

84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

REGULAR SESSION

MARCH 26, 1985

PRESIDENT:

The Senate will please come to order. Will the members be at their desks and will our guests in the gallery please rise. Prayer this afternoon by the Reverend Victor Kaltenbach, St. Patrick's Church, Springfield, Illinois. Father.

REVEREND KALTENBACH:

(Prayer given by Reverend Kaltenbach)

PRESIDENT:

Thank you, Father. Reading of the Journal. Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Tuesday, March 19th and Wednesday, March 20th, in the year 1985, be postponed pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDENT:

You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Vadalabene. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries and it's so ordered. With leave of the Body, a gentleman from UPI has requested permission to shoot pictures. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. All right, if I can have the attention of the membership, we have some special guests visiting the State of Illinois in the Senate Chamber today, and I would ask Senator Chew to make the appropriate introductions.

SENATOR CHEW:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen. Doctor Davidson had informed me sometime ago that we would have some visiting dignitaries here from the Ivory Coast. They are currently here and in the President's Office and I'd be happy to turn the mike over to Doctor...Senator Davidson for the introductions.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Thank you, Charlie. Mr. President and members of the Senate, it's my pleasure to present to you four gentlemen who are National Assemblymen from the Republic of Ivory Coast from Africa, their national assemblymen is the same as our U. S. Congressmen and U. S. Senators 'cause they have a unicameral Federal legislation. At this time, my pleasure to present to you, Deputy National Assemblyman...Assemblyman...Voli, National Assemblyman Kabran, Nationally Assemblyman Kone and Nationally Assemblyman...you lawyers eat your heart out, another one of your fellow lawyers, National Assemblyman Sombo and their interpreter, and we'd like for you gentlemen to say a few words to the members of the Senate and our guests in the gallery and you, interpreter, take it from there. I know. The interpreter will preside for...

INTERPRETER:

(Remarks made by National Assemblymen)

SENATOR CHEW:

Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. They will be in the United States for thirty days and this is one of the major stops that they had. We were fortunate to introduce them to the President of the Senate prior and some of his staff and also to the Governor, Governor James Thompson came down and met them this morning. So, now I'll turn this back over to the President of the Senate. Hold tight just a minute.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Would you four gentlemen step up here so we can get that picture you want to send back to the Ivory Coast. Mr. President, thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Committee reports.

SECRETARY:

Senator Savickas, chairman of Assignment of Bills Commit-

tee,...assigns the following Senate bills to committee:

Agriculture, Conservation and Energy - 367, 368 and...and 375; Appropriations I - 393; Appropriations II - 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366 and 387; Elementary and Secondary Education - 302, 347, 350, 351, 352, 380, 381, 382 and 398; Higher Education - 355; Elections and Reapportionment - 353; Executive - 349; Finance and Credit Regulations - 354; Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities - 369 and 370; Judiciary I - 304, 371 and 372; Judiciary II - 393; Local Government - 348, 373, 374, 376 and 395; Public Health, Welfare and Corrections - 384, 385, 386, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392; Revenue - 305,...377 and 394; Transportation - 303, 378, 379, 396 and 397.

Senator Berman, chairman of Elementary and Secondary Education, reports out Senate Bill 156 with the recommendation Do Pass.

Senator Marovitz, chairman of the...Judiciary II, reports out Senate Bills 9, 97, 99 and 155 with the recommendation Do Pass.

PRESIDENT:

Messages from the House.

SECRETARY:

Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate the House of Representatives has passed bills with the following titles, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to-wit:

House Bills 23, 26, 35, 40, 43, 99, 129, 156, 157, 182, 210, 220, 222, 242, 247, 273, 338, 340, 369, 391, 428 and 485.

Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate the House of Representatives adopted the following joint resolutions, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask

Committee of the Whole

the concurrence of the Senate, to-wit:

House Joint Resolution 24. It's congratulatory.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY:

And House Joint Resolution 23 and 25.

PRESIDENT:

Executive...are ready. Senator Maitland, for what purpose do you arise, sir? Later.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move that the Senate resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole.

PRESIDENT:

All right, you've heard the motion as placed by Senator Maitland. On the Calendar, on page 6, we have called for a Committee of the Whole to consider the...issues of education reform and education funding. All in favor of the motion indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The Senate will now convene as a Committee of the Whole. We will at the conclusion of the Committee of the Whole be in Regular Session. We have a number of things that we have to deal with. In the meantime, the Chair will yield to the chairman of the Senate Education Committee, Senator Berman.

CHAIRMAN BERMAN:

The Senate, as a Committee of the Whole, will please be in order. This is the third session of the Senate Committee on the Whole to address the questions of education reform. The next meeting of the Senate Committee on the Whole will be on April 10th at twelve o'clock, at which time we will hear from Bob Beckwith, Director of Government Affairs for the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce and from Dr. Manford Byrd, Superintendent, Chicago School District. This afternoon...Ladies and Gentlemen, could we please have your atten-

tion. This afternoon we are fortunate to have four presentors who represent very important constituencies in the education community of Illinois. We have Reg Weaver, who is the President of the Illinois Education Association; we have Bob Healy, who is President of the Illinois Federation of Teachers; Paul Jung, President of the Illinois Association of School Administrators and Joan Levy, President of the Illinois Association of School Boards. We have requested each of the presentors to limit their initial remarks to ten minutes. After all four presenters have completed their presentations, we will open the Floor to questions from Senators directed to any or all of the four presenters. Our first presenter is Reg...Weaver. Mr. Weaver was first elected President of the Illinois Education Association in 1981. In addition to his service on many boards and committees, Reg has represented the IEA on the State Teachers' Certification Board for nine years. A classroom teacher for over twenty-one years, Mr. Weaver earned his Bachelor of Science degree from Illinois State University in the area of special education for the physically handicapped. He also holds a Masters Degree in Educational Administration from Roosevelt University. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I can't have a little bit of your attention, I'm going to ask you by name including some names that I think would not want me to interrupt the introduction of Reg Weaver. Please, could I have your attention. Reg has also worked with educational issues on the national level and has represented the National Education Association at the World...Confederation of the Teaching Profession Conferences in Africa, Brazil and Luxemburg. He is the recipient of many awards and has been honored with Ebony Magazine's Influential Black Educators Award and is listed in Who's Who in Black America. Reg has demonstrated his commitment to the issues of educational reform through his excellent service on the Commission for the Improvement of...Elementary and Secondary

Education and other groups. We are happy to have with him...have him with us today. Ladies and Gentlemen, Reg Weaver.

REG WEAVER:

Thank you, Senator Berman. To the distinguished Body, it is indeed a pleasure for me to have the opportunity to appear before you to make a few short remarks.

CHAIRMAN BERMAN:

Excuse me, Reg. Please extend a little courtesy to our guest, Ladies and Gentlemen. Thank you, Reg.

REG WEAVER:

Thank you, very much, Senator. I feel that the single most important reform before the General Assembly this year is a proposed amendment to the Illinois Constitution that will require the State to provide at least one-half of the financing of the State's public schools. If no other reform were mandated this year, public education would still benefit significantly from the amendment, and this is what I call real reform. It is imperative that the State of Illinois fulfill its obligation to its citizens. For the past ten years, the burden of financing our schools has increasingly fallen on the local school districts with the State paying proportionately less and less. The districts have in turn,...they've had to ask their voters for help and the local...local taxpayers have grown increasingly resistant. In many districts, voters are simply refusing to accept property tax hikes to save our schools and many...many feel that they are taxed to death; and when they have a chance to say, no, many of them do so regardless of how noble the cause may be. It is time for the State to do its part and enact a real reform. Governor Thompson and State School Superintendent Ted Sanders have both proposed that the State increase its funding significantly from the current declining percentage, and we applaud them, and we certainly hope they feel as we do

that at least fifty-one percent of the State's contribution to public education should be put on the books permanently so that every year is at least a fifty-one percent year. Our future generations deserve at least that much. Many of the school...or many of the reforms in the "Excellence in the Making" package are good ones. The members of the Illinois Education Association support a Statewide test prior to certification as well as regular evaluation of teachers. The IEA has and still does support expanded, meaningful in-service staff development programs as well as other kinds of training for teachers and administrators. The IEA supports pay increases for teachers, full-day kindergarten and early learning programs. Additionally, we support encouraging private industry to get involved with public education and all of these things are part of our legislative program. However, there are some things that the IEA...some of the proposals that the IEA will not be able to support this spring; and despite the good intentions of the commission, we feel that some of the ideas could actually hurt public education in Illinois. I think most will agree that one of the biggest problems facing public schools today is the feeling of low status and low self-esteem among teachers, and the question has to be asked, what kinds of things will improve the climate in which teaching and learning can take place? Where your treasury is, there will be your heart also. If we are to renew...if we are to renew America's dream to begin a renaissance of American industry, of American cities and of American society, we must begin by renewing our commitment to excellence and equity in education for all of America's children. Surely one thing must be clear, we cannot expect to be first in defense or first in business among the nations if, in fact, we settle for second best in education. The most sophisticated machines and computers will avail us little without educating the human resources to design and maintain

and operate those sophisticated devices. Education is not just our birthright, it is the foundation of our freedom and the support of our progress. Some people seem to think that the only thing that is necessary is to grant tuition tax credits for private schools and to...and to lecture local school boards about how they should pay their teachers. In this, as in every other function of our society, rhetoric is a poor substitute for support. It is fine to suggest that we ought to pay a bonus to our most gifted teachers but of little help if a school district can't pay any of its teachers a satisfactory wage. Some of the schemes that are receiving the most publicity right now are calculated to drive away more of the outstanding teachers that we have left rather than attracting the ones that we need. So, we say to you,...we say to you, show us your good works and we shall respond favorably to you. Reveal to us your records of support and we shall work to uphold you and...and lead us responsibly and we shall follow. We say that the future, the strength, the dream of free quality universal public education is at stake. Not only is the hope of free quality universal public education at stake, but so too is the future of Illinois' children; children, many of whom come from homes where circumstances demand that they be older than their years; children who come from homes where...where both parents have to work in order to eke out a meager existence, and...and children who have been deprived of love and affection and caring, and many who come from...from...from home to school who are very, very hungry, and children whose...whose...whose lives are a steady school of hard knocks, and children whose greatest expectation...whose greatest expectation is just to survive one day at a time. These children are among our next generation of leaders. Public education is their hope. Public education is our hope. Public education is their future and our future, and

we say that we want to join hands with colleagues, we want to join hands with the parents of the students and with business and labor and all others who are interested in...in Illinois public schools, with all who cherish the integrity of the American dream; and with them, we want to resolve...resolve that through Illinois public schools we shall reaffirm the major priorities of this nation; "to form a more perfect union to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquility, to provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our prosperity." Thank you, very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Thank you, Reg. We will have questions after the four presenters have completed their remarks. Our next presenter is Bob Healy. Bob Healy has been president of the Illinois Federation of Teachers since 1971. He is also currently serving as vice-president of the American Federation of Teachers and secretary-treasurer of the Chicago Federation of Labor. Bob has been a delegate to many educational conventions and has been a member of numerous advisory committees. Bob is a graduate of Hyde Park...Hyde Park High School in Chicago and the University of Chicago. He has also worked as an English teacher and department chairman at four Chicago public schools, including Gage Park, Harrison, Kelly and Farrogate High Schools. A native of Chicago. Until last year, Bob served thirteen years as president of the Chicago Teachers' Union. We are happy to have him with us today. Please welcome Bob Healy.

BOB HEALY:

Thank you, Senator Berman, Mr. President and Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the Senate of Illinois. Representing the Illinois Federation of Teachers, I am very pleased and welcome the opportunity to participate in this hearing. We in the IFT believe that the current discussion

about educational reform and change in Illinois will be beneficial to public education and to the State of Illinois economically and in all other ways. We have expressed our desire for a free and open discussion of the problems in education, the causes of those problems, as well as the proposed solution to those problems. School boards, teachers and administrators have struggled, and sometimes failed, we admit, to maintain school programs and raise the quality of instruction in the face of rising costs and other changes in our society. At the same time, unfortunately, the State of Illinois has decreased its financial support of schools. While hundreds of millions of dollars in school support have been shifted from the State to local property taxpayers, teachers have endured mounting criticism because student achievement on test scores have been disappointing in some instances. The IFT believes, therefore, that the education community and other supporters of schools must respond to the call for reform with proposals to raise standards, number one, and strengthen dramatically the State's financial commitment to education, number two. On school finance, the IFT supports the State Board of Education's recommended increase in State aid to schools of four hundred and four million dollars. We also recognize and have praised Governor Thompson's leadership in recommending in the budget the largest increase for schools that has been ever recommended. We do think it falls just slightly short of the State Board of Education's recommendation. Such an increase or increases is needed to begin the work of raising standards and improving educational opportunities for the young people of Illinois. We believe, also, that the goals of adequate State support for the schools and equity in the distribution of available resources will be far more likely to be attained through efforts to reform the existing structure of school support, rather...by...than by moving to a radically new and untested

model such as the resource equalizer model. Under the area of teacher training and certification, we believe that it's necessary to make some dramatic changes. First, we would require that all teachers seeking certification for the first time in the State of Illinois pass a rigorous examination. Number two, we think that we should require competent performance in basic skill areas for students admitted to teacher education programs in the universities and...so that all teacher candidates perform at levels higher than the average for college students. Third, require that all college and university graduates in teacher education have a major in an academic subject field other than education and that secondary school teacher candidates have an academic major in the subject area which they will be teaching. Fourth, require that students preparing for elementary school teaching have intensive preservice training in the traditional liberal arts. Fifth, require much closer supervision of student teaching and other field experiences of teacher education students by university faculty from the appropriate disciplines; and also where appropriate, that internships should be set up for beginning teachers. As well as passing a rigorous examination and academic standards, we feel there ought to be a period of time when they are supported and counseled by veteran teachers. In respect to evaluation of teachers, we recommend a comprehensive Statewide program to train evaluators; that is, the administrators. The IFT also supports a Statewide mandate that requires all school districts to evaluate its employers under fair procedures. The IFT believes evaluation procedures that are negotiated by school management and the teachers bargaining agents will improve education, and that unilaterally developed and imposed teacher evaluation methods are not as likely to be successful. In respect to the area of in-service training or staff development, the State should also require staff

development programs so that teachers can update skills and knowledge. Such in-service training programs should be developed jointly by school administrators and bargaining agents for the teachers. The one area that we have spent the most time in and we have a detailed report on it, though I must just summarize it, is in the area of discipline and a safe learning environment in the schools. We believe that this is an area where many administrators, many boards of education, many political figures and many union teacher leaders have been rather gutless. We have spent too much time being concerned about the one or two children and their rights who disrupt the classes of the school children and not enough time about the ninety-eight percent of the students whose learning is interrupted in the classroom and because of those interruptions not only takes away learning but demoralizes teachers. We believe that teachers must be given State authority to remove disruptive students from their classrooms. Students whose behavior in regular classroom settings has a continuing negative effect on other students must be placed in alternative programs developed and guided by the State of Illinois. School districts should be required also to develop and enforce fair and effective student discipline codes through joint efforts of teachers, administrators and parents. The IFT urges the development of alternative programs for students with chronic behavior problems and that such programs be funded by the State. In respect to class size and other teaching conditions, the IFT urges the General Assembly to mandate class size standards because class size has a direct bearing upon the quality of instruction and the quality of the relationship between students and teachers generally. Maximum class size should generally not exceed twenty students, with changes, of course, for special education and so on. We also believe a standard should be established Statewide to provide a minimum

sixty minutes of planning and preparation time during the regular school day for all teachers. Teachers also could be relieved of noninstructional duties through the use of paraprofessional staff. We further urge the State to give special attention to the problem of dropouts and also the early...intervention to prevent drop outs. We urge that this State establish and enforce standards to guarantee that all schools should have adequate counseling services, psychologists, social workers and school nurses in respect to this drop-out problem. You know that fifty percent of the female students who drop out of school do so because of pregnancy and in...it's in this area where school nurses and so on could be especially helpful and try to retain those students in some manner to get an education. On the question of student testing, the IFT continues to support the use of testing as a tool in the context of the total evaluation system in our schools. Tests serve a valuable function in education. We support Statewide mandated examinations of regular education students at appropriate stages during their years in school. All across the State we feel that students should be evaluated so that the schools can be evaluated so that you know whether we're doing the job you're asking us to do. We believe that early childhood education would be a...would be money well spent by the General Assembly. Special attention should be given to the establishment of early childhood programs and full-day kindergarten programs. Research has proven conclusively, and I refer you to the Ypsilanti Study in Michigan that took place over a nineteen-year period, that early childhood education programs contribute...significantly to children's success throughout their education and that such programs are also economically beneficial to society as a whole. The children who go through them earn more money in their lifetimes, they are less liable to be involved with the law...on the bad side of

the law rather, and it's proven that it would really pay to spend some money on early childhood education. We would feel that the General Assembly should mandate that a full-day of kindergarten be funded by the State. In respect to teachers' pay, which comes last in my speech but not necessarily in my heart, the teachers' pay and improving teachers' salaries and other economic benefits is crucial to the success of education reform. Current statutory minimum salaries should be raised from ten thousand dollars to twenty thousand dollars in increments by 1987-'88 and proportionally increases on salary schedules for the veteran teachers. We do know that a teacher shortage is imminent and we would like to see Illinois be the beacon light where we have decent salaries at the beginning level with a short period to maximum so that we do not start school in September with a thousand classrooms with no teachers as could happen if something isn't done now. The...school districts also should try to develop schedules of no more than ten year's length with maximum salaries to be no less than forty thousand dollars. We're asking over a three-year period to get to a base salary of twenty to forty thousand dollars for teachers, many of whom have students who graduate, as you know, from colleges and go into accounting, law, engineering and start at much more than the minimum we're suggesting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Excuse me, Bob.

BOB LEAVY:

...I...

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

We have some people in the audience that are not Senators and we would ask them to please be courteous in extending a little bit of courtesy to our guests. I'm sorry, Mr. Healy, please proceed.

BOB HEALY:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The IFT would oppose any attempt by the State to impose merit pay, career ladder or differentiated staffing plans on a Statewide basis. Development and implementation of any such plans should be subject to collective...bargaining at the local level to meet local needs. Such negotiated incentive salaries should be funded by the State, that would be above the base, and we feel they should be developed locally. In conclusion,...on behalf of the tens of thousands of members of the Illinois Federation of Teachers in two hundred and eighty school districts across this State, I wanted to thank Senator Berman, President Phil Rock, my own Senator, Senator Aldo DeAngelis, who's always very strong on educational needs and whose children also go to the school that came in third in the State tournament, Homewood-Flossmoor, and Governor James Thompson for focusing attention upon the vital work of reforming and renewing public education in Illinois. We in the IFT are prepared to give full support to your efforts for change to make sure that public education remains one of the strengths of our State in the future. We want especially to thank the members of the Berman-Mulcahey Commission and all the other educational and citizens' organizations who have been and will continue to be involved in this important work. Thank you, very much, and I would be glad to respond to questions at the end of the...whole presentation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Thank you, Bob. Paul Jung is president of the Illinois Association of School Administrators. He has previously served as both treasurer and director of this organization. Paul is currently serving as superintendent of schools for Des Plaines District 62 and has previously held administrative positions with the LaGrange-Highlands District 106 and Palatine Community District 15. Paul holds a...Doctorate in Educational Administration from Northern Illinois University.

In addition to his school activities, Doctor Jung also has been very active in community activities including chairing local...committees for services to young people. As president of the IASA, Paul has served with distinction and we are honored to have Paul Jung with us today. Paul.

PAUL JUNG:

President Rock, Minority Leader Philip, Senator Berman and members of the Senate Committee of the Whole on Education Reform. It is a privilege to have this opportunity to present the position of the Illinois Association of School Administrators on the educational reform issues before the Illinois General Assembly this Spring. Our testimony is based on a careful review of the recommendations in the reports of the Illinois Commission of the...on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Illinois Project for School Reform and in the proposals released by Governor Thompson and the State Board of Education, as well as our association's legislative principles. Given the limitations of time, allow me to review some of the major reform issues. The first issue is student learning expectations. We support the recommendations of the commission and the State Board that local school districts should develop learning expectational...expectations or instructional outcomes which meet or exceed the State requirements. While the commission is silent on the issue, we can only assume its intent is the same as the State Board's proposal, that the change to learning objectives would be accompanied by a repeal of existing curriculum mandates. The commission and the State Board both have recommendations on changing the requirements for mandatory daily physical education and driver education. We prefer the State Board's proposal to make physical education elective for students in grades eleven and twelve, rather than only under certain circumstances as...permitted in the commission's proposal. And we

suggest that the State Board's proposal be expanded to allow students to be excused from physical education, with credit, if they are participating in a sports program and that kindergarten student not be permitted...not be required to take physical education and that health education classes be allowed for physical education credit. The State Board's proposal making driver education permissive should be enacted, and we support the commission's proposals to allow private providers for behind-the-wheel instruction and to charge a reasonable fee to participants, allowing for waivers for students unable to pay. Two, student assessment schedule. The commission, the Illinois Project and Governor Thompson all offer similar recommendations for assessment schedules. We support requiring regular education pupils to demonstrate academic proficiency levels at the third, sixth, eighth and tenth grades, in accordance with established criteria developed by the State Board of Education; in reading, 1987-'88; reading and mathematics, 1988-'89; reading, mathematics and language arts, 1989-'90. All grade level retention decisions should be made by the local school district. The State Board must make prudent use of test results and district by district and building by building comparisons must be avoided. We further support the Governor's report card proposal. Item three, job descriptions and certification of school administrators. As we did when the commission's draft report was issued, we must oppose its final recommendations on requiring the law to be amended to "specify the vital role of the principalship" in order to assess the current educational climate and "reestablish their teaching skills," and on requiring the law to establish the criteria for certification. We must caution against writing school personnel job descriptions in Illinois law. These recommendations fail to recognize the wide variance in school district size, organization and finances which defies spe-

cific statutory definition. In response to the commission's recommendations on certification on administrators, we proposed language that requires the State...Teachers' Certification Board to set standards rather than establishing the criteria in law. Item four, the recertification of school administrators. The commission proposes that administrators be recertified every five years. As we responded when this recommendation was issued in the commission's draft report, we will support it if it is expanded to include all certificated personnel. We found it curious that the reason the commission's draft report gave for the need for recertification of administrators was an Illinois citizen's concern that "provision must be made for periodic upgrading of competencies for both teachers and administrators." For some reason, the commission was unable to recommend that recertification should be required of all certificated personnel in Illinois school districts. Item five, racial minorities and women in school administration. The commission recommends that scholarships, fellowships and internships should be established by the State Board for racial minorities and women interested in becoming school administrators. IASA strongly supports these recommendations. As an association of school administrators, we are working to enhance recognition of the needs of racial minorities and women who would like to move up through the ranks of school administration. At our annual conference next month, we are offering special panels for these candidates on advancement as school administrators. Item six, teachers' salaries. All four proposals recommend an increase in the minimum salary for teachers. We support increased salaries for teachers, but we are cautious about the specific proposals because of the uncertainties of the costs involved. If the State is mandating increased salary costs of local school districts, we can only assume that they will cover all the additional

costs. Before legislation on increased salaries receives serious consideration, we suggest all interested parties reach an understanding of how the salaries would be increased, given effects on salaries above the minimum, and how much those increases cost...will cost in Fiscal Year '86 and in future years. We strongly urge that increases to the minimum salaries should include provisions for an extended employment year, as determined locally. Item seven, teacher evaluation schedules. The commission, Illinois Project and Governor all offer proposals regarding evaluation of teachers. We support the establishment of district evaluation procedures developed according to general State Board criteria, but we are opposed to statutory guidelines for specific procedures. For example, the number of evaluations per teacher per year should not be set in law but rather developed locally. Item eight, the probationary period for teachers. None of the education reform proposals address the issue of probationary period for teacher tenure. We support an extended probationary period to more adequately provide for careful and deliberative decisions on tenure. State Superintendent of Education Ted Sanders has said that we face the dilemma of over-choice with regard to the education reform proposals this Spring in Illinois. The burden of choice now rests with you as you consider legislation which addresses the numerous reform recommendations. Hopefully, we, legislators, educators, parents, business leaders and other citizens can work together during the coming three months to send a responsible package of education reform legislation to Governor Thompson for his approval. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Thank you, Paul. Joan Levy is the president of the Illinois Association of School Boards. She has previously served on several association committees including six years as chairperson of the Legislative Committee. Joan is currently

-serving as a board member with New Trier Township High School District 203 where she was first elected in 1977. Joan holds a Bachelors Degree from the University of Michigan and a Masters Degree from Columbia University. She is married and has five children. Since local boards of education will play an instrumental role in any legislation that we enact to enhance the quality of education received by our young people, the Senate felt it was only appropriate that Joan Levy, president of the...IASB be invited to address us today. Please welcome Joan Levy.

JOAN LEVY:

Thank you, Senator Berman. Members of the Senate, I do thank you for the time and attention you are giving to strengthening education for the children of Illinois. You have heard more reform proposals than I'm sure you ever wanted to hear about today and I will try to condense my remarks, but I know you are looking for school districts to become more accountable and I...we have no quarrel with that. We do believe that districts ought to be accountable for the effective use of tax dollars. They ought to be accountable for student performance and accountable for employing and retaining well-qualified teachers and administrators. The IASB recognizes that 1985 is the year for action and we will support changes designed to improve our schools. Instructional standards are at the forefront of most reports and that is refreshing, for we have not talked enough in the past about the essence of education. The IASB supports the Commission on Improvement and the State Board of Education's recommendations on learning outcomes. We believe this approach acknowledges the proper role of the State while providing local school districts a reasonable degree of latitude in developing programs to meet the needs of individual students. At the same time, the General Assembly must deal with the issue of existing instructional mandates. Current

requirements are a hodge-podge of good intentions. The individual mandates have never been considered within the total framework of instructional priorities. We support the Commission on Improvement's recommendations to allow flexibility of the physical education mandate in grades eleven and twelve and the driver education behind-the-wheel mandate. We also agree with the recommendations to allow the use of proficiency tests in order to provide able students with more time to take advanced courses. Pupil testing is one of the key accountability proposals. We have doubts about the wisdom of imposing a Statewide test of academic proficiency. We much prefer that testing programs be developed and administered at the local level. Testing programs should be used to measure the needs of individual students and chart their growth, improve school curriculum and strengthen teacher performance. The recommendation that regular education pupils periodically demonstrate academic proficiency in reading, mathematics and language arts has our support with the qualification that student retention decisions remain at the local district level. Further, the State Board of Education must be prudent in the use of test results. District by district, building by building comparisons of raw scores serve no useful purpose without recognition of the varying composition of student groups. The needs of the kindergarten and preschool child have been dealt with in many reform reports. The statistics are startling, fifty-five percent of the children under twelve have working parents; forty percent of the three to five year olds have working mothers. In the coming months, we ought to carefully consider what the role of the public schools should be in this area. The care and education of these children...is a societal necessity, and public schools may well be the institutions to provide for this clientele; but there is a cost for these services and we cannot cut existing programs to meet the need, new funds are

required. We are in full agreement with proposals to improve the preservice and in-service training of school personnel. We believe that applicants for teaching, administrative and school personnel certificates should pass a proficiency examination on basic communication and mathematic skills and a proficiency examination in the major field of the desired teaching or administrative assignment. Teacher salaries are a significant consideration in the budgets proposed by both Governor Thompson and the State Board of Education and every report has called for increased salaries. The IASB's Delegate Assembly has adopted resolutions based on the national commission's report "A Nation at Risk." These resolutions call for increased teacher salaries and for the development of career ladders that distinguish among the beginning instructor, the experienced teacher and the master teacher. We support a deliberative approach to the question of performance pay. We believe that teachers, administrators and school boards can work with the State Board of Education to develop various models that districts could use as a framework for negotiating performance pay plans through the bargaining process. Let me quickly share with you some thoughts on the performance pay issue. Public school administrators must improve their evaluation techniques and the appraisal systems within the districts. For pay to be related in any way to achievement, somebody has to be equipped to evaluate the effectiveness of performance. Effective evaluation and differentiated pay are not going to make any difference in the quality of teacher performance unless the perception that bad teachers are invulnerable is changed. Statutory provisions of tenure, the hearing officer procedure and the defeatist attitudes of some administrators have convinced mediocre teachers that they are, for all practical purpose, untouchable. Many teachers cannot understand why they should work hard when there is no difference between

their...compensation and job security and that of their uncommitted colleagues who barely maintain minimum standards. Conversely, why should inadequate teachers struggle to improve when there is no reward if they do and no penalty if they don't. The most drastic punishment imposed upon an incompetent teacher is often involuntary transfer to another school or a less visible assignment. It's not enough to reward good teachers, we must identify the inadequate teachers, make a good faith effort to help them improve and fire or relocate them in a new career if they are unable and unwilling to improve. The fact that public school districts are required by law to bargain wages, hours and other conditions of employment must be carefully considered by the General Assembly as it debates the various reform proposals. State mandated teacher salaries and working conditions negate the very premise of collective bargaining and totally undermine the balance in the bargaining process. What is left for management to negotiate other than who will control the school system? We believe the existence of the collective bargaining law is itself a powerful argument against legislating minimum salaries. However, if the General Assembly determines that it is important public policy to raise minimum salaries, we think there are some significant points which should be included as we make that change. First, increases in the State mandated minimum salary must be funded by the State of Illinois and funding should also be required to cover the so-called ripple effect. Given the pattern of teacher salary schedules in this State, please remember that the ripple effect of State mandated beginning salaries of twenty thousand dollars produces forty to fifty thousand dollar salaries for the more experienced teachers. Second, the probationary period for teachers should be extended to...more adequately provide for careful and deliberative decisions on tenure. For the teacher who is just beginning a

teaching career, we would suggest an initial one-year internship program followed by a four-year probationary period. Experienced teachers who move from district to district should have a three-year probationary period rather than the existing two-year period. This is not intended to be punitive but, rather, to make the evaluation system more reasoned and effective. A system of renewable tenure should be examined, a system that would allow, with necessary safeguards, relocation or removal of the mediocre. This is particularly relevant since about only twenty-five hundred new, inexperienced teachers are hired by Illinois school districts each year out of a teaching force of one hundred thousand. Local school districts must be given some leverage in requiring improved performance by teachers already in the system. Third, we need to move toward a system that will allow at least a portion of our teaching staff to be employed on eleven or twelve-month contracts. Until we overcome the perception that teaching is a part-time occupation, the profession will never achieve the status it deserves. Not every teacher would want to take advantage of the full-year contract, but the longer contract would provide opportunities for increases in compensation, more effective use of teacher talents and generally raise the status of teachers. One short word about funding. I will not belabor the statistics, but I must assure you that the IASB has as its highest priority the State assumption of a greater share of the costs of public education. These reforms all have a price tag and substantial amounts of new dollars are required. At the same time we have to keep our existing programs operating at least at their current levels. I urge you to continually be aware of the necessary balance between dollars for reform and dollars for maintaining current services. The eighty million dollars estimated by the commission is the State cost of increasing beginning teacher salaries next year, plus the

ripple effect is based on the assumption that all school districts will pay a five percent across the board salary increase to all teachers. The local district cost is estimated at a hundred and twenty-five million new dollars for next year and does not include the cost of the longevity step in all teacher salary schedules. The cost of that automatic salary increase for teachers who've not reached the top of the salary schedule is usually two to two and a half percent of the total salary cost. All of these costs are supposed to be assumed by the local district next year. Since there is expected to be virtually no increase in local property assessments throughout the State next year, this mandated five percent increase in teacher salaries will have to be funded by new State dollars or must come from increased class size or reduction in school programs. I bring this to your attention because there are so many reform proposals before you, many of them imposing new requirements on local school districts. I have frequently heard our membership express the fear that on June 30th, we will end up with many new mandates, as well as all of the old mandates still in place, and once again, insufficient funding to carry on our existing programs, much less implement new reforms. Such a self-defeating response to the needs of Illinois students can only...be compared to the compromise which a not-so-funny comedian proudly described after he and his wife failed to agree on how to spend their limited resources. He wanted a car. She wanted a fur coat. So, they compromised. She got the fur coat and they keep it in the garage. Please, don't saddle school districts with the trappings or wrappings of reform instead of investing in less glamorous vehicles with long-term capability to achieve meaningful improvement. We look forward to working with you in this effort. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Thank you, Joan. Now if we could have the four

presenters come to the Rostrum; Reg, Bob, Paul and Joan. Questions from the members of the Senate. Looks like you've answered everybody's questions, I see no lights lit up. Very good. Thank you, very much, all four of you, for your fine presentations. The Chair recognizes Senator Maitland.

END OF REEL

REEL #2

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would move that the Senate arise from a Committee of the Whole.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

You've heard the motion. All those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed. The motion carries and the Senate does here arise. Thank you. Senator Rock.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Berman has moved that the Committee of the Whole do arise. All in favor of the motion indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. We are back in Regular Session. Senator Kustra, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President. With leave of the Senate, I would like to add Senator Poshard as a hyphenated cosponsor to Senate Bill 398.

PRESIDENT:

Senate Bill 398, the gentleman seeks leave to add Senator Poshard as a cosponsor. Is leave granted? Without objection, leave is granted. Senator Hudson, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR HUDSON:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. With leave of this Body, I would request to be added as a hyphenated cosponsor to Senate Bill 305.

PRESIDENT:

305, the gentleman seeks leave to be added as a cosponsor. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. So ordered. Senator DeAngelis, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to have leave of the Body to move Senate Bills 274 and 275 from the Committee on Local Government to the Committee on Revenue.

PRESIDENT:

There has been objection. That motion will be taken up later. Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

The following resolutions are all congratulatory or commendatory.

Senate Resolution 86 offered by Senator Lemke.

Senate Resolution 87 offered by Senator Carroll.

Senate Resolution 88 offered by Senator Rock and all Democrat Senators.

Senate Resolution 89, Senator Welch.

Senate Resolution 90, Senator Mahar.

Senate Resolution 91, Senator Geo-Karis.

Senate Resolution 92, Senators Sangmeister and Jerome Joyce.

Senate Resolution 93, Senator Kelly.

Senate Resolution 94, Senator Davidson and all Senators.

Senate Resolution 95, Senator Lechowicz and all Senators.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar. Introduction of bills.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Senate Bill 399, by Senator D'Arco.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 400, by Senator Rock.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

401, by Senator D'Arco.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

402, by Senator D'Arco.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

403, by Senator Carroll.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

404, Senator Luft and DeAngelis.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

406, by...405, by Senator Schaffer and Geo-Karis.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

406, by Senator Welch.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

407, Senator Welch.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

409, by Senator Sangmeister.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

410, by Senator Sangmeister and Coffey.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

411, by Senator Rigney.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

412, by Senator Rigney.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

413, by Senator Sangmeister.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

414, by Senator Degnan.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

415, by the same sponsor.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

416, by Senator Holmberg.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

417, by Senator Hall.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

418, by Senator O'Daniel, Jerome Joyce, Luft, Coffey,

Poshard, Demuzio, Schuneman and Rigney.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

419, by Senator Savickas.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

420, by Senator Demuzio.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

421, Senator Luft.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

422, by Senator Dunn.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

423, by Senator Jeremiah Joyce.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

424, by the same sponsor.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

425, by Senator Keats.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

426, by Senator Demuzio.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

431, by Senator Holmberg.

(Secretary begins reading S.B.431)

427, by Senators Donahue and Demuzio.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

428, by Senators Kustra, Rock and Keats.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

429, by Senators O'Daniel, Poshard and Welch.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

430, by Senators O'Daniel and Poshard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

431, by Senator Holmberg.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

432, by Senators Maitland and Jerome Joyce.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

433, by Senator Marovitz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

434, by Senator Marovitz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

435, by Senator Marovitz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

436, by the same sponsor.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

437, by Senator Karpiel.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

24-38, Senator Berman.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bills.

PRESIDENT:

Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 96 offered...Senator Hudson and Mahar.

It's...commendatory.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 97 offered by Senators Donahue, Demuzio, Bloom and others.

PRESIDENT:

Executive. Before I recognize Senator Vadalabene, WAND-TV from Decatur wishes to film the proceedings. Get your right profile, Sam. Senator Vadalabene, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you for the introduction. I would like to be shown as a hyphenated cosponsor of Senate Bill 262.

PRESIDENT:

262, the gentleman seeks leave to be added as a hyphenated cosponsor. Is leave granted? Without objection, leave is granted. Senator Marovitz, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President. At the request of Senator Lechowicz, as chief sponsor of Senate Bill 300, I would ask leave that Senator Lechowicz be added as a hyphenated cosponsor of Senate Bill 300.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Gentleman seeks leave to show Senator

Lechowicz as hyphenated cosponsor of Senate Bill 300. Without objection, leave is granted. Senator Hall, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to now when you might get to 3rd reading, I had a bill...

PRESIDENT:

We're going...

SENATOR HALL:

...it's of an emergency nature.

PRESIDENT:

...I understand. We are going immediately to page 2 on the Calendar to the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senator Schuneman, for what purpose do you arise, sir?

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

To ask leave to be added as a hyphenated cosponsor on Senate Bill 316.

PRESIDENT:

316. The gentleman seeks leave to be added as a hyphenated cosponsor of Senate Bill 316. Without objection, leave is granted. All right. If you'll turn to page 2 on the Calendar. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 10. Senate Bill 18. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, top of page 2, is Senate Bill 18. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 18.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 29. 31. Senate Bill 50. Senate Bill 79.
Senate Bill 105. Senate Bill 111. Middle of page 2. Senate
Bill 118. 133. 134. 141. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 141.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Executive offers
one amendment.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Take it out of the record, I...that's mine.
145, Senator Carroll. 167. 170, Senator Weaver. On the
Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, the top of page 3, is
Senate Bill 170. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 170.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 174, Senator Hall. On the Order of Senate
Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 174. Read the bill, Mr.
Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 174.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 175, Senator Hall. 180, Senator Karpel. 187, Senator Lemke...212, Senator Demuzio. 238, Senator Marovitz. 243, Senator Holmberg. 249. 248. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, the middle of page 3, is Senate Bill 248. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 248.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Executive offers one amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Holmberg on Committee Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Committee Amendment No. 1 deletes everything after the enacting clause and requires that the State's portion of the proceeds of the lottery shall be paid into the Common School Fund. As we know, the Governor recently announced his support for total transfer of lottery proceeds to be transferred into the Common School Fund rather than the General Revenue Fund and this amendment will accomplish that transfer.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Holmberg has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 248. Discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

I have not seen the amendment, President Rock, but...don't you have a bill that...that would, in fact, be in conflict with what she's trying to do at this time?

PRESIDENT:

No. Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, would this preclude the municipal reapportionment of the monies? This is not amnesty? Okay, I'm sorry.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Holmberg has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 248. Any further discussion? If not, all in favor of the amendment indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Are there amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 249, Senator Holmberg. 254, Senator Luft. 262, Senator Demuzio. On the bottom of page 3, on the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 262. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 262.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Appropriations I offers one amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Demuzio, Committee Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Committee Amendment No. 1 reduces the total appropriation from fifty million dollars in GRF to twenty-five million dollars. And I would move the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Demuzio has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1...Committee Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 262. Any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment

is adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Are there amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. Top of page 4. We'll move immediately, with leave of the Body, to the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1, Senator Welch. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 1.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This Senate Bill No. 1 will appropriate one million fifty-seven thousand six hundred dollars to the Board of Regents to enable Northern Illinois University to create an engineering school. The purpose for this bill is to insure that there are sufficient number of spaces for individuals in Illinois where students who want to become engineers to fulfill their goal. The State Board of Higher Education has already passed a resolution enabling Northern Illinois University to create an engineering school at Northern Illinois. In fact, what we are now awaiting is the funding from the State in order to proceed. At the present time, there are many Illinois citizens who want to become engineers but are unable to attend school due to the lack of space in those schools or to the high tuition requirements at other private schools. In fact, twelve hun-

dred Illinoisans have had to go to the State of Iowa in order to receive an engineering degree in the last year. The number of students who are dissuaded from becoming engineers cannot be measured. For those who go to see their counselors, when they are counseled on their future careers, must be told that to get into engineering school you either have to be in the top one percent of your class or be rich or be both. The idea of an engineering school is not merely for academic purposes, it is for purposes of improving the economy of the State of Illinois. One of the main requirements of General Motors to bring the Saturn Plant to Illinois is that they be within fifty miles of an engineering school and engineering goes hand in hand with high technology. For too long we have not played up the high technology aspects and the availability of our schools of higher learning to business and now we must play catch-up. It's not for no reason at all that Massachusetts has become such a center of high technology; with MIT and Harvard and their other fine schools, they're a natural magnet for this type of high tech. industry, and that's what we want to do here in the State of Illinois. This bill has received a great deal of support, I believe we have thirty-one sponsors at this time. The number of jobs that it will create is unknown, but we think that in northern Illinois with the availability of the Argonne Lab, with our attempts to bring in the super colliding super conductor to the area, with other attempts at making it a high tech. area, we're trying to bring in Chrysler into Belvidere with more automobile building. Each of these requires engineering training and both takes from engineering schools the courses that they teach and supplies teachers to those schools. For this reason, those of us in northern Illinois and throughout the entire State, in order to improve our economy and make life careers for our students here in Illinois, are supporting this bill. I'd be glad to answer

any questions, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill No. 1 pass...Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Thank you, Mr. President and fellow Senators. Got a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

He indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR BLOOM:

In the presentation of this bill, the Board of Higher Education, it was stated, endorsed the creation of another engineering school in the State of Illinois. Was not the staff of the Board of Higher Education...did not their study end up recommending against creating another engineering school in the State at this time?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Bloom, would you repeat that. Senator Welch missed your question.

SENATOR BLOOM:

I'm...oh all right, Mr. President. My...question is, although it has been stated both in committee and now on the Floor that the Board of Higher Education has endorsed the creation of an additional engineering school in the State of Illinois, is it not correct that the staff of the board, the study that they conducted, concluded that it would not be necessary to create another engineering school in the State of Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Bloom, my understanding is that the initial staff report in December, before the bill was introduced, did indicate that based on projections then available that not enough

students were applying to become engineers. But that's a self-fulfilling prophecy. If there are not enough spaces for people to become engineers, you're going to have fewer students applying; plus, you're going to have your school counselors discouraging students from becoming engineers. So, in effect, what you had was an attempt by the...the staff of the Board of Higher Education, who I am not sure are wholly neutral on this issue, making a recommendation early on which was not followed by the Board of Higher Ed., just the staff recommendation is what you're referring to.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Well, I...I don't want to unduly prolong the proceedings here. With thirty-one cosponsors, perhaps the outcome is foreordained, but I think a record must be made. The response about kids discouraged and so on and so forth, I have been informed by...schools that are among the Federation of Independent Colleges and Universities that indeed there is not, outside of the University of Illinois, such a demand as to warrant an additional engineering school. I would...respectfully disagree with the characterization of the staff recommendation, not that any agency should blindly follow the recommendations of staff. However, it is with a great deal of reluctance that I do rise against this particular measure because I...it could be misinterpreted in the sense that somehow I want to...it has nothing to do with the sponsor, I understand why the sponsors...the thirty-one sponsors are doing what they're doing, but I would suggest that it probably would be a wiser allocation of the 1.7 million dollars if we got the institutions of higher education that offer such programs, especially the independents and Southern and some of the others, to do rather aggressive outreach program, I know that Bradley University which has such a program

in my own home town would be willing to participate to do an outreach to encourage high school students to enroll and pursue a career in engineering. Thank you for your time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President. It is tough to go against thirty-one...thirty-one cosponsors on a bill. But, Senator Welch, I would...I would submit to you that the argument that we use from time to time in Illinois that the students go elsewhere to get their degree and that ultimately go someplace else to...to get a job would still take place even if we educated those students in Illinois. I'm not sure we have a deficiency in...in...in engineers in Illinois. Certainly, we may...we may want to...the young...the young people who want to pursue an...an engineering degree may want to go to school here, but I'm not sure that after graduation they really want to...to seek employment here. That concerns me just a little bit. But I think of a bigger...bigger magnitude is...is the fact that every senior university in this State wants to be all things to all people, and I...I don't fault university presidents for that, I don't...I don't fault the people involved in those universities for wanting to do that. But we are never going to fund higher education in this State until we address the fact that these universities, each and every one of them, can't be all things to all people. They have to build on the programs they have that are very good and do away with those that are not doing what they should do. The same argument applies with creating new courses at those universities and that troubles me a great deal. It would seem to me, that as Senator Bloom mentioned, that privates and...and in particular University of Illinois should expand their program and do a more efficient and...and better job of...of engineering of...of educating engineers in

the State. And again, I don't think we're going to fund...higher education at an adequate level until we address those problems. My final point would be this, could you tell the Body what the ultimate cost of...of the engineering program at Northern will be? Now the 1.7 million dollars I understand is for the first year of operation. What then would be the ongoing annual cost?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator, the...the...this bill is one million fifty-seven thousand six hundred dollars, not 1.7 million. The three year...1.9 million is going to be the total cost of the program over the next two fiscal years. Right now, even though there is some problems getting engineering faculty, here at Northern Illinois University we already have ten or eleven engineers on the staff that will move within the school to the engineering school upon its designation. So the initial cost is going to be 1.9 million dollars..for two years.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President. Can you...can you reach out a...a bit farther on that though?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Or not...if not, that's okay, I just was curious.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator, the...the projections for this school are that we continue to use existing facilities and hire some twenty engineering teachers. So the...the cost, unless there's a radical change, will continue to remain within that million dollar proposal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Well, I think we've all had a lot of discussion on whether we need any more law schools or any more medical schools, and our friends in those two professions will at least privately tell us there's plenty of lawyers and plenty of doctors; but if you talk to an engineer, most of them will tell you there aren't enough engineers. And if we are serious about all the programs, Build Illinois, education reform, one of the things...all of those things are aimed at is creating the kind of a...an economy where engineers are going to be absolutely vital. The students for this proposed...Northern Illinois Engineering School come primarily from northern Illinois, from Cook County, the collar counties and the northern twenty counties. Northern has a very enviable...record compared to some of the other universities in that the kids that are educated at Northern tend to go back to those northern twenty counties and...and have careers and become solid...contributing citizens to the State...Senator Bloom points out, I didn't make that mark quite yet. One of the saddest things for me is every year talking to the parents of kids who have straight A averages that can't get into an engineering school here, that end up in Iowa or Nebraska and all around the country. We cannot afford to export our brightest and best. And I'm led to believe that the private engineering schools in this State have no shortage of candidates, and for them to be in here and hiring lobbyists to shoot this bill down is...well, at the best, terribly tacky. Thank you for the word. This is something that should happen, this is something that's needed; and frankly, if the other institutions, State institutions or private institutions, need additional help, I think this General Assembly is prepared to do that simply

because we recognize to build the kind of economy we need, we're going to need to keep the brightest and best in this State and this is one way to do it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? Senator Holmberg.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President. One of the things that we find in northern Illinois is when we talk to businesses that are interested in coming into the area or businesses that are thinking of leaving our area, the number one reason that they give is the lack of immediate studies in engineering. They cannot have ongoing, up-to-date programs for the men that they wish to employ. If we want to go to an engineering school, it's that same four-hour drive down Highway 54, and I think Senator Maitland and a few other people have experienced it coming the other way, and it certainly has been something that has hindered the progress of the economy from the northern edge of the State. I think as we're trying to rebuild Illinois, I can think of no better way than to bring northern Illinois back into the State with an engineering school.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Welch may close.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to point out for the Body that fifty percent of all the scientists, technologists and engineers employed in Illinois are within a fifty-mile radius of Northern Illinois University and that eighty percent are within a seventy-mile radius. And it was for that reason that only two months ago Governor Thompson came to DeKalb and announced his support for the engineering school, and as he did, he said that we need the engineering school to help bring in jobs and that was the bottom line. I know schools try to be all things to all people, Senator, but I

think that they should be something to the people who want to attend a school. And the people who want to attend a school in my area want to become engineers and that's what we're trying to do with this bill. Even though this may cost a million dollars this year and a million dollars next year, I think that we should look at this in the broad perspective. I think that we should look at this not as an expenditure of funds but an investment; an investment in the future of Illinois, an investment in our students here in the State of Illinois, an investment in bringing in jobs and not just high tech. jobs because those jobs bring in your low tech. jobs. I think that this is a bill that can help not just the school but help the entire State of Illinois, and for that reason, I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 1 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 44, the Nays are 11, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1 having received the constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 39, Senator Hall. Senate Bill 40, Senator Hall. Senator Hall. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SENATOR HALL:

Hold it, just a second.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'd like to pass at this time, I'm waiting on an amendment. If we can come back to it, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senate Bill 120, Senator Lemke. Read...Senate Bill 123, Senator Lemke. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 123.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lenke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

What this...bill does, it revised the manner in which vacancies in the office of...of...of...township trustees of schools are filled. What this does is when there's a...an even split, it allows the local regional superintendent of public instructions to choose the...the other trustees so they can choose the treasurer to administer the trustees...the township funds. I think it's a good bill and I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? Senator Welch. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate...Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

He indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

This has to do with, for example, in our case, the County Board of School Trustees?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lenke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

This...this deals with what we call the...township trustees. In other words, if the...they...what...their pure function is to choose a treasurer to invest and take in the school funds of the schools in the township. That's the mere function what we're doing here, and what we have is that we

have a board of...of five and we have a split of two and they can't choose who the treasurer is. This allows the...the fifth guy to be chose after a period of time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, what...what committee did this go through, if I may ask? I...I'm not sure that I'm opposed to the bill, but I'm just curious as to whether or not you're affecting school government in my area, and...and in our case, we have county boards of school trustees or regional trustees as opposed to the...the method that you're talking about. And it seems to me that what your bill is going to do is take selection of those people out of the hands of the public or the...other trustees and put it in the hands of some other elected official. So...I guess my first question is, where did the bill...through what committee did the bill go, education or elections?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lenke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

No, what this does...I'm sorry, this applies to boards of school trustees, the same method as...is for filling on school boards. It's...it's...it just includes the board of trustees.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Our staff tells me that the bill only applies to Cook County, so that takes care of my objection.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Well, just briefly in support, this bill was given a full

hearing at the Elections Committee and it does apply to one isolated case that just...when you have two persons and they won't compromise and that's why. So there's a...the number of days that are given would...would more or less place them in a position to make a decision...to make...to make this decision during the period. So, it's a...we didn't have any opposition in committee and I think it's a good concept and it only applies to Cook County.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator DeAngelis. Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

Yes. I was going to say also that there was no testimony against this bill, and I think that I...I have read of and I have heard of situations that this tie breaker would affect in Cook County. And, as I say, there was no opposition against it and I see no problem with the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 123 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 54, the Nays are none, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 123 having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 132, Senator Luft. Senate Bill 160, Senator Welch. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 160.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill will create bonding

of two hundred million dollars to finish off Route 51. As many of you know, Route 51 is the corridor going from Rockford to Bloomington that we're trying to build and also down to Decatur, trying to make it a four-lane road. The Governor recommended in his address on Build Illinois that Route 51 was utmost importance. The Governor recommended that we not waste any time in completing this road and he recommended that...that we do it with bond funds. The purpose of this bill is to insure that the bond money is available early on to complete Route 51. And for that reason, I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 160 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 52, the Nays are 3, none voting Present. Senate Bill 160 having received the constitutional majority is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'd like to go back to Senate Bill 40. Senator Hall has received the amendment. Leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 40. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. That...my...I...I have an amendment on here that I want...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

...Senator Hall...seeks leave of the Body to bring Senate Bill 40 back to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Hall.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This just simply takes out the City of Chicago.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there any discussion? If not, those in favor...of adopting Amendment No. 2 indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. We have Senate Bill 168. Senator Carroll. Senate Bill 263, Senator Demuzio. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 168. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 168.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The impact of Senate Bill 168 is now to transfer the monies that were available out of Ag. Premium Funds that had once been allocated for county matching of extension services for farming. Since that...the counties were unable to adequately use up the full match that we had given to the university, this would transfer that to create a hotline so that those in our Rural Route Program who need help in agricultural problems which we know that the farming communities of our State are now being faced with, can have the expertise

SB 263
3rd Reading

available to at least give them that advice that is available. We know that there are no good programs yet in place to save the Illinois farmer but at least that which may be available should be advisable to them. So this would, therefore, transfer those monies that would otherwise have been unused and extend the hotline program so that they will have a place to call even if they can only find out that the news is bad. And I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 168 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 56, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Bill 168 having received the constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 263, Senator Demuzio. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 263.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentleman of the Senate. Senate Bill 263 creates the Emergency Farm Credit Allocation Act. When we originally started in this proposal we had envisioned at least a fifty million dollar interest proposal; however, we have amended that by virtue of an amendment that we placed on the appropriation bill today, the twenty-five million dollars. Also, when this bill originated it started out with a ninety percent guaranteed provision by the State of Illinois which was amended out on...by virtue of Amendment No. 1. And Amendment No. 2...placed a fifty thou-

sand dollar cap on the amount of the loan rather than the one hundred thousand dollars. What, in fact, we are doing here is we are embarking upon a...a loan program for Illinois agriculture for those individuals who are in need of planting or seed money for crops for this year. It is certainly not an unprecedented...position for the State of Illinois to be involved in loan programs since we have already been involved with a twenty million dollar allocation to Chrysler a few years back. This is not a bailout also for the agriculture community in Illinois but it is certainly a loan program that provides that lenders working with the borrowers may have the opportunity to negotiate the loan. At the end of twelve months the borrower would then pay back the full amount of the loan up to the maximum of fifty thousand dollars plus one-half of the interest. The remaining one-half of the interest would be paid back to the State of Illinois over a five-year period of time. It is a proposal that, frankly, the State of Illinois...it's questionable as to whether or not we should, in fact, be embarking upon this position in the first place. But it is something that we are responding to as a result of the inaction of the President and inaction of the...quite frankly, the Secretary of Agriculture who is a resident or was a resident of the State of Illinois has refused to go along with helping out agricultural interests in this...in the...in the United States. Therefore, there's still some room, I am told, for possible negotiations between the Congress as well as the President in an attempt to extract a compromise that might lead to a Federal solution to this very severe problem. As such the...the House and the Senate here in Illinois are certainly not going to turn our back on our responsibility to Illinois agriculture. And as a result, we are proceeding and poising ourselves to be in position to act affirmatively to help the farmers in...in Illinois in case the Federal Government does not, in fact,

come through with any kind of a...a compromise. It is a...as I said, it is a proposal that is a loan proposal. It is one that will be only for Illinois residents and who are principal operators of the farm for which the...the loan is intended. The person must demonstrate that he has a positive cash flow where the depreciation and the net income do not exceed twenty-five percent of their gross income. He must demonstrate that he is creditworthy according to the standards that have been prescribed by the lender and the Illinois Farm Development Authority who will be the administer of the program, and it seems to me that they will have an immediate effective date. This twenty-five million dollars and interest would assure us that we would have about three hundred and eighty-four million dollars in principal for operating loans in Illinois. It would serve at the maximum about seven thousand six hundred and ninety-two providing that all of the individuals that applied for the fifty thousand dollars would be eligible and that the awards were made...or the...the loans were made at the fifty...fifty thousand dollar level. I would ask for your positive support relevant to Senate Bill 263 and would respond, if necessary, to any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I think it is indeed a shame that we have to be debating this measure here in the State of Illinois. I agree with what the sponsor is trying to do and I support him and I applaud him. But for us to have to do this, to take twenty-five million or fifty million or whatever it is, out of our treasury when our schools could use it and it could be used many, many other places, for us to have to bail out the Federal Government when they are letting the farmers in this nation go by the wayside is indeed a shame.

We have an administration that is totally unreceptive to the farmers. We have a Secretary of Agriculture who is...who is a native son of Illinois and will not promote a program that originated here in this Senate, that would not cost the Federal Government anything but would bring a billion eight hundred million dollars into this State to help out farmers. We are, today, trying to...to help these farmers and we're not going to get to the ones that really need the help, the bottom fifteen percent, they're going to go down the drain if help doesn't come from Washington and then next year the next fifteen percent will go down the drain. We are not in as serious a trouble in Illinois as they are in Iowa and some of the other states, South Dakota, North Dakota, but it won't be long until we are. Farmland values in Iowa are on a downward spiral, they're going down five, ten percent a week. The equity is gone from all of those farms in...in Iowa and it's fast happening to us in the State of Illinois. Another native son of this State, the President of the United States, was quoted the other night, saying the...that we should export the farmers and keep the grain. We were in Washington, a bunch of us last week, with the Governor's Task Force and one of the Secretary of Agriculture's spokesmen told us that if we had a farm program next year like the one we had this year with target prices for farmers, it would be horrendous the amount of people that would go along with the farm program. I've never known an administration that would set up a farm program and then hope that no one went along with it. We are not the cause of low grain prices and failing farmers in this State, we balance our budget, we had a tax increase a couple of years ago; but the high dollar is the real culprit and that's caused by the Federal deficit not the State. So, for us to have to come here today and...and attempt to keep our farmers solvent is not the right thing to do but it's something we have to do. Another native son of

this State many years ago in 1896 said, "Burn down your cities and leave our farms and your cities will spring up again as if by magic, but destroy our farms and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in this country." And that was William Jennings Bryan. So, today, we should try and help farmers and we should pass this bill but, indeed, it is not our responsibility. And I think the responsibility will be borne heavily by those folks in Washington, D. C. whose responsibility it is. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

I don't know whether to debate Senator Joyce or ask Senator Demuzio a question, but I'll ask Senator Demuzio a question first.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

He indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

If I might. Senator Demuzio, how much money does Treasurer Donnewald have available at this time for farm loans?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Over the last...three allocations, I think he probably has around two hundred and twelve million dollars that had been made available to three hundred and eighty banks out of twelve hundred in Illinois, I'm told.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, you mean three hundred and eighty-one banks have applied.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

I believe so.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

A little different than the way you phrased it. Two hundred and twelve million is correct. Does his bill cap the interest the bank can charge?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

I am told that the...the treasurer puts out money, I think, each week and I think...on a bid basis, and I think that the...the...the recent figures I...I believe on the bid was nine percent and the banks are allowed a two and a half percent...addition to the...the nine percent, that's what I am told.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

That's correct, he has a two and a half percent cap. Does this bill have a cap?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

No, but it's anticipated that the Illinois Farm Development Authority will by rule or regulation cap and suggest that no loan would be more than thirteen percent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, you know, the State is going to get stuck for half of the interest cost. I think the State ought to at least know what the interest cost is going to be. And there's a

tendency, and my good friends in the banking community might disagree, but when there's such an attractive opportunity where the State's going to pay half the interest, I think there might be something there. Why...why did you not include a cap in your bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

The bill provides that it would be...that the prevailing interest rates...and I'm trying to find the certain section for you, but that is what the bill says, at the current interest rates which are...which is not an unusual statement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, who is eligible under this bill that will not be eligible under Treasurer Donnewald's program which is three times larger than this and currently is not even totally subscribed?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, I didn't totally hear the last part of your question, but on page 3 of the bill, Section 7, it indicates that...the interest rate not exceeding the prevailing rate...not exceeding the prevailing farm operating loan rate and the final approval, in fact, will be made by the Illinois Farm Development Authority to allow us an opportunity to keep a...an...eye on that. Who can qualify for the program is an individual who is...stipulated to and by definition on page 1 of the bill, "applicant meaning an Illinois farmer," Senator...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator...Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

That wasn't my question. My question was, who would be qualified for your loan that wouldn't be qualified for Treasurer Donnewald's program?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

I think about twenty percent of those who apply for this particular program...I'm sorry, twenty...twenty percent of those that are in Illinois won't be helped at all; about thirty percent of those will, in fact, probably not apply and this would apply to about fifty percent of those that are currently in financial problem. It's not the availability of the money, it is the cost of the money that makes it more attractive to the lender to...to make the loan because the balance of the one-half of the interest is deferred. So, I think that if you're talking about cash flow that those individuals are...are the persons who would be more...more apt to be included in this program rather than the treasurer's program.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, Senator Demuzio, without making a big issue on this, what you are doing essentially is...is giving credit to those who least need the credit; because under the stipulation of your bill, it's the creditworthy that are going to receive the credit. Now I'm not opposed to that, but not...let's not paint it as a program that's going to help the distressed farmer that's teetering on bankruptcy that may not make it through this year, 'cause that person under your bill is not going to get a loan. So what's going to happen, it's going to benefit those people who normally could go and get a loan but they're going to get it at a lower rate of

interest. Now, we are already funding Treasurer Donnewald's program by subsidizing the interest differential on his loss of interest at a normal rate to allow them to put the two hundred and twelve million dollars. And I...I just don't want the false impression that this is going to solve the farmer who is about ready to go under in my district's problem because this bill is not going to do anything for him or her.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President. I...am disappointed I guess that we got into a...a partisan debate on...on this issue with regard to the present administration. I am...we've work shoulder to shoulder and...and head to head on this issue for...for some weeks together and...and have disagreed with the...with the Secretary. I've talked with him on several occasions and tried to urge him to change his position, and I can recall never getting up on this Floor when...when an embargo was presented some years ago by another administration and yet I think that's why we are in part here today grappling with this problem, and I would hope that we not get involved in a partisan debate on this matter any further. I voted against this bill in committee, as Senator Demuzio very well knows, and I think it's quite a...an inappropriate position for a state to have, and I agree, Senator, with your position on that; and...and yet, it seems to me that given the inability of all of us to convince the Secretary that a change has to be made, I believe we need to advance a number of tools to help us get out of the dilemma that we're in. My problem, Senator, with the bill, and it continues to be a problem, is...is two or threefold. I guess, number one, I'm concerned that it almost becomes a bank bailout bill to the...to the extent that I...I'm afraid

they're going to...to charge a higher interest rate, and prevailing interest rate bothers me a little bit and they could up that by a percent or a percent and a half, and it seems to me that should be tied to something. We've not been able to do that yet. Secondly, I would like to see it with a one-year provision. I think we discussed that this morning and I think that's...that's your plan. I think that should be...that should be a...a part of the bill. And the third factor goes back to the bankers. If, as you suggest, that the farmer has to show a positive cash flow, as we discussed in committee some weeks ago, they can still alter that cash flow projection to allow a farmer to show a positive cash flow and then qualify for the loan. And I...I'm not sure we want to do that, it...it would seem to me as though there should be an oversight on that cash flow projection, because you can make...I can even make my farming operation show a cash flow, a positive cash flow, I'd love to do that, it doesn't look that way right now. But that's a...that's a prominent concern that I have. I'm going to vote for the bill this time. I'm going to vote to get it out of here. I'm not convinced it's the proper tool, but I...I think we need to advance those different mechanisms to try to resolve the problem.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Coffey.

SENATOR COFFEY:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I rise also in favor of this bill and would like to make a couple of comments. First of all, just a few short weeks ago when the Governor come out with his Build Illinois program I felt that agriculture should be part of that. I think it's a sad day that when we talk in this Body that another twenty-five million dollars to...to help out the agriculture industry of this State, that if we think that's too much money, I

think we need to take a look at the taxes that agriculture pays in to...to our schools, for instance. In one county in my district the total taxes collected is...around nine million dollars and of that nine million dollars, six million, a little...a few dollars less than six million is actually paid by agriculture by the farmer themselves. If we allow the agriculture in our districts, if we allow them to fail and if allow them not to go to the fields as...has presented several numbers to us; for instance, the Illinois bankers are saying maybe as many as five out of every banks might not be able to go to the field, I don't know what that percentage is going to be, I've heard as high as thirty percent of farm loans might be turned down. I'm not sure this is going to address all the problems but if it addresses only a small percent of those problems, it's going to be helpful. If we lose, if these farmers fail and do not go to the field and that if they take a Chapter 7 or a Chapter 11 and don't pay their real estate taxes, that money we're thinking about putting into education on the top end is going to be nothing to what they lose in those school districts. So I think this a...a bill that we ought to move on, it maybe needs a little work, I think we can still got a few days to do that, but I'd ask our...our colleagues to support this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I have since I've come in this Senate represented a district that has a farm in it, so I can rise with some standing on this question. I would like to address my comments to Senator Maitland, for whom I have a great deal of respect. But I would like to explain to you, Senator Maitland, why this has now become somewhat of a partisan issue, even though I know that you know why. Senator Joyce has referred to our native sons, we have the President

of the United States from Illinois, and we have the Secretary of Agriculture from Illinois and the present Governor of the State of Illinois was the campaign manager in Illinois of the President of the United States and was, in part, responsible for the Secretary of Agriculture being appointed to his position; and yet through all of this, he has remained relatively silent on the question. The farmers of Illinois have gone to him and have sought to involve him in their problem and he has played politics with...with this. He has chosen to stay on the side of the administration and not offend those people in Washington at the cost of sacrificing the farmers of Illinois, and that's why it has become a partisan issue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

I want to explain, I'm a real expert on this subject myself, I think I got three or four farms. No, I got two in Glenview and one in Buffalo Grove that I'm aware of. There's one in...unincorporated Northfield too. I wanted to throw in one thing for Senator Joyce, the other Senator Joyce. I've been sitting here listening and I'm sympathetic to what you're saying, but almost everyone who's bothered to study this problem realizes there are two or three very root causes. I can't remember who was President when we had a grain embargo, I don't remember, but it wasn't Ronald Regan, that much I do remember. And when you look at all the programs that started this deficit which is part of what's caused the dollar problem overseas, awful lot of those programs passed in the sixties and seventies. Now I can't remember who controlled Congress but it wasn't my party. So when you're blaming it on everyone, don't lose your historical perspective on where this came from. I've been sitting here so I'm going to vote for the bill, we're sympathetic on the issue, but while you guys make it a partisan issue...you

pretend like this problem started yesterday. Maybe I'm a little older than you guys are and maybe I have a longer memory, but some of us know this problem didn't start yesterday, that budget deficits started in the sixties under the great society and that grain embargo came under another president. So, when you're being partisan, keep in mind that the root cause goes back a little farther than the memories of some of our members.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Demuzio may close.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I won't attempt to get into all of the things that have gone back and forth. I want a program that works, I want a program that helps my community of Carlinville, I want a program that will help Carbondale and all the rest of the downstate communities and those areas that have farming interests. And my office has been loaded with people that can't get credit and can't get their...funding sources from the respective lending institutions that have traditionally...received their loans. It seems to me that there is still some room for negotiation as these bills cross the respective Chambers as we wait for additional congressional action, and it seems to me that, Senator Keats, the only thing I have to say is that the deficit under the current President is...far exceeds all of the deficits of George Washington up to his administration. So I would ask for your affirmative support on this bill...on Senate Bill 263.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 263 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays

are none, I voting Present. Senate Bill 263 having received the constitutional majority is declared passed. Senator Rock, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR ROCK:

...before we move to the Executive Committee report, I'd just like to point out a real true partisan issue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

With leave of the Body, we will now go to committee reports.

END OF REEL

REEL #3

SECRETARY:

Senator Lechowicz, chairman of the Committee on Executive Appointments, Veterans' Affairs and Administration to which was referred the Governor's Message of February the 5th, 1985, reports the same back with the recommendation that the Senate advise and consent to the following appointments.

Senator Lechowicz, chairman of the Committee on Executive Appointments, Veterans' Affairs and Administration to which was referred the Governor's Message of March the 6th, 1985, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Senate advise and consent to the following appointments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lenke...I mean, Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Senator Brady. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resolve itself into Executive Session for the purpose of acting on Governor's appointments set forth in the Message of February 5th, 1985, and Message of March 6th, 1985. Mr. President, with respect to the Governor's Message of February 5th, 1985, I will read the salaried appointments to which the Committee on Executive Appointments, Veteran Affairs and Administration recommends that the Senate do advise and consent.

To be the Director of Department of Agriculture for the term expiring January 19th, 1987, Larry Werries of Springfield.

To be Assistant Director of the Department of Agriculture for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Michael C. Williams of Pawnee.

To be Director of the Department of Law Enforcement for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, James B. Zagel of Chicago.

To be Assistant Director of the Department of Law Enforcement for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Christian R. Maerz of Darien.

To be Director of the Department of Rehabilitation Services for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Susan S. Suter of Springfield.

Mr. President, having read the salaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on one roll call, unless some Senator has objection to a specific appointment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

You've heard the two motions by Senator Lechowicz; the first that we go into Executive Session, and the second to consider these appointments on one roll call. Is leave granted? Leave was granted. All those now in favor of supporting Senator Lechowicz's motion on the appointments indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. We need a recorded roll call. All those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? (Machine cutoff)...the record. On that question, the Yeas are 57, the Nays are none, none voting Present. On that question, the Ayes are 57, the Nays are none, none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Mr. President, with the respect to the Governor's Message of March 6th, 1985, I'll read the salaried appointments to which the Committee on Executive Appointments, Veterans' Affairs and Administration recommends that the Senate do advise and consent.

To be a member of the Civil Service Commission for a term expiring March 1st, 1991, John L. Gilbert of Godfrey.

To be a member of the Court of Claims for a term expiring

on January 21st, 1991, Randy Patchett of Marion.

To be Assistant Director of the Department of Public Health for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Barbara Franzin-Weiner of Chicago.

To be a member of of the State Mining Board of...for a term expiring on January 19th, 1987, Robert Weatherford of Pinckneyville.

To be the State's...Sanitary District Observer for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Connie Peters of Arlington Heights.

To be a member of the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority for a term expiring May 1st, 1987, Nancy...Lundstrom of Rockford.

To be a member of the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority for a term expiring May 1st, 1989, Arthur Philip of Oak Brook.

Mr. President, having read the salaried appointments, I now seek to consider these appointments on one roll call, unless some Senator has objection to a specific appointment. Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

You...you've heard the motion. Leave is granted? Leave is granted. Then the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Yeas are 57, the Nays are none, none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. With the respect to the Governor's Message of March 6th, 1985, I'll read the

unsalaried appointments to which the Committee on Executive Appointments, Veterans' Affairs and Administration recommends that the Senate do advise and consent.

To be a member of the Board of Aeronautic Advisors for a term expiring January 1st, 1987, Joseph Lyon of Wayne.

To be members of the Board of Agriculture Advisors for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Kenneth Bush of Milan, Duane M. Smith of Allendale, Enid Schlipf of Gridley.

To be members of the Agriculture Export Advisory Committee for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, A. Bard Board of Barrington, John Hughes of Palos Heights, Leslie Shearer of Barrington.

To be members of the Advisory Board to...Department of Conservation for a term expiring January 21st, 1991, Paul Andricopoulos of Chicago, Mark Frech of Jacksonville.

To be a member of the Illinois Development Finance Authority for a term expiring January 16th, 1989, Ping Tom of Niles.

To be members of the Board of Higher Education for a term expiring January 31st, 1991, Warren Bacon of Chicago, Jane Rader of Cobden.

To be members of the State Board of Education for a term expiring January 21st, 1991, Peggy Pilas-Wood of Chicago, Walter Naumer of DuQuoin, Carroll Ebert of Naperville, Jacqueline Atkins of Chicago, Michael Bruton of Chicago, Denene Wilmeth of Decatur.

To be members of the Export Development Authority for a term expiring on January 20th, 1988, David J. Paulus of Winnetka, Sheldon Gray of Chicago.

To be a member of the Illinois Health Facilities Authority for a term expiring June 30th, 1989, Katherine S. Janega of Chicago.

To be members of the Health Facilities Planning Board for a term expiring June 30th, 1986, Bernard Weiner of Kankakee,

Harold Maysent of Rockford.

To be members of the Health Facilities Planning Board for a term expiring June 30th, 1985, Jonathan Shattuck of Evanston, Mary Barb Johnson of Lake Forest, Marjorie Albrecht of Princeton.

To be a member of the Illinois...Illinois State Historical Library Board of Trustees for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Frank Mason of Springfield.

To be members of the Illinois Housing Development Authority for a term expiring January 9th, 1989, Mr. A.D. VanMeter of Springfield, Arthur F. Quern of Evanston, Dr. Rudolph Shoultz of Springfield.

To be members of the Board of Livestock Commissioners for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Joseph Cochonour of Casey, Art Barnard of Wayne City.

To be members of the Medical Determinations Board for a term expiring June 27, 1988, Philip M. Foreman of River Forest.

To be a member of the Board of Natural Resources and Conservation for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Walter Hanson of Springfield.

To be a Public Administrator, Guardian and Conservator of Grundy County for a term expiring December 2, 1988, Diane Yohnka of Morris.

To be a member of the Southern Illinois University, Board of Trustees for a term expiring January 21st, 1991, Ivan A. Elliott,...Jr. of Carmi.

Mr. President, having read the unsalaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on one roll call, unless some Senator has objection to a specific appointment. Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules.

PRESIDENT:

All right. You've heard the request of the gentleman.

Is leave granted? Leave is granted. The question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move the Senate arise from Executive Session.

PRESIDENT:

You've heard the gentleman's motion. All in favor of the motion to arise indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. It's so ordered. Introduction of bills.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 439, introduced by Senators Lenke, Darrow, Vadalabene and Geo-Karis.

{Secretary read title of bill}

440, by Senators Bloom and Luft.

{Secretary reads title of bill}

441, Senator Kustra.

{Secretary reads title of bill}

1st reading of the bills.

PRESIDENT:

Any further business to come before the Senate? Announcements? Senator Sangmeister.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

Yes,...Executive...the Executive Committee will meet immediately after adjournment in Room 212.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Zito...Senator Welch, at Senator Zito's mike.

SENATOR WELCH:

Mr. President, I would ask that Senator Zito be added as hyphenated cosponsor to Senate Bill No. 160 and a hyphenated cosponsor to House Bill 223.

PRESIDENT:

All right. The gentleman seeks leave to show Senator Zito for Senate Bill 160 and House Bill 223. Leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like leave to add Senator Zito as a hyphenated sponsor to Senate Bill 254.

PRESIDENT:

The gentleman seeks leave to add Senator Zito as a co-sponsor of 254...Senate Bill 254. Without objection, is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you. I'd like to have permission to add Senator Hudson to...as a cosponsor to Senate Bill 7.

PRESIDENT:

Senate Bill 7? The lady seeks leave to have Senator Hudson as a cosponsor of Senate Bill 7. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. To announce that the Insurance Committee will meet here on the Senate Floor at 4:00 p.m. and also to seek leave to suspend the posting requirements for Senate Bill 147 so it can be heard today in the Insurance Committee. It was inadvertently left off the posting and I ask leave that that...so that that bill can be heard.

PRESIDENT:

All right. The gentleman asks leave to suspend the rules...prerequisite the posting for Senate Bill 147. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Dawson.

SENATOR DAWSON:

Mr. President, I'd like to announce that the Public Health Committee will meet in Room 400 right after adjournment.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Public Health immediately after adjournment in Room 400. Any further business to come before the Senate? Further announcements? If not, Senator Hall moves that the Senate stand adjourned until Wednesday, the 27th day of March, tomorrow, at noon. Wednesday, at noon. Senate stands adjourned.