractors, and administrators, and then, oh yeah, wait a minute, there are kids in the equation. Oh, yeah, okay, I guess we gotta try to teach them. Essentially, that's the problem we have, and that's why it's so difficult to take it on.

Ballot access, the timing of primaries, the redistricting process, campaign finance, leadership in the capital and other places, virtually everything is set up to maintain the status quo. In California you can change a lot of laws, for better or worse, through the referendum process, the petition process. In Illinois it's extraordinarily difficult. And a couple years ago we had what I thought was a golden opportunity to revisit all of this when it was suggested that we have another constitutional convention. But that was defeated in the electoral process.

And interestingly enough, two of the people I would have thought would have argued most strenuously for a convention, people like Dawn Netsch and Jim Edgar, led the charge against the convention. They made a good argument. It would have cost forty or 50 million dollars, and the convention could have just as easily been controlled by minions and functionaries of the same political leaders who run things now, and so at the end of the day you'd spend the forty or fifty million and nothing would change.

So let me leave my portion of this with just one thought that I share with every audience that I speak to. By myself, as the head of an organization which has become more formidable in the reform effort in the last few years, by myself, I think of myself as Don Quixote, the errant knight that Cervantes wrote about some

generations ago. Cervantes wrote about Quixote, who was charming and quaint, but ultimately ineffectual, because by himself he tilted at windmills, and that didn't exactly create the power grid for a city or a state.

Patton won the battles because Patton had the army. And so I still believe today as firmly as I always have that no editorial board and a few civic groups working individually, for the most part, no collection of individual efforts done sporadically and intermittently is ever going to change a system as large and powerful and self-entrenched as this political system.

It is going to take an army of citizens doing something, whether it's passing term limits or eventually redistricting reform, which is the new push for the CHANGE Illinois coalition, whether it's people that somehow sign on to some very creative effort that basically says to people running for office, you're going to sign the reform pledge, you're going to support ten different things, most of which are written about by Cindi and Kent, and most of which were in the Pat Collins reform commission report.

David asked us—and this is my final word—David asked us to come up with some thoughts about where to go from here. Well, in addition to reading what Cindi and Kent wrote, which is the great historical perspective on all of this, I would say you should dust off the Collins report. This was the reform commission put together in the wake of the Blagojevich impeachment by Pat Quinn, led by Pat and including David Hoffman and others. Collins and Hoffman both on the BGA board trying to help us do our thing.

But they spent 100 days at an absolute sprint around the state of Illinois talking to everybody, exploring everything that could and should be done to clean up the system. And they put together what I thought was the best group of recommendations any group could do that quickly. They went down to Springfield, presented it to the state legislature and got laughed out of the capital. Laughed out of the capital and told, in effect, "Who are you people? Where do you come off? What are you talking about? The problem is a couple of governors who were crooks and went to jail."

Had I been there that day and could speak freely as a resident of the state of Illinois and not on behalf of a group, I would have said you folks are some of the luckiest SOB's in the world. The U.S. Attorney in the Central District of Illinois has never gone after you guys with the balls that they did up here in Chicago, and as a result, you all are lucky that more of you are not sitting behind bars in orange suits, too. I didn't say it, but I felt it when I watched what they did to Collins and those groups.

It was reprehensible and disgraceful to pretend that the problem of corruption was two governors, when it's basically systemic and it's basically unsustainable. We're here today because business as usual is not affordable. The corruption tax is not affordable or sustainable. It's several billion dollars a year that go as a transfer tax from our pockets to the pockets of the insiders to enrich people who don't need it,

without providing us the services or the other government programs that would either create jobs, keep jobs, attract businesses or improve education and social services.

So I don't have the answer, but it's wonderful to be with a group of people who are at least trying, in the 90th year of the BGA's existence, to do what they tried to do in the very beginning, when Al Capone was calling the shots. So thanks for having me.

Mr. Green: Well. Andy, I've known you a long time, and I have to admit, in front of all these people, you and Don Quixote? I... First time I've made that comparison. You could be right. I just think it's... I just kind of... But thank you.

Mr. Shaw: Here's my—I'm tilting up with my pen nowadays.

Mr. Green: But thank goodness you're still an optimist. That report certainly showed a lot of that. Okay, Brad McMillan, go ahead, you're up.

Mr. Brad McMillan: Thanks, Paul. Brad McMillan, Bradley University. I'm a downstater up here in Chicago, and I'm happy that I work at a private university and that our funds are not reliant upon the state of Illinois, like a number of the institutions here. And I want to thank Andy, because I actually had the honor and the privilege of serving on the Illinois Reform Commission with Pat Collins and Sheila Simon and Dave Hoffman and your Attorney General, or State's Attorney up here. And I'm somewhat reluctant to share this story, but—

Mr. Green: Oh, you're among friends. Go ahead.

Mr. McMillan: If you want to know what's wrong with Illinois politics, the first week after I was appointed to the Illinois Reform Commission, I was called by an aid of one of our most powerful legislative leaders to go to coffee.

Male: You want to say which one?

Mr. McMillan: And after sharing a few niceties, this individual began to berate the political experience of those serving on the Reform Commission, and then said to me that his boss knew that he and I were meeting and that they were hoping, because I did have some real political experience, that I would advocate for minimal ethics reform in Illinois so that we could avoid a direct conflict. That was the first week of my new assignment as a reform commission member. And I politely said that I thought we needed to have sweeping reform in the state of Illinois, and that we were going to do our work diligently. And I picked up the bill and paid it and left.

But what that underscores—and I agree with you, David, in your earlier comments, that there are some wonderful public servants in the state of Illinois. I had the honor of serving as chief of staff for Congressman Ray LaHood, who's now our Secretary of Transportation. There are wonderful people serving in Springfield and at the federal level. But we have a few key political leaders in this state that their only concern is holding onto power and control, it's not serving the best interests of the people. And

in my view, we're not going to change what's happening in Illinois until we have some new leadership in some of those key spots.

We have a deep culture of corruption in Illinois. When I was serving as chief of staff to Congressman LaHood, we had a lot of interns. One of our best interns went on to Springfield to work in one of the state constitutional offices. In the first week of her job she called me in tears and said that they wanted her to do political work during her normal taxpayer hours, what should she do. And I told her she should go in and resign, and she did. It's sad that people are faced with that kind of a predicament, being involved in Illinois government.

When I served on the Reform Commission, the 15 commissioners, we held seven public hearings around the state, heard from experts around the country, and those experts basically said Illinois was not doing much right, and that there were best practice models that we could look at in other states in the significant areas of campaign finance reform, state procurement of contracts, transparency, redistricting. This is the report that Andy was referring to. And so our recommendations for reform were very broad and sweeping.

Always remember one of the experts coming—and you mentioned this also, David, in your opening remarks—that Illinois loses billions of dollars a year in a corruption tax, because businesses simply refuse to come to Illinois because of their concern with pay to play and a number of other things. And with our unemployment rate at 10%, 11%, that should outrage Illinoisans, it really should. But unfortunately, it doesn't.

When it comes to campaign finance reform, I do commend ICPR and all the good people that worked on campaign finance reform. But we felt pretty strongly at the Reform Commission that if you don't have caps on leadership transfer of funds, you're really not going to change the dynamics here in Illinois very much.

We had an open contested House seat in the Peoria area where Speaker Madigan, between direct contributions and in kind contributions, gave \$550,000. Ninety-two percent of the money for that candidate in that race came from outside of the district that she was running for to be a state representative. Is that a good system? And the thing is, in any given election, there's only maybe ten targeted races in the entire state. The rest of them are shoe-ins because of the redistricting, so they can pour an enormous amount of money through these leadership funds into these targeted races.

And then I'm just going to talk briefly about redistricting. That was the area that I spent most of my time on with the Reform Commission. Then I worked with the League of Women Voters and a broad coalition on the Illinois Fair Map amendment. We didn't get the signatures that we needed within the five months that we gave ourselves, but we are going to re-launch the effort after this election. CHANGE Illinois and a number of other key groups are working on that.

But this is fundamental, in my view, to righting the ship in Illinois. We need legislative districts that are balanced and are not safe districts for either Democrats or Republicans. We have 98% of incumbents that get reelected in this state. Are we 90% happy with our elected representation? I don't believe so. And so I think that hopefully, the groups that are in the audience today will get actively behind that. We need to have a fair process for drawing our legislative districts. And I'll leave it at that, Paul. Thank you.

Mr. Green: We had this conversation the last reform conference with Governor Edgar in this very building, didn't we? Yeah. We kind of disagreed, as I remember.

Mr. McMillan: Yeah.

Mr. Green: All right. I'm holding back. Terry.

Ms. Terry Pastika: Hi. My name is Terry Pastika. I am the executive director and a community lawyer with an organization called Citizen Advocacy Center. CAC is a nonprofit, nonpartisan community legal organization that's been around about 20 years. The mission of our organization is to build democracy. So the perspective by which we engage in this political reform work is essentially doing community organizing around local public policy issues.

So on a daily basis we get calls that start with average people walking through our doors saying, "Can they"—insert a government entity at the local level—"do that"—insert some kind of government action. And we help them understand the government decision-making process related to their issue and where they can put pressure on their public officials to get the outcome that they're looking for. And so through this process of helping people engage in community politics, we identify systemic barriers rooted in state law, local laws and state laws, and then as lawyers at our office, we take action, and we work with other colleagues to dismantle those barriers to open up the gates to democracy.

So that's the perspective by which we're coming to this conversation. And I don't have—my colleagues here I've had the benefit of working with for a while, and it's been great, and I see some friends here in the room. And when I saw David's highlight of what's in the water in Illinois, I thought, well, one, thanks for asking me to sit on this panel without having to write a paper, because I read the papers that were submitted that are going to be discussed here, and it's outstanding.

And Jim Nowlan's in the room, right? Jim, where are you? And I read in your outline that the governor in the 1830s started off with saying it's not good politics to have to offer whiskey to people to come out to vote, and I thought, well, there must be whiskey in the water because this has been going on a long, long time, since the 1830s. And when you put Illinois politics in that perspective, we have an enormous hill to climb. But like Andy, I'm an optimistic person.

So in terms of what's wrong with Illinois and where can we go from here, from reading all of the outstanding academic papers, universal themes are definitely

coming up, both in your papers and on this panel. And the first is that Illinois politics is individualistic in nature. And Andy talked a little bit about that. Public officials see it as we're in it for us rather than for the common good.

And another theme that came up is this idea of whether it's actual corruption or perceived corruption, the outcome is the same with the public, which is low trust in government and low confidence in government. And the second theme that I saw in all these papers had to do with how do you convince public officials, who are individualistic in nature, how are you going to convince them to change the rules to make it a better democracy? So that's three. And then No. 4, primarily, while I understand that this symposium is primarily on ethics, and so a lot of the papers have to do with campaign finance and ethics, a lot of the reform measures in Illinois history are focused on campaign finance and ethics.

And so in the context of seeing those four major themes, from Citizen Advocacy Center's perspective, in order for a healthy democracy to work, you need to have a balance between government bodies at all levels that have policies and laws that encourage access to the democratic process, and have meaningful enforcement mechanisms which actually have teeth to them when they're applied, balanced against a citizenry that's engaged, informed, and actually has interest in participating in the political process at all levels. And in Illinois, not only is that balance out of whack, because that would assume that either the citizens are really engaged or we have really great policies, we don't even have the balance up. It's not even on the table to have a measurement. And so where do you start?

And again, from my perspective, if Illinois has been dealing with this political culture since the 1830s, the fact that we've been dealing with campaign finance reform issues primarily as our reform mechanism for 40 years—I'm going to go out on a limb—is really not that long. And so—and I'm seeing sighs and heads shaking—but from my perspective, what we need is a multifaceted campaign that looks at using the different ways that we can affect policy, which is we still engage in campaigns to get the legislators to change the laws to make democracy more applicable at that level, but we also engage the citizenry to change the people who are making the laws.

We also use ballot initiatives. And while in Illinois they're very restrictive, within the Illinois Compiled Statutes, there are various ways that citizens can use binding referenda. And so we train people how to use that and force change upon our government officials. And then the fourth part—I am a lawyer, so I have to include this—we're suing. We should be suing.

So that, I think, is one thing, is that we have to engage in a multifaceted campaign to change policy. What are the issues? I think we have to expand the issues beyond campaign finance and ethics. I think we have to look at democracy is a mosaic of lots of different things. And so that includes campaign finance, but it also includes we have to be looking at our election code. We have to be looking at our tax increment financing statutes, which I know we have some people in the room who have had experience there. We have to look at our home rule. Are you shaking no because—

Mr. Green: No, no. No, no. You're on a roll. Go ahead.

Ms. Pastika: All right. I'm used to public comment, where you have to be done in four minutes, so I have to speed it up.

Mr. Green: This is a reform group. Go ahead.

Ms. Pastika: My point being made is that we have to look at a mosaic of laws that enable access to the democratic process, and that is expansive. The other element here is that we have to instill in people that the status quo is unacceptable. And Brian asked how do we change culture. We change culture by, how about let's have civic education mandatory for grade school, starting in grade school, and start educating youth about what does it mean to go to a government meeting, and that you can get up and give a public comment.

I think it's absolutely unrealistic to think that people will get on a bus and go down to Springfield for lobby day if they've never been to a government meeting in their own backyard, they've never written a letter to the editor. And so I think that to change the culture, it's just like the anti-smoking campaigns and some of these other cultural campaigns. We have to start young, but starting at high school, in my view, the civic habits have already been ingrained, and it's very difficult to do that.

Mr. Green: Another whole page?

Ms. Pastika: No.

Mr. Green: [Conclude] with your best shot.

Ms. Pastika: And then the other thing is that—and Andy alluded to this—we can't do this alone. Our reform organizations and lots of public interest organizations in the Chicago area have begun to build coalitions with each other through the redistricting initiative the last round. And there's been some groups that have come together to look at government transparency. I think that we have to look at how our work relates to each other. We have to look at bringing in organizations to work together that we wouldn't think would be an ally.

When we help community groups organize advocacy campaigns, we go through a process where we sit down and we say what information do we need to document the policy flaw? What's the process that we have to take to overcome the barriers? How do we base-build? How do we bring people into the process, and how do we bring them in where they're at? Again, we can't expect them to get on the bus if they've never written a letter to the editor, so we have to have a continuum of civic engagement.

We have to look at coalition-building and we have to basically get down and have people understand how do you use your First Amendment freedoms. How do you engage the press? How do you use your right to free speech, organize a rally, petition the government? And for most people, this is like speaking a foreign

language. They have no basis by which to understand how to engage in these things. So before we can talk about meaningful reform, to turn a bus around that's been going in one direction since the 1830s, we have to have a multifaceted, multilevel, multi issue marathon relay, if we're not exhausted, to change this thing around.

And to the funders in the room, there has to be an understanding for those who support this work that there's low-hanging fruit and then there's the gold medal, and there's a lot of incremental steps between that. And I'm good. You didn't have to cut me off.

Mr. Green: Very good. No, no, no, very good. Well, you heard all the panelists. There's many people in here that have many—I can just see—ideas to sprout, ask questions. Of course as the moderator, Mr. Chairman, I may just take a moment here. Suing in this state. Remember the old Irish expression, “The English want to know the law, the Irish want to know the judge.” [*Laughter.*] Careful who you sue. No. 2, not that my friend Jim Nowlan isn't historically accurate, but this state started in 1818. You've got to go back to 1818. I mean, you know, just don't give us 15 years of leeway there. This started at the very beginning.

So my only question to the panel, and I'll throw it open to the audience, because there's a lot of people here, if all of this stuff is so bad, if there's so much anger out there, poll after poll shows that people are really ticked off. Why do basically the same people win year after year after year after year?

Male: Because they're drawing the district line.

Mr. Green: I would perhaps disagree with you, but I'm not here to debate, I'm just raising the question. And last but not least, one of the real problems of this Frank Capra-esque notion—it reminds me of my days at the University of Chicago, going to IVI meetings. “We're gonna show Richard J. Daley this time that we mean business. We're organizing the city. We're getting all those groups together. We're marching.”

I believe in all of this, but I think—last point, and then I'll throw it open to questions, please—unless you show not a moral, not an ethical, not a legal, but a political price to pay, it's only going to be exciting, wonderful chitchat. It's the political price that will change things. And when the political price changes, then the government of Illinois and Chicago will change. So until that price happens, that's it. All right. Now that I've got you all convinced, state your name and where you're from.

Ms. Mary Schaafsma: I'm Mary Schaafsma with the League of Women Voters of Illinois.

Mr. Green: You know I've spoken to your group many times.

Ms. Schaafsma: You have, and we really appreciate that. Thank you so much. I actually have an answer to your question, and a comment. I think that what we're facing in Illinois in the reform community and have decades of this—

Mr. Green: They want you to stand up.

Ms. Schaafsma: I will. Decades of this is that we have a political leadership that's entrenched. So even when we go to friendly legislators and ask them to sponsor perfectly legitimate reform measures, we come up against, "I can only do what the leader tells me to do." And I think we have to figure out, short of some options that I'm sure we have all thought of when we're trying to get a meeting with an esteemed leader, how do we break that down? I mean, how do we get those legislators who feel much more beholden to the leader from whom they get, as Brad points out, money, the ability to pass legislation?

I mean, I know of examples of legislators who had bills on third reading, which is where you really want your bill to get if you want it passed, who, because they have done something to shame the leader, have had that bill pulled back to the Rules Committee, and it never sees the light of day. And there are legislators who are willing to be friendly.

And that is the culture with which we live. So that we, instead of electing people who say, "You know what, I want to stand up against the status quo, I really want to be a leader here," they find themselves stuck in this predicament so that speaking of the culture, we now have a culture that accepts that this is the way we have to run in Illinois and probably across the country in order to keep our seat. And if we have an idea for how to challenge that, I think you'd find any reformer in this room willing to stand in line and say—

Male: Well, I got an idea for you.

Mr. Green: Hold on one second. I certainly assume you're speaking about all the leaders, not just one, right?

Ms. Schaafsma: I'm actually speaking about one leader. [*Laughter.*]

Mr. Green: I'm personally shocked. Just remember—

Ms. Schaafsma: And I work for a nonpartisan organization.

Mr. Green: This whole system came about—Nowlan, back me up on this—this whole system came about because of reform.

Female: Exactly. [*Bokey*] gave those guys the power.

Mr. Green: The Cutback Amendment created the speaker.

Mr. Shaw: Can I say something?

Mr. Green: Go ahead, [*Andy*]. You've never been shy.

Mr. Shaw: It's an open forum, so a couple things. Brad gave you the on-the-ground example of what happens when you take on somebody in a contested district. Let me just say two things. The system is rigged to favor the perpetuity of incumbents. It's not just the way the district maps are drawn. It's not accidental that our primaries are in the frigid winter months of February and March, and then six months to forget the candidates before you come up to an election.

It's not accidental that it's very easy to knock challengers off the ballot when the election machinery is run by the same organization that the incumbent is a part of. It's not accidental that mailing privileges and other visibility opportunities give the incumbency name recognition. What you're left with, for the most part, is the need to either be wealthy enough to launch a big, expensive media campaign, and even that backfires on a lot of people by the name of Hull and Ryan and Gidwitz. That is not a dispositive sort of thing.

Mr. Green: Don't forget Oberweis.

Mr. Shaw: There you go. It took six races to win, what, a state senate seat finally, or maybe. But the point is that the electoral machinery is rigged to favor incumbency. And the only way you change that is by asking the people for whom the system is rigged to change the law, which they won't do, or to try to go down this long circuitous referendum route which, as Brad and others have pointed out, is extremely limited and restrictive in Illinois.

I want to say one thing on behalf of Andy Shaw, not the Better Government Association, because we've debated at this organization, and we do not have a consensus. If I were in charge of the reform movement in Illinois, I would not forego the redistricting portion, but I would launch a term limits referendum drive, for a very simple reason. As important as redistricting is, it's still esoteric and it's dry. People understand term limits. They understand what it means to be able to say you've been here X amount of time and you're out.

There is no proof that term limits will produce a better governing class, but I think it's fair to say that, in proving the negative here in Illinois, we couldn't produce a worse governing class. And as a result, if people agree in the state, as they seem to, that the bottleneck in the leadership is the biggest single problem to change, then you've got to be able to change those people. You can't do it electorally, because it's just rigged, so you probably have to try a petition drive for term limits that passes constitutional muster, and then, in a generation, perhaps, we'll start to see change. Sadly, many of us won't be around to see it, but maybe it will come eventually.

Mr. Green: Quick comment, then more from the floor. Go ahead.

Mr. McMillan: I actually agree with Paul, because I—

Mr. Green: Keep talking.

Mr. McMillan: After Blagojevich got ousted and the Reform Commission worked hard at getting the hundred day report together, I mean, we really felt that what was going to fuel us was public outrage, and there just wasn't. And until Illinoisans stop being totally apathetic... And there has to be political consequences in order for real action to take place.

Mr. Green: But Brad, they're not apathetic, there's just not a vehicle.

Mr. McMillan: No, the primary after Ryan's in prison and Blagojevich is indicated, 23% of Illinois registered voters showed up to the poll to determine who our nominees were going to be for governor next time. And that's of registered voters. And then there's all these age eligible adults that aren't even registered to vote in Illinois. I'm not letting the citizens of Illinois off the hook here. They're just...they've got to get more engaged if we're going to change the politics in this state. They have to get more engaged.

Mr. Green: Question. Yes, young man.

Mr. George Cheung: Hi, I'm George Cheung from the Joyce Foundation. Specifically about the Cutback Amendment, I'd like the speakers to talk about whether or not you think cumulative voting and multi-member districts would be an advance that would strengthen democracy in Illinois.

Mr. Shaw: Why don't you weigh in, Paul, because you've probably talked more about that—this is something you mention at almost every one of these events.

Mr. Green: I was against it. I was working for a well-known reform state representative, the legendary Tony Scariano. Some of you may not even remember him. Most of you never even heard of him. But the Cutback Amendment was, for anyone who understood Illinois, it was going to be a disaster, because what it did—and obviously we've got to be careful because the man I used to debate is now the governor. It was sold that it would save money. It didn't. It would create more competition, which it didn't. It would reduce the number of bills introduced, which it didn't. I believe the League of Women Voters is a fellow traveler on this one.

Ms. Schaafsma: None of the three of us are.

Mr. Green: All right, all right. And the notion was you just...and one-on-one voting is what people, because they don't understand cumulative voting. It literally created, if a person had the ability—and we know what we're talking about—to consolidate power in such a way that it never could have happened before that, because cumulative voting forced you to work both sides of the aisle. It also created all these people who could never get elected on a one-on-one thing—Republicans from Chicago and Democrats from the suburbs who owed nothing to anybody because they didn't have any organization that could threaten them.

And so once you created the Cutback Amendment, through reform, and the speeches were unbelievable. Frank Capra was in the room. And all of that meant

one thing: the consequences were more dismal than they were before. Last point. Governor Edgar and I, we'd gone around on this, and I guess the constitutional law is you cannot change the legislation if you add some. So what we have to do if we wanted cumulative voting, we'd have to reduce the number of legislators. And it's going to be a hell of a deal because most of the legislators, given what all of them said, they don't want cumulative voting. More people to talk, different people. Let's go. Whoever you are, stand up.

Ms. Geri Miller: Thank you. My name is Geri Miller. I'm a longtime Chicagoan, but I live in Fort Wayne, Indiana. I'm a professor at Indiana University, Purdue University in Fort Wayne. I'm also the daughter of a longtime Illinois politician who served for many years in the Illinois legislature, and I think we're forgetting our history here.

Mr. Green: Whose name is?

Ms. Miller: His name was Pete Miller. And he's been gone a long time.

Mr. Green: South suburbs?

Ms. Miller: No. City of Chicago.

Mr. Green: Republican?

Ms. Miller: Republican in the city of Chicago. I think that we are forgetting our history, and I think that's part of the problem. And I think that...and I'm sorry, I don't know how to pronounce your name, Terry.

Ms. Pastika: PAS-tika, yeah.

Ms. Miller: Terry Pastika hit the nail right on the head, that when you forget your history, when you forget your roots, you're doomed to repeat it. And we forgot that the cumulative voting came into effect by the Chicago *Tribune*, McCormick from the *Tribune* brought it into effect to do away with that very—

Mr. Green: Medill.

Ms. Miller: Medill, I'm sorry. To do away with that very problem. And we've repeated it because we didn't go back and look at that, same as we're repeating the mistakes because we're not educating our kids, we're not bringing them into the culture that we need to bring them into. I see these kids come in every day as freshmen. They look like deer in the headlights. When you say whose government, they say, well, it's all those people out there making decisions. No. It's us. It is us. And it takes me a whole semester to try and get through their heads that this is a part of us, and we don't reform by taking tiny measures across the board and making the decision-makers answer, we make ourselves answer. And without that, we don't get anywhere.

Mr. Green: Comments? Since you were praised, go right ahead.

Ms. Pastika: I think that...you know, so one of the ways that we can do that is I think a lot of our reform efforts have focused at the state level, obviously, to change, you know, that's top-down reform. But I think we are missing the boat in not also emphasizing change that can happen in local government, because presumably that's where citizens can have the most immediate impact, and direct impact. And through working at the local level, you know, that's the farm team for state government, right?

I mean, a lot of our legislators were once an alderman or a school board member, or they sat on the county board. And if their behavior at the local level of government went unchecked, now they're at the state level, and how do they stand up to a leader that's demanding things, or the system of government? And so I think that educating our youth about the unacceptable nature of the status quo, showing them that local government levels, where politicians learn the trade is just as important as focusing at the state level.

Mr. Shaw: One of the most astonishing revelations I've had in the years at the BGA after leaving the news business was the fact that really nobody watches the suburbs. Terry does, to the extent that her group allows. But some of the worst behavior in government is in these village boards, and park boards, and library boards, and school boards in the suburbs.

And the number that Brad cited for the turnout in the primary statewide, you can halve that number. Ten percent, 9%, 11% come out for school board elections in the suburbs. And so you basically get what you vote for. That 11% turns out to be eight of that 11% is probably people with a vested interest in keeping the incumbent in power, which is true in all of the elections the lower the turnout.

I think there's one thing that offers hope now, if it comes together, and this is, you know, a couple things happened in the state in the past few years, and if you look at how they happened. For instance, the Campaign Finance Reform bill, which was flawed, but a big step forward, was driven by ICPR, but they formed a big broad coalition called CHANGE Illinois, so you had in the room 80 groups with a potential membership of two million people mixing with all the editorial boards and a few reform politicians, and you were able to get something done.

This summer a similar thing happened that is one of the reasons for my optimism. Pat Quinn signed a bill passed by the legislature to abolish legislative scholarships, a very juicy, coveted, powerful perk that lawmakers gave up, gave up their own perk because groups like ours and lots of others kept the heat on by reminding people how scandalized the program had become, how the single rule of the program, that the recipient live in your district, was violated repeatedly, as people came up with false addresses, as we could track the campaign cash to the politician back to the family whose kid got the scholarship. And so this well-meaning program to provide educational opportunity was scammed by a dozen or more craven lawmakers. That law got changed, even though politicians don't normally give something up, because there was a huge, coordinated effort that kept the heat on.

And so all I'm suggesting is CHANGE Illinois is now trying to form itself into an organizational structured reform movement as opposed to a loose coalition. And I think that if we all participate, and they come up with several more plans beyond redistricting, I think we have a chance if you can get all the reform groups on the same page with four or five issues, get some of the foundations to help with the funding, keep the editorial pressure on from the newspapers and the investigative reporters, and maybe you can engage enough citizens to make things happen. But that's a lot of ifs in that sentence, and it doesn't happen very often.

Mr. Green: I think you used to be a professor, didn't she? Retired back there. Go ahead.

Mr. Gladstein: I come from working almost two decades in communities. I come from a more community organizing perspective than a reform perspective, which is why I think it's kind of exciting to be here and kind of bridge that gap. And I think the problem that we have is there's a lot of passion out there.

There's a lot of people agitated about issues with schools. We just saw the strike happen in the city. You know, healthcare issues in the state, police brutality, a variety of different issues that are affecting people's lives every day. And reform is the No. 2, No. 3, No. 10 issue when people are kind of galvanizing and getting upset about what's happening in our neighborhoods, yet it is the one issue that everyone's up against.

I worked in public housing. We couldn't get anywhere because there were huge contracts being given to companies that were giving huge campaign contributions to the CHA. Working in Pilsen, there were huge developers giving cash to the local alderman—who I won't mention—to knock down affordable housing and build high-end condos in an industrial corridor.

So when you're up against that, and that's where I think the momentum is, I think it's where the agitation is. I think that's where we saw the Occupy movement. We even see, on the other side, the Tea Party movement. People are frustrated, people are upset, so how do we start to look at taking that passion and that interest and creating change, and bring it to the reform community.

And how do we, then, at the reform community bring them to the table? Because the first year I've been at ICPR, we had a few groups, [ICAR] and a few other coalitions that have groups like that at the table, but we really haven't been able to build something that can create the change against the leadership and the system, so until we do that, I think we're just going to end up having these same conferences every year.

Mr. Green: Professor Redfield, yes, sir.

Mr. Kent Redfield: I'm Kent Redfield with UIS, and anybody that's seen me at one of these forums is going to be shocked, because I'm not going to make a speech. I have a short question. And it goes to the point that Paul raised. He said you're not

going to get reform unless it makes political sense. Okay, education in the state of Illinois changed dramatically in the mid '80s when the business community decided that poor schools were a big problem because it was hurting their bottom line. They had to retrain the people that were coming out of Illinois high schools.

So we've heard assertions that Illinois' image hurts our business climate. So the question is, how do we get the business community to the table? Why, when we stand up in Springfield, why isn't Doug Whitley from the Chamber of Commerce there? Why isn't Greg Baise from the Manufacturers' Association there saying this is important politically because it has to do with the state's bottom line? I would be interested in terms of what are the strategies, how do we get the business community to the table?

Mr. Green: Terry, you want to go first?

Ms. Pastika: I would like to go first. You know, Kent, I think one of the things that we have to do is bring the business community to the table and have a meeting of the minds around the concept that the goals of economic development are not inconsistent with the goals of democracy. I think there's plenty of crossover between the two.

And from my perspective, what we have is a persistent theme going on that we can't have economic development without also respecting and engaging citizens in the democratic process. And so I think that from my perspective, that's one of the things that we have to tackle, because as the state focuses more on issues of economic development to dig us out of this financial hole, we're seeing the eroding of democratic measures, meager as they currently exist, under the guise of, well, if we don't do X, how are we going to bring a business in?

Mr. McMillan: With the Illinois Fair Map Amendment last time, Doug Whitley was intimately involved in the redistricting coalition. They actually hired a full-time staff person from the state Chamber to help with the petition drive downstate. And it's important to know that the coalition last time, which was led by the League of Women Voters, but it included the state Chamber, it included the Illinois Farm Bureau, it included a wide array of groups across the political aisle because it was such a fundamental reform that everybody could agree on.

So we're hoping, at least when it comes to re-launching the redistricting effort, that we can build on that coalition, make it even bigger and stronger, and we'll have 18 months instead of five months to get the signatures to get it on the ballot for 2016, and so I think hopefully we can do that.

Mr. Green: Yes, sir?

Mr. Tom Tresser: Hi, everybody. My name is Tom Tresser. I was the Green Party candidate for Cook County Board President not too long ago, and a friend of mine said, "You haven't done democracy till you've lost an election," so I can stand here before you and say that I've done democracy.

And to speak to your point, Brian, about connecting passion with organizing, I think the people in this room, the resources in this room might consider a statewide training called "Reasons to Run in 2014" and connect some of the points that you've made—ballot reform, access to the ballot, I mean, things that we can all agree on, nonpartisan, transparency, must have, five things, whatever they are, the things that would really make a difference for the reform movement that you guys have documented and worked all your lives on.

But let's put some power behind this, folks, because an old mentor told me politicians have reptilian brains, and they only ask what helps me or what hurts me. So unless we can help or hurt some politicians and put some new ones in place, I think we're never going to get out of this room. So let's have Reasons to Run in 2014.

Mr. Shaw: Tom, if I may just take a quick stab at that because it relates to something that's true of all of us sitting here. We have a problem with the tax classifications between the 501(c)(3) and (4), and as a result, a lot of us run up against that wall that you have to stop in front of. And so you can talk a lot about policy and laws and advocacy and reforms, but you can't cross over into candidate endorsements and—

Mr. Tresser: No, no, no.

Mr. Shaw: I'm just saying that it gets a little murky when you get too deeply on the political side.

Mr. Tresser: I hear you. There's an organization called The Leadership Institute in Virginia. It is a nonprofit 501(c)(3). It's been training conservatives for 40 years. And they include Karl Rove, Grover Norquist and Ralph Reed. And they train people in the mechanics of running for office from a conservative point of view. And it's boldly stated. They train 100,000 people.

Mr. Shaw: You're saying we need one of those here in Illinois for reform candidates?

Mr. Tresser: That's right.

Mr. Shaw: Totally.

Mr. Tresser: So it's not partisan. It's not Republican, Democratic or anything. It's just saying here are the five things that we all agree on good government.

Mr. Shaw: Can I just say one thing to Kent on the business question? Business is not a monolith. I mean, Dave Vite has a group and Baise has a group, and the Chamber is a different group, and the Chicagoland Chamber. And a lot of those groups, as long as government stays a little bit away from them and they don't raise the taxes too frequently, and they nibble around these issues like Workers' Comp and Medicaid, those businesses are pretty happy with the status quo. And as a result, they're one of the stakeholders in government. So I wouldn't say that they're very natural reformers.

The tax increase, of course, incensed a lot of people. But then Madigan was smart enough to get behind a little bit of Medicaid reform, and a little bit of Workers' Comp reform, and they're talking pension reform. And so I don't know who you're going to get among those people. They're not one group, and that's why it's hard. When you say get business to the table, get the civic committee to the table or the manufacturers or the retail merchants? I mean, they're all their own groups with their own agendas, and it's the same as us. It's hard to get us all at the table around a similar group of things because we have our agendas.

Mr. Green: Another question out there. This is like the 1927 Yankees up here. You're not going to get a [batting order]. Yes?

Mr. Gary McDougal: I'm Gary McDougal from Chicago. It seems to me there are some states that are a lot better that we could learn from, and I hadn't heard any of the panelists talk about some good state and how they got there. Has anybody done any thinking about that, or are we just going to invent the wheel all by ourselves?

Mr. McMillan: Well, again, if you look at the Illinois Reform Commission hundred day report, most of the recommendations that we called for in reform came from best practices models from experts from other states that came and said this is how we do campaign finance reform. There's many states—I'm probably going to get this wrong, but I know there's at least six to eight states that recently have gone to an independent redistricting commission format that we took a lot of the fair map amendment from.

One of the things that Pat Collins—and this hasn't been brought up here at this discussion yet—one of the things Collins was so adamant about was if you look at who is fighting corruption in Illinois, it's the U.S. federal prosecutor. And it's because they're the only ones that have the law enforcement tools to be able to go after public corruption. Other states give their state law enforcement the same tools that the federal prosecutors have to root out public corruption. And Pat Collins was adamant about trying to give state law enforcement the same tools to root out public corruption, but that went absolutely nowhere in Springfield.

Mr. Green: I wonder why. Who was that Attorney General? I can't think of the name.

Mr. McMillan: Completely shut out. So anyway, but we did look very closely at—

Mr. McDougal: And how did they get there? I mean, there are six states that have these redistricting—

Mr. Shaw: Well, one of the problems is if we went to ever—and I've done this three times before those panels. They always talk about Iowa. If we start doing what they did for 2022 or whatever, we wouldn't be out of the courts until 2042.

Mr. McMillan: I want to comment on that, though, because I agree with that. But we realize Illinois, diversity-wise, is totally different from Iowa. In order to not violate the Voting Rights Act, we had to create the Fair Map Amendment in a way... We're not

advocating for the Iowa model as far as redistricting in Illinois because we can't, because we'd end up in litigation time and time again.

The other point I want to make is none of these reforms in other states that we reviewed happened quickly. I mean, Terry talked about it, Andy talked about it. I mean, ten, 20, 30 years of consistent, persistent effort finally resulted in significant change happening in those states. And I, too, even though I've been somewhat negative today, I still believe that we can make it happen here, but we're going to have to keep working at it as hard as we can for as long as it takes.

Mr. Shaw: And Gary, to answer your...the oversimplified answer that I use, because this always gets asked, I think it's fairly safe to say that as you move west, away from the deeply entrenched, unionized, ethnically-based, machine-based cities and states, as you move west into newer territory, where the states are younger and the political systems are younger, and the entrenched ways of doing business are a little less overbearing, you find that the behavior of the governing class is more reflective of what does what we can call service to the people as opposed to the business.

So it's not accidental that people say look at Oregon, look at Washington. I'm not saying those places are perfect, but as you move into the newer places with a little less of that corrupt tradition, I think you'll probably find more of the best practices in effect, which is hardly heartening, because we're not going to be like that.

Male: How do you explain Minnesota and Wisconsin?

Mr. Shaw: Well, how do you classify them?

Male: They're not new states like Oregon.

Mr. Shaw: And you're saying that Wisconsin and Minnesota, you're saying they're better behavior?

Male: I certainly think the political culture in Wisconsin is much more oriented towards ethical standards, and Minnesota as well.

Mr. Shaw: Did you follow—Wisconsin had a pretty interesting year. They elected a governor that Illinois would never elect. I mean, look, I don't know the answer to that. Maybe it's the Scandinavians in Minnesota and going west. Maybe Scandinavians have better [government].

Mr. Green: Oh, watch out now. Ooh.

[Mr. Yepsen]: If I could just add, in response to your question, the two panelists sitting right in front of you from the National Conference of State Legislatures, and they'll be on later today, and they're going to talk about what goes on in some of the other states.

And secondly, I just want to add that part of the purpose of what the Institute is going to do with that conference in April, Paul, is to try to bring some people to Illinois from Florida, from California, from some of these other larger states that are big states with diverse populations and are irregularly shaped, and they have gone to commissions. And so we'll be able, hopefully, to take a look at how did it work in the 2012 elections. They got the Voting Rights Act. How did they deal with it. And maybe we can move this forward. I didn't mean to—

Mr. Green: Just as long as we don't take the electoral commission from Florida and the debt commission from California, we'll be in great shape. [*Laughter.*]

Female: I totally agree with you on—

Mr. Green: Let her talk. Anyone who totally agrees, I don't care what you NCSL people—get up there.

Female: I totally agree with you on Florida, since I live both in Florida and Chicago.

Mr. Green: Where do you live in Florida?

Female: Sarasota, which is more of the moderate area. But getting back, on fair districting, they did a great job. It didn't solve the problem, though, so I sort of agree with Paul on the fact that it's not the only solution. But Florida did a wonderful job on their fair districting. Sixty-two percent of the voters voted for it. And there is still a clash. You've got the Republicans and the Democrats in the legislature hating it, for the most part, but they did a wonderful job. And a wonderful education job of the citizens to get it out.

My name is Sheila Smith. I'm with the [Better] Education Foundation. We do have a civic engagement program for middle school kids in Chicago, working in some of the Chicago public schools. And it's been very tough for the foundation to get the funding to continue to support that program, which is getting incredible results.

Mr. Green: Terry, you want to respond?

Ms. Pastika: Yeah, a couple of things. One, the gentleman talked about what's the difference of Minnesota and Wisconsin. And I think at this conference, in your papers many of you talked about political cultures and Elazar in the 1970s, and talking about the difference of a moralistic political culture.

Mr. Green: Yeah, yeah.

Ms. Pastika: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. But you know what? It means something. I think it does mean something in terms of what is the perspective by which the citizenry and public officials perceive government life to be. That's number one. And number two, related to redistricting, redistricting is absolutely important, but it's not a silver bullet, just like campaign finance isn't, and just like ethics isn't.

And unfortunately, with Illinois, the Illinois constitution the way it is, we can change the redistricting process, but we can't take the General Assembly completely out of it. So we can tweak it and we can make it better, but we can't do something like California, which completely has a citizen-based redistricting effort, which is why, getting back to my point, it needs to be a mosaic of reform efforts that include changing the election laws, which are some of the most restrictive in the country, better transparency laws, yadda-yadda-yadda.

Mr. McMillan: And if I can also add. I mean, I think there's some other issues that we think have some traction here, and one is to look at New York City. So you asked about other states and cities. New York City has a campaign public financing system. It's a six to one match where if you give up to \$175, they'll match it six to one, so \$1,225 goes to that candidate, which can really change the control of special interests on those elections.

Mr. Green: Who's the mayor in New York City?

Mr. Shaw: Rahm-berg.

Mr. Green: He probably took the public financing, I bet. I'm just guessing.

Mr. McMillan: And they're trying to go statewide with that, so I think there's some other models out there. There's traditional public financing in other states like North Carolina that I think would have some traction. We had a bill that's been in the senate that's come out three times. Unfortunately, Madigan has not brought it out of committee in the House. Recusal standards is something else that has been significant in other states.

So I think there are other reforms that we need to all look at very specifically and see can we build a movement and agreement. Andy, you talked about how we're all doing our separate things. I do think we need to come together in a unified voice and say what are the three or four things that we can see happen in the next five years, and put all our forces behind. Changes around redistricting, I still think that's something we need to do, but I think there's two or three other pieces of legislation and campaign issues that we can push for.

Mr. Green: Well, a couple more questions out there. Yes, sir?

Mr. Rowe Snyder: My name is Rowe Snyder. I'm an attorney in private practice, and sort of a novice at this sort of thing. But after listening to all of you, it occurs to me that—I was just at a conference here earlier this week with the insurance department where there was some discussion about the public pension problems in Illinois, and it also underlined a number of aspects about the state's dire financial situation. And you're all talking about a need for a hew and cry to unify action and need for reform.

Why isn't the state's dire financial condition—I mean, I heard on the radio yesterday that the Illinois Horsemen's Association had to pony up money so that the state fair would have prize money, so that the people riding the horses would get their money

before the end of the year, in time. So why isn't that—and I know no one wants to talk about death and taxes. I understand that.

Mr. Green: Not this crowd.

Mr. Snyder: But why isn't that more the few and cry for reform, and is there compelling evidence that our corruption that you're talking about is a cause for the state's dire financial condition?

Mr. Green: I'll be very brief on this. Part of the problem in the state is that the state capital should never be where it is because what you have is that you have it isolated, and the media doesn't cover it. Andy would go down to Springfield only when there was total chaos. And we don't have anybody really spending the time and energy to cover it.

And the other thing, of course, is that the problems have become just too large. I taught a class on the state budget this summer. It's incredibly difficult. When the state treasurer came in, it even became more difficult. The reality is that people understand five more quarters in a parking meter in Chicago and get their nose out of joint than the fact that we're billions and hundreds of billions of dollars in debt. Until that comes clear to people, the beat goes on. Go ahead.

Mr. Shaw: No one paid any attention to the pension crisis at all until it became a threat to the solvency of the entire state because it's tomorrow's problem. It doesn't affect you as you go about your business today, and the unbalanced state budget doesn't affect you unless you're a vendor waiting for a bill to be paid. And so most of this stuff operates without having an impact on the day-to-day life of people.

Paul put it exactly right. Everybody drives their car, and when you start having to feed meters with a lot more. I would argue that people are—that there is an awareness out there that is increasing, but it's at a glacial speed. The current mayor of Chicago, I think, in many ways is an improvement over his predecessor when it comes to a concern with ethics. The county board president, a vast improvement. That was a pretty low bar, so that's not saying much. *[Laughter.]*

I would say that the state legislature is beginning to see the severity of these problems, tweaking Medicaid, tweaking Workers' Comp, promising pension reform, which I think we will see. So little by little I think that all of these—this cacophony of noise is making a difference.

And to one point that was made by Paul, the biggest single fundraising goal of the BGA this year is to open an office in Springfield. The reason for that is simple. No one is watching. And it's not accidental that when no one is watching a building where the most money decisions are made of any public entity, government is most dysfunctional, most inefficient, and most troubled, so it's not just us. All of us should be down there on a regular basis because that's the battleground for most of these changes.

Mr. McMillan: And I would make the argument that there's a connection, because there's a lack of accountability. And that lack of accountability goes back to the fact that these incumbents are pretty much, unless they do something absolutely horrendous, are going to get reelected. So they don't have to make the really tough decisions, because they're not accountable. But if all of a sudden they had a more balanced district that they were running in and they couldn't just play to their base of voters, I think you would get more action on some of these key issues.

And I will say this. I agree with Andy a little bit. I see some bright spots. I think, for example, senate president John Cullerton is a vast improvement. And I think if he had a magic wand, he would see reform happen in a broader way. But he doesn't control everything down in Springfield. But if we can start to change some of these significant pieces of the puzzle, I think we can hopefully make better headway.

Male: Paul, we've got some questions back here.

Mr. Green: All right, back there, I can't see. You've got to stand up. Who are you?

Mr. Tony Simone: My name is Tony Simone. I'm the executive director of the Illinois Harness Horsemen's Association. *[Laughter.]* Yes. I had to be here.

Mr. Green: Oh, I see we got you *[fired up]*.

Mr. Simone: You did, sir, and I find that fascinating, because obviously it's a slow business time. But we just put out a little simple press release, and everybody has picked it up. And we've done this for a couple years as far as fronting the money to horsemen when the state hasn't paid it to get the money in their hands. Then the state will pay us back in three, four, five, six months. But anyhow, I had my question planned before that, but I find that fascinating in how much that has picked up.

But I'd like to ask—we talk about corruption, and then so closely related to corruption is ethical issues and moral issues. And how...I think that the society in general is part of the problems. When we talk about business stepping in and creating a proper culture, well, are we referring to the private sector that has been in many scandals throughout the years? They're out there, you know, sell the mortgages and make sure you have billable hours. So we live in a questionably morally deficient time, and, you know, does the group agree?

Mr. Green: Let's get some response here. Go ahead.

Ms. Pastika: Okay, a couple of things. Jim Nowlan—Jim, can you raise your hand? Just wave.

Mr. Green: Not again. Come on.

Ms. Pastika: Well, no, no, no. He, in his paper, outlined questions that as a public official one should ask themselves as to whether or not the action they want to take is ethical. And I think that Jim, when he talks about his panel, that's a great starting

point, because one of the questions is if you even have to think about whether something is ethical or not, you probably shouldn't do it. And so that's one point.

The second point is, again, we have to think about how do we change this culture. How do we change the culture? Which starts in that we have to start teaching young people what is acceptable and unacceptable behavior. And again, using an example of local government, I've seen community watchdogs organize campaigns, and then they decide, you know what, I want to run for the board, so I want to be part of the school board or the school district. And then you know what? They get censored by their colleagues for being kind of the stick-in-the-mud and the one always speaking out on issues.

And this is something that, you know, how can we teach our students to stand up to bullies in school when basically you have bullies at the local government levels beating down people who are trying to talk about shouldn't we need a budget when we have a TIF district, and shouldn't you be able to outline where the different areas of the budget are? And so I think we have to start at looking at how do we change the culture, which is looking at how do we change perceptions of acceptability for the youth, while at the same time we work at the top level, through the General Assembly, to the best extent that we can, legislate ethical behavior, which is very difficult to do.

Mr. Green: Okay, we're now in the bullet round. Ten minutes to go. Short questions, shorter answers. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Adriana Colindres: My name is Adriana Colindres. I used to be a reporter in the statehouse, and I'm curious to hear exactly what you meant when you said it's not covered, because a lot of my friends and former colleagues cover state government. There's a monthly magazine, *Illinois Issues*, dedicated to issues of state government. So, I mean, it kind of hurt my feelings.

Mr. Shaw: Oh, I don't want to hurt your feelings. Before I was fired, I used to write for *Illinois Issues*, so that happens often. Very quickly, *Illinois Issues* circulation, with all due respect to all my pals at UIS, which should be still [we're talking about state] miniscule. The report up here, if Rahm Emanuel sneezes, that's big news. If something happens in the legislature, unless it's horrendous, it's no news. So it's just not reported. There's like a wall.

Ms. Colindres: It's reported.

Mr. Shaw: Yeah, but what's the good of reporting if no one reads or hears or sees it? I mean, you know. Except you keep a job.

Mr. McMillan: Adriana, you know better than anybody that the media is undergoing significant changes, especially newspapers. I mean, there aren't nearly as many people covering Springfield as there used to be five years ago. The reality is—and I know you did a great job when you were down there—but they're not covering it as much as they used to.

Mr. Shaw: And Adriana, let me just say I did not mean any disrespect. I ran into you a hundred times down there on our [forays] to come, and you guys, I think collectively the press corps in Springfield did a pretty good job speaking to a very small audience. For the most part, you're speaking to a small audience in that Sangamon County area, and with the cutbacks, what does the *Tribune* have, one person now, and the *Sun-Times* one person? They cover the governor and the legislature.

But where are the long advocacy campaign-based series of stories on 7,000 units of government and 300 boards and commissions, and mid-level bureaucracies run amok at CMS and Corrections and things? These things get done occasionally, but I would argue that those of you on the beat down there have your plates full just kind of following the governor and the lawmaking process along, and so there isn't—when I say no one's watching, I mean there isn't a lot of digging going on that is followed up with campaigns to try to change things.

Mr. Green: Andy, the bullet round. Another question.

Mr. Dana Heupel: I'm Dana Heupel. I'm the editor of *Illinois Issues*. [Laughter.] I would just like to expand on what Adriana said. There is a press room full of people. The *Tribune* reporter and the *Sun-Times* reporter break news almost every day. The *Sun-Times* runs it. The *Tribune* runs it. WBBM has somebody down there. Andy would show up on rare occasions. The fact is that no one is listening. It's not that it's not being covered. It can be covered better, no question about that. But nobody is listening.

The *Bellefonte News Democrat* did a wonderful story that's going to be the cover story of *Illinois Issues* this month on Department of Human Services ignoring 53 deaths, saying that when someone dies, they no longer deserve services. The *Tribune* ran four inches, the *Sun-Times* ran four inches, none of the TV stations picked it up. I mean, it is being covered. It's just not being...nobody's listening. I'm sorry. Adriana and I both become a little defensive.

Mr. Green: All right, don't be defensive. You're in Chicago now. Keep your gloves up at all times. [Laughter.] Keep your gloves up. There are no low blows. Just remember, Marquess of Queensberry, you wear your trunks around your ankles if you can't take—you know, as the mayor of Chicago says, no whining. A couple of more questions real quick. Going once. Why don't you close out this round? When the dishes are rattling, that usually means the questions are ceasing.

Mr. Yepsen: That's a good sound, isn't it, that something better is coming. Something better. All right, listen, I want to thank all the panelists. Paul, thank you for a good, lively conversation. [Applause.] You got us off to a very good start. Lots of good issues discussed. We're going to take a break now for some refreshments, and we'll be back in a little bit to hear from Dr. Charlie Leonard, who will go over the polling data that we did on these issues.

Male: Point of information. Many papers were referenced here. Can we find these papers?

Mr. Yepsen: Once these are done, it's our intention to publish a proceedings of this. I can't promise you when, but the website.

Female: Will they be on your website?

Mr. Yepsen: Yes.

Female: When?

Mr. Yepsen: I don't know. As soon as we can get them there. It's a little bit of a processing task to get them. If we have your email, I'm happy to let people know.

Female: Well, my question is if you're publishing it in a book, that takes longer than—

Mr. Yepsen: Yeah, we can do both. All right, back in a few minutes.

[End of recording.]