

84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

REGULAR SESSION

March 5, 1935

PRESIDENT:

Senate will please come to order. Will the members be at their desks. Will our guests in the gallery please rise. Prayer this afternoon by the Reverend Eugene Weitzel, the Director of Chaplains at St. John's Hospital, Springfield, Illinois. Father.

REVEREND WEITZEL:

(Prayer given by Reverend Weitzel)

PRESIDENT:

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

SENATOR KELLY:

Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Thursday, February 21st; Wednesday, February 27th, and Thursday, February 28th, in the year 1935, be postponed pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDENT:

You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Kelly. 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. Senator Savickas, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Purpose of announcement. Senator Smith will be absent today due to illness.

PRESIDENT:

The record will so reflect. Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 56 offered by Senator Jeremiah Joyce, it's congratulatory.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar. Introduction of bills.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 260 introduced by Senator Holmberg.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

261, the same sponsor.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

262, by Senators Demuzio, O'Daniel, Poshard, Welch and others.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

263, the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

264, Senator Savickas.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

265, Senator Geo-Karis.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

266, Senator Lemke.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

267, the same sponsor.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

268, the same sponsor.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

269, the same sponsor.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

270, same sponsor.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

271, the same sponsor.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

272, the same sponsor.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

273, Senator Degnan.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bills.

PRESIDENT:

Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 57 offered by Senator Davidson and all Senators, and it's congratulatory.

*Committee of the Whole  
S.R. 48*

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar. If I can have your attention, WCIA - TV and WICS - TV have requested permission to film the proceedings. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. (Machine cut-off)...Lenke, for what purpose do you arise, sir?

SENATOR LENKE:

Just to let the record show that last Thursday I was absent because of personal reasons involving my grandchild who is going in a special education program, and I ask to be excused.

PRESIDENT:

The record will so reflect. If I can have the attention of the membership, as I'm sure you're aware, we will shortly convene as a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of discussing education reform and funding, and immediately after that Committee of the Whole we will then reconvene in regular Session. Senator Berman has indicated that there will be ample time for everyone to ask whatever questions and discuss whatever they wish. So that...Senator Berman, if you are prepared...Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr...thank you, Mr. President. I move the Senate do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the issues of education reform and education funding.

PRESIDENT:

All right. You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Berman that we resolve ourselves into a Committee of the Whole. If there's no discussion, that's pursuant to Senate Resolution 48, all in favor of Senator Berman's motion indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The Senate is now convened as a Committee of the Whole and the Chair will yield to Senator Arthur Berman, the chairman of the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Thank you, Mr...thank you, Mr. President. The Committee of the Whole will come to order, please. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, today is the first of a series of meetings of the Senate as a Committee of the Whole pursuant to Senate Resolution 48 that was sponsored by Senate President Rock, Senate Minority Leader Philip, Education Committee Spokesman Maitland and myself. Today we are honored to have with us the new Superintendent of the Illinois State Board of Education, who I will introduce in a moment. Following Mr. Sanders' presentation, we will have time for questions and answers from the members of the Senate. Following today's Committee of the Whole, we will have another Committee of the Whole scheduled for March 19th, at which time we will hear from Miss Gail Lieberman, who was the coordinator of the Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education and from Dr. Michael Bakalis, Executive Director of the Illinois Project for School Reform. We anticipate having other Committees of the Whole on March 26th and April 10th. The witnesses on those respective dates to be announced as soon as they are confirmed. The purpose of today and the following Committee of the Whole Sessions is to allow all of the members of the Senate to hear from representatives of groups that have made studies and issued reports dealing with education reform and education funding. Because of the importance of these subjects, we have decided pursuant to the resolution that was adopted that it's important for all of the members of the Illinois Senate to have an opportunity for hearing and questioning on these critical issues, in addition to the normal procedures which we will follow as to the deliberations of the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education, the Appropriations Committees and the Revenue Committees. This morning...morning to...we have with us, in addition to the new superintendent, I would like to acknowl-

edge the present...presence of Walter W. Naumer, Jr., who is the chairman of the Illinois State Board of Education. Walt, thank you for joining us. Ted Sanders was appointed Illinois State Superintendent of Education in January of this year. Previously, Mr. Sanders had served as superintendent of public instruction in Nevada since January of 1979. For eight years prior to that he had held several administrative positions, including the second ranking position in the New Mexico Department of Education. He has been a leader of the Council of Chief State School Officers, having recently completed a three-year term on their Board of Directors. Mr. Sanders chaired the council's committee on teacher education, preparation and accreditation, which committee recently issued the report staffing the nation's schools...a national emergency. Mr. Sanders began his career as a mathematics-physical education teacher and acting principal in Mountain Home, Idaho. Before joining the New Mexico Department he was also a teacher and a chair over the mathematics and science department for a Navaho Secondary School in Crownpoint, New Mexico, graduate teaching assistant in the West Texas State University mathematics department and teacher in mathematics department chair at Cleveland Jr. High School in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Mr. Sanders earned a Bachelor of Science degree in mathematics and education at Wayland University in Texas and a Master of Arts in teaching from Washington State University. He is nearing the completion of requirements for a doctoral degree in educational administration at the University of Nevada in Reno. We, in Illinois...ladies and gentlemen, we, in Illinois, are very fortunate to have a man of Ted Sanders' caliber here in our State; and on behalf of the Illinois Senate, Mr. Sanders, I welcome you to Illinois. Ladies and gentlemen, Ted Sanders.

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

(Machine cutoff)...Rock, Chairman Berman, distinguished

members of the Senate, I am indeed pleased to be before you today on this important occasion. Although you regularly deal with the weighty matters which have great effect upon the daily lives of Illinois citizens, I submit that the topic with which we are concerned today is of supreme importance to the youth of today and to the future generations of Illinois adults. Your action today to meet as a Committee of the Whole signals to our State your intent to address the important concerns dealing with the improvement of our schools this year. This is indeed an exciting time for Illinois education. A strong and a...prosperous state is dependent upon having strong and effective schools. Having education first on the public agenda helps to generate the excitement and the motivation necessary to achieve significant educational reform. And the essence of that reform is the revitalization of the thousands of classrooms which make up the Illinois school system. I have with me today materials which will supplement our presentation to you. First of all, a summary of the State Board of Education studies and recommendations to address these important issues of reform; and secondly, a matrix which will compare for you the recommendations that have emanated not only from the board's studies but from those other studies that you will be hearing about as you address this important issue. I ask that you give them your careful attention. I won't spend a lot of time today with you on the board's detailed proposals; instead, I'd like to use the brief time that we have together to give you an impression of where we're coming from and why. There are five major educational improvement problems that we must address, at least as we see them. First of all, declining student achievement. Second, the quality of teaching and administration...third, the neglected one-fourth of our students who are at risk of failure in school and account for the major part of our decline in achievement. Fourth, the

gap between the needs of employers and the training we provide for students going directly into the work force from high school; and fifth, the inadequacy and lack of equity in the financial support of our schools. In addressing these problems we should first and foremost show a degree of humility in determining exactly what the State can do about them. We must resist the temptation to believe and therefore act upon the assumption that the State can be so detailed in its requirements and that in effect runs...that it in effect runs the day-by-day operation of our schools. The facts tell us that we should restrict our efforts to setting general conditions which require certain improvements at the school level without hampering local problem-solving ingenuity. We must remember that real improvements in education have in the past bubbled up from creative teachers, principals, superintendents and school boards who were spurred on by nothing more than the desire to do a good job. That doesn't mean, however, that such people do not look to the State for guidance and for the very necessary messages on what is important in education. You and others who serve here speak with the voice of the people. It is you who gives the impetus and the direction to education by telling us what, in your collective wisdom, represents that will of the people. Legislatures before you and down through history have done a good job of meeting their responsibility to lead our schools. Evidence abounds that Illinois schools have always been more than good, they've been top-notch. Now we face another challenge today, a challenge to be even better, and it calls for us to take a new look at what we as a State tell our local districts is important in the educational enterprise. Given that backdrop, let me first address the problem of student achievement and what, in our opinion, appears to be appropriate for State action in addressing that problem. Your predecessors and mine long ago decided that a convenient and

effective way to see that the right things were learned was to specify the right things to be taught. As time went on, these statements in the Statutes became more and more detailed. As a consequence, Illinois Statutes are filled with requirements that schools offer certain courses and that students be required to take them. Many such laws were written when fewer than half of our children went through high school and when many jobs required less than a high school diploma. They appear to have worked well under the conditions and seemed to satisfy a public need for understandable standards for our schools. As time went on, however, the convenience of the school system setting attracted a number of programs which were designed to solve pressing problems in the general society which, although they were real and intense, were remote from what most of us then and now regard as the essence of education. Since they were adopted as school responsibilities in an era when prescribing courses was the avenue used by the State, each got such a requirement in law, adding incrementally to the task of the schools, and through doing so further narrowed available choices for both schools and students. As a consequence, we now find the State in an awkward position of being an unwitting contributor to the conditions which allow for declining student achievement. Our leadership has helped to lead local boards and teachers to believe that the State's interest stops at the level of schools providing courses and students taking them. We have little or no interest expressed in our laws about what students have learned or what they're able to do as a consequence of their schooling. The time is upon us to change all that. As your commission under the leadership of Senator Berman has concluded, the State must begin to express clearly what it thinks is important for students...for schools to give their attention to, and it must also find out whether students are learning at least what the State expects



them to know. Such a step sounds simple, perhaps too simple, to yield important results; but both I and the State Board of Education, supported by major national studies, believe strongly that a move to define the State's interest in terms of knowledge rather than courses, skills, rather than hours behind the wheel, holds the greatest promise for unleashing the local creative energy necessary to solve the problem of student achievement in the foreseeable future. I might mention here that we also believe, and other major studies also agree, that such a move must be coupled with rigorous testing and public reporting of results to insure that the healthy stimulus of informed public opinion is always prodding our local schools to do their utmost for our children. The second problem mentioned earlier has to do with the quality of our teachers and administrators. Any efforts at reform that do not address the quality of our work force will simply miss the mark. How does the State set conditions to improve what is generally acknowledged to be an area of great concern? It goes without saying that if our teachers are not the best and their leaders are not outstanding educators, all other efforts at reform may well be in vain. The State Board of Education believes, as does every other group, nationally and in this State, that it is nothing short of absurd that our average teacher, with years of experience, earns no more than a twenty-one year old engineer. We are literally entrusting our children and our future to a group of people paid at a level comparable to unskilled labor. As a consequence, we draw too many of our teachers and future administrators from the lower ranks of high school and college graduates, and those who are truly exceptional often choose to leave the profession for more lucrative employment. We must change the status of teachers in our society. We must begin by making their salaries more competitive, their training more rigorous and their licensing more demanding. We must

continue in the future by assuring that they are supported by strong local evaluation systems and inservice training in keeping their skills up-to-date. It's indeed sobering to realize that just this year two hundred seventy-five teaching jobs in Illinois were not filled, first, because one-third of them had no applicants whatsoever and the remainder had no qualified applicants. This year, for the first time in recent history, two dozen of these jobs were in the important field of mathematics. Who is to lead teachers in providing superior service to our students? We've allowed the important instructional leadership role of the school principal to be eroded by paper work and housekeeping duties. We must today reassert our conviction that principals are primarily instructional leaders, and we must provide them with the training and support necessary to assure that they perform in this role. The State Board of Education has suggested and you have supported the creation of a principal's academy to help in accomplishing this task. We must continue and expand our efforts in this important area. Next, I would like to bring to your attention to what I call the "neglected" one-fourth of our students. Nearly one-half...near half a million Illinois students come from poor families. Nearly twenty-one percent of our students who enter ninth grade do not continue through four years of high school and graduate. That rate is even higher today for minority students. Nearly half of our black and Hispanic students do not complete high school. An unacceptably large group of our poor and minority students are chronic school failures, and in the last ten years the proportion of such students in our schools has increased by nearly one-third. This waste of human potential is reflected in every set of school achievement statistics reported in the general...to the general public. What isn't reported is the human tragedy and the squandering of financial resources that are embodied in their condition. These

and other children from all levels of society who fail in school can be helped to succeed. Research tells us that these "at risk" youngsters can be identified early in their lives, at...as early as three or four years of age, and special help for them can pay off in two ways; first of all, in success in school and...and...then in success in life. These studies show that early identification and intervention yields seven dollars saved for every one dollar invested in such programs. The State Board is sufficiently interested in these programs to be studying their viability for Illinois right now and right now is when we should act to provide the support so necessary for these children. To briefly recapitulate, before moving on to another matter, I believe the following steps should be taken immediately, and these are drawn from those studies in which the State Board of Education has been engaged over the last three years. First of all, the State should concentrate its requirements on what we want our children to learn rather than specifying course and time allocations. Each local school district should be required to establish learning objectives for its students which are consistent with learning statements prescribed in State law and develop appropriate testing and other assessment systems for determining the degree to which such objectives are being achieved. The State should require public reporting of test results in a manner which will satisfy the public that students are achieving what the State expects; and if they're not, that appropriate local school action has been taken to see that they do. Next, once the system we have just mentioned is in place, the State should repeal all references to its laws relative to course and time requirements. Next, the State should act immediately to repeal the requirement that schools provide, and that students take, behind-the-wheel driver education. This program should not be competing with school time in the areas of mathematics,

sciences and foreign language. Next, the State should, as an interim measure, change the requirement in physical education so that the program is elective in grades eleven and twelve. Next, the State should alter the requirement in bilingual education so that such services are provided for all of our students in need, not those who just happen to appear in groups of twenty or more. Special education services should be provided for certain handicapped children from youth...from birth. The State should require students to remain in school, even part-time, until age eighteen or the completion of a high school program. The State should...redefine truancy, and chronic truancy relating both the definition and school attendance to academic performance.

The emphasis should be on supportive services. The State should improve salaries of teachers in order to attract and to retain capable individuals in the profession. The State should provide scholarships emphasizing the need for retraining of our teachers. Institutions of higher education should improve the rigor of teacher preparation programs. The State should require personnel evaluation plans for each school districts, and the State should provide programs to assist principals and other supervisory personnel in developing effective evaluation skills. Education for employment of our youngsters who graduate from high school and go on to work is a continuing concern for the State Board of Education and all of us who recognize that one-third of our students make this choice to enter the...work force directly from high school. The State's vocational education delivery system is in need of an overhaul today. Many of our teachers have not worked on state-of-the-art industrial equipment for twenty years; students are learning on manual typewriters today in a word-processing age and some programs are being provided whether they address a labor market need or not. The board has called for drastic change in the manner in which programs

are planned and which will require more careful attention to labor market needs on...a regional basis; a systematic effort to enlist industry and business in the training of teachers in modern industrial environments and a move toward insuring the modernization of equipment and facilities to bring them in line with the real world. Surely, such an effort will be worth it if it contributes not only to the healthy development of our young people but also to the economic well-being of our State. I urge you to give us your support as we implement these new measures. Last, we come to the question of funding. In all discussions of school reform, questions about funding are paramount. How much is needed, why is it needed, and who should pay for it? Education is a responsibility of the State. The State creates local boards and districts. The State provides for local taxing authority and mechanisms, and the State monitors and regulates the conduct of education. The Illinois Constitution stipulates that the State has primary responsibility for financing. But that's not the direction that Illinois has been headed for at least the last decade. The decline in the State's share from forty-eight percent in 1976 to the current thirty-nine percent means that more than two billion dollars has shifted from State revenue sources to those of local school districts. During the past several years we've been developing a procedure that is beginning to provide a basis for determining how much money should be made available for the education of our elementary and secondary education students. Indications are at this point that we are substantially below a spending level that would provide an adequate set of programs and services for all our students. Hundreds of school districts, by their own testimony, have had to respond to a shortage of funds by public...by program cutbacks, laying off teachers, and making decisions not to offer courses even though they know they are needed and would be beneficial to

their students. Many of our students do not have sufficient funds behind their education. Education per pupil in Illinois schools range from a low of sixteen hundred dollars this year to over nine thousand dollars at the high end. While some of this disparity is due to differences in district size, there is nonetheless a strong indicator here that for too many of our students there are simply not enough resources available. Should we do more? Other states do. Although Illinois is part of the national picture of shared state and local responsibility for education, it's far below the national average of about a fifty-one percent state share; in fact, given our size, Illinois' current share of less than forty percent undoubtedly pulls down the national average. Of all the funding formulas now being used for state aid, which include special education, transportation, vocational education and others, only the general State Aid Formula addresses in any real sense the question of equity. That is, are the districts with the greatest fiscal need getting the greatest fiscal help from the State? And even that formula has eroded in its equity capacity over the past several years because of shifts and reversals in formula conditions such as attendance, assessments, tax exemptions and tax revenue access. The range of equalized assessed valuations per pupil today is even greater than the range of operating expenditures. They start at a low of eighteen thousand dollars per pupil and range upwards to over 1.6 million dollars per pupil. While the State general aid formula takes much of this into account, the same is not true for categorical reimbursements in special education, vocational, gifted, bilingual and other areas. These circumstances suggest that the funding for education in Illinois is not generally adequate or equitable. I have made my Fiscal Year '86 recommendations to the State Board of Education and they will consider them for adoption as a part of their budget on March

14th. The question of "how much" is treated by first recommending that the State provide for a four percent inflationary increase over this year's combined estimated State and local expenditures, recognizing that the no-growth situation in local assessments creates a real barrier to increases in local operating revenues. This four percents...four percent yields approximately two hundred twenty-five million dollars to be applied as follows: two hundred million in the area of general aid and twenty-six million to mandated formula reimbursement programs to fully fund them as they're currently structured under law. Added to this, a request for fifty-three million dollars increase for other categoricals and special programs to provide full State support for full student participation in gifted, bilingual, vocational, adult, textbook and other programs. And finally, then, reform costs. Based on the board's comprehensive set of mandate and policy studies, our request calls for ninety-two million dollars in Fiscal Year '86 as the beginning of an investment in the State's commitment to reform in instructional programs, teacher salaries and staff development, pilot efforts in special education early childhood programs, and alternative programs for dropout-prone high school students. This total increase, which amounts to over three hundred seventy-two million dollars, meets the basic Statewide fiscal needs, provides support for growth in programs of long standing and begins the State's commitment to responsible, effective educational reform. The two hundred million dollars to be distributed through general State aid will be used in part to begin to restore a greater...degree of equity in State support among the differing types of districts, elementary, secondary and unit. We will be bringing to you recommendations for changes in the formula dealing with tax rates, weightings or other formula factors that will be directed at the equity problem. While the resource cost

model and formula developed through the board's finance study are not yet ready for implementation and will continue to be subjects of our study, they have served to document the depth of financial reform both in equity and adequacy, that this State must continue to address in the years to come. The State Board of Education is heartened by the other major education reports, including that from your own commission, which accomplished an enormous task in a short period of time. Taking...taken as a group, they are more noteworthy for their broad areas of agreement than for their differences. They give us and, I am sure, the people of Illinois confidence that agreement can be reached on what is needed in Illinois education and that change of a positive nature will indeed occur. Reasonable people, proceeding independently of one another, have arrived at markedly similar conclusions and now the political process will act, as it always has, in the best interest of all of our people. I know that you'll do the right thing. The State Board of Education and I stand ready to help you in the debate and the decisions that will follow. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERNAN)

Thank you, Mr. Sanders. Now, we will open up for questions to Mr. Sanders from the members of the Senate. Let me lead off so that we try to put some of this into prospective...you had said about a recommended increase of three hundred and seventy-two million dollars. Would you address how that figure compares to the three hundred and thirty million dollars that the Governor recommended last week?

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, our three hundred seventy-two million dollar request excludes the...the treatment of the sixty percent payout in teacher retirement; if you fund that at the level that the Governor is proposing, our total request would come to four hundred four million dollars to contrast



directly against the three hundred thirty million dollars. If you'd like, I can go into some specific differences in the general aid and the specific reform proposals also if you'd like.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

If...if you would for a moment.

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

Yes. In...in general aid, the Governor is recommending a hundred twenty-five million new dollars; we're proposing two hundred million dollars, as I mentioned there. Secondly, we're proposing that the categorical programs that are mandated by the State be fully funded. As they currently exist in Statute, that would require an additional 14.8 million dollars in special education funds, 10.2 million dollars in transportation funds and eight hundred forty-seven thousand dollars in lunch and breakfast programs. The other categoricals which include programs and vocational education, textbooks, gifted, the truants alternative program and others, we're requesting an additional forty-seven and one-half million dollars; fourteen million of that would be added to our vocational programs, twelve million in textbooks, bringing the total to twenty-three million dollars. Those are the major items. Other special programs we're recommending be increased by 4.9 million dollars, and the reform costs that we discussed funded at roughly ninety-two million dollars; eighty million dollars of which would be to improve salaries. Here, we are consistent, Mr. Chairman, with your own commission report in recommending eighty million dollars this year as the beginning of a three-year commitment to raise salaries in the State to twenty thousand dollars. The Governor's proposal calls for ten million dollars to be used to raise salaries to fifteen thousand dollars this coming year, and with additional funds made available to develop and then implement performance pay plans and career ladders.

We're requesting two million dollars in staff development funds as the beginning of an effort to fully fund staff development programs aimed at up-grading the skills and knowledges of our teaching force. Three hundred fifty-nine thousand dollars in our request for scholarship funds; seventy percent of that would be used in our proposal to support teachers who are willing to cross-train in areas where we're experiencing shortages, and thirty percent to go to prospective teachers who are currently in teacher training programs. 5.4 million dollars of our request would go to funding the planning and implementation of our learning outcomes proposal that would be the beginning of a three-year investment that way, with an additional four hundred thousand dollars intended and targeted for the development of a State-wide assessment or testing program to develop those anchor items that would be embedded into the expected testing programs to be implemented locally so that we might have a fix not only on pupil performance in district reporting systems but at a State level...consistent with the State's expectations for learning; two million dollars to address a compulsory attendance initiative, the beginnings of a several year effort to address the problems of loss in our schools between grades nine and twelve that we referenced earlier, and a million dollars that would be spent in pilot special education programs for zero to three, and just over one million dollars, Mr. Chairman, that would be allocated to those districts that have already exercised the statutory incentives for reorganization and have now consolidated and are therefore now entitled to those funds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Thank you. Senator Holmberg.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Superintendent Sanders, I noticed that one of the ways in which your report differs

from the Governor is the level at which you are establishing the minimum salaries for teachers.

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

Yes.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

How do you view the Governor's proposal of fifteen thousand dollars and would this be acceptable?

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

Well, I think the Governor's proposal is a step in the right direction. I believe that we should make the commitment to move through across the three-year period as your own commission and we are recommending to fully funding twenty thousand dollar minimum starting salary. When you look at statistics about our teaching force today and you find that a forty-one year old person in our classrooms making just over twenty-four thousand dollars is the average teacher, that salary is roughly what a beginning engineer makes. We're not competitive. Fifteen thousand dollars will move us in that direction; twenty thousand dollars will do much more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and let me first say, welcome, Director.

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

Thank you.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

One comment and one question. The comment is that among the five major subject matters that you chose, although you mentioned dropout in context of your speech, there wasn't very much emphasis placed upon that and I'm...I'm concerned about that. The second...the question I'd like to ask is this and it relates to priorities. You just discussed the...the fact, with which I agree, that teachers' salaries

do need to be raised. I wonder if you have some concerns about the priorities with which the dollars that are presently available are expended; for example, in some schools, it is my understanding, that the janitor makes more than the teacher, which seems to say to the children that...it sends a message out which I think is absolutely devastating to the youngsters in those schools. I understand also that most of the tradesmen make more than the teachers. Now, in the lawyers' union we say, you spent x-number of dollars for your college education and you have to recoup it, and you lost wages for that period and you have to recoup it, and you spent x-number of dollars for tuition in...in law school, you have to recoup that. You spent...you lost x-number of wages at that...for that seven-year period, you have to recoup that. That seems to me to be logical. So, if you're saying...if we say that we want teachers with masters degrees, for example, in competition with people who may have the equivalent of a high school education, and I'm not knocking that, they're honorable...it's honorable employment, it seems to me that a question ought to be raised as to how we set our priorities with regard to what happens in our educational system. If the emphasis seems to be placed on the maintenance of structures rather than instruction of children, it seems to me that's...that's absolutely...a...a...a diversion of priorities that we ought to address all at once. Do you agree with that position and are you willing to take some steps in that direction?

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

I...I basically agree with the position as I understand it, Senator. I believe that we...our task must not be to just maintain for maintenance sake, that we must...but we must maintain quality programs that currently exist, but we must foster from the State level the kinds of conditions that allow each school to become an inquiring institution, con-

tinuously improving itself and the services, educational and otherwise, that it delivers to its students. That means that there are some things that we can do, as we've talked about, instructionally that deal with some of the...that fosters the answer to some of the problems that face our schools. It means, likewise, that specifically it's time for us to make the commitment at a State level to improve the compensation levels of our teachers. While we may not be able to tamper greatly with the priorities that may be established or have been established in the past relative to the compensation levels within classes of employees in school districts; certainly, by this proposal, our proposal, our committed effort to address the salary question at a State level, we not only signal that we value teaching as a society, that we're willing to better compensate teachers, we also begin to deal with the long-term problems that we're going to face in the nineties and beyond with the quality of work force that will be in our schools then.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thank you, very much. I wonder if you would have some of your staff people prepare for my office some kind of table that will give me some idea concretely of what those salary differentials are...

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

Yes.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

...between those who maintain and those who teach and that kind of thing.

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

Yes. I'd be happy to, Senator.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thank you, very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to be sure that I am clear about the State Board and your proposals with respect to the way in which the State's funding is going to be distributed, at least, as they stand at the current time. Now, as I understand it, you will be making some recommendations with respect to some shifting within the basic formula; that is, the...the weighting or perhaps the tax rates or whatever, and that will be forthcoming at some point soon, I gather. Is that correct, first?

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

That is correct, Senator. Yes.

SENATOR NETSCH:

But then, and, a proposal...a specific proposal with respect to the resource cost model will not be forthcoming this year, as I understand it; at least, not from...from you as a source. Is that correct?

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

That is correct, Mr. Chairman, Senator.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Then, as far as the State Board and you, as superintendent, are concerned, the...the funds that will be the State's share this year will be distributed in approximately the same manner that they have been in the past; that is, the largest hunk through the general State aid formula and, then, some through categorical and perhaps some additional funds through the...the special reform projects that are incorporated within your...your board's recommendations. But there will be no major restructuring of the way in which school funds are to be distributed. Is...is that a fair statement of your position?

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

That...that is correct. There will be some restructuring, but it will be in the context of the current

school finance plan and formula. Yes.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Does that mean that an idea such as the resource cost model has been for all effective purposes or for all practical purposes abandoned?

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

No, it does not, Mr. Chairman, Senator. In my...in making my recommendations to the State Board of Education last week, it was my recommendation that we continue over the next year or two the study of school finance issues, that we address the...the technical questions that have still not been answered relative to the resource cost model, and that we begin addressing some of the other kinds of issues that ought to be looked at in conjunction with it, such as a definition of what constitutes an adequate program as well as adequate funding.

SENATOR NETSCH:

I...I guess, and perhaps this is more of a comment or rhetorical question, but one thing that...that does strike me is that if this is to be the year of educational reform, it is also the year in which any major restructuring of the distribution system should also take place, and the...the momentum may be gone after this year. Does that concern you? I'll make that my question. Does that concern you?

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

Certainly that concerns me, and I hope, as I stand before you today, that this isn't the last year of intense focus on our schools. Yes, it concerns me. This...the climate of today though is more closely focused on reforms than...that have a relationship to instruction, to teachers and to those kinds of issues much more than the focus that we had in the seventies on financial reform. Yes, we've got to sensibly address those concerns about our current finance plan; but to...to do so in a fashion that's not carefully thought out

may yield greater folly than not taking the opportunities that the time may present.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Sanders, I am one of those who is very much concerned about the...the equity or the lack of equity that exists in the present formula for distributing State aid. Now, I'd like to pursue the...the...some of the same thoughts that were just raised by...by Senator...Senator Netsch. You indicated in your response to her question and also in your initial remarks that you're going to take a longer time to look at the resource cost model. My own feeling is that there is much, while there are some problems with that particular proposal and the way in which it...it would work, that nevertheless that basically it is a...represents a far more equitable method for distributing State aid than the formula we now have. You did say that what you proposed to do, at least as I understood your earlier remarks, you said that you would initiate some revisions in the existing State Aid Formula for implementation in this next year. I...I have two questions. First of all, could you elaborate further on what...what kinds of changes that you are now examining for possible implementation? And then, number two, if you could share with us what your time schedule is going to be. When might we know what these changes are going to look like?

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

Yes. First, in response to the...the first question, there are several issue areas that are very, very evident out of the...the study that brought forward the RCM. First of all, we know very clearly that we've got to improve the relationship between the funding of elementary and high school districts. We know that we must do something further to respond to the needs of...of children in poverty. We know



that we've got to do something in terms of more equitable access to the tax rates between the...the various kinds of districts, specifically the unit districts in relationship to the dual districts. And we've got to do all of this at...at the same time that we do not cause some of our districts to sacrifice the levels of quality that currently exist in their schools, so that we may assist those who have the...the greatest amount of need. No small challenge. Timewise, it is our full intent to have recommendations to you in a fashion timely to...your decision-making processes. I wish I could guarantee you this morning, as I stand here before you, that we would have a firm set of recommendations back in two weeks or a month; but I learned early in the...in coming to Illinois and trying to grapple with the questions surrounding the RCH and what general recommendations we might bring forward that the time schedule doesn't necessarily move as quickly as one would...would like, but we have a firm commitment to have those recommendations to you so that you can use them in a sensible fashion in your decision making.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Mr. Superintendent, I can't help but tell you that as I sit here as a representative of the suburban collar county areas that I can't help but think, based on your comments, that there are very dark days ahead for the school children in my area. It...it appears to me that based on what's I'm hearing from you and other sources that we may very well implement "reforms" that will drive education costs, but we will then distribute whatever new money by a formula that is totally unfair to my area, and that I have the very distinct possibility in July and August of seeing headlines that education reforms actually cost my districts more than they get at a time when referendum after referendum has gone down; and

while you and the Governor and the rest of us are out putting out press releases and beating our chest about how noble we've been in education and all the new money, our school districts will be putting out in my area press releases announcing that band and gym and extra curriculum activities and the computer program and everything that we fought for twenty years to build is going down the chute because of a formula that you and that bunch of wonders we call the State Board of Education choose not to take a look at this year, because of a formula that's based on a very unfair assessment of wealth, that being assessed valuation, not ability to pay. I've got districts, I've got a district that has a lower percapita income than the City of Chicago that is getting one dollar in four compared to the City of Chicago. That isn't fair. We've got to do something with that formula, and to talk about reform and not talk about formula reform, and not talk about a formula that each of us can go back in our district and say, we got x-number of dollars because the...wealth in our area is this and such, is to avoid the issue completely. We've got to address that formula or everything else we do is just window dressing and posture taking. I am bitterly disappointed that the board has chosen to cop out. I can't blame you. You haven't been here long enough to take the blame. I'll give you about another week and half. But please, please think about what you're doing. Just raising the minimum salaries, our districts, frankly, pay above that, but when you compress that salary schedule and you come up with a program to make up the differences to the schools that weren't at that minimum level, don't forget, you've pushed up the other top of that salary level for all of us without a program to compensate the districts. You'll drive up our costs, but you won't compensate districts that I represent without some looking at that formula. Please don't cop out. I can't blame you, you're a new kid on the street,

and you're going to be able to get away with murder for a couple of months because of that, but I can blame the State Board of Elections...Board of Education and I will. We need reform of that formula and we need a formula that each of us can go back into our districts and defend. I can't defend that formula, and I haven't heard anybody around here try in a long, long time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Superintendent, nice to see you again this afternoon. First part of my question was going to deal with the issue that Senator Schaffer just addressed, and I would have addressed it perhaps somewhat the same way. I have the same kind of district structure in my legislative district and it's very difficult as I've been doing in recent weeks to go out and preach reform with those people fully understanding that they're not going to get much of the money that's going to go with paying for that...that reform, but nonetheless, the reform is very necessary and will come forward. But let me address another issue, the issue of school district reorganization, and I'm a little bit concerned with the point that you make about addressing the equity factor with the different types of districts, and I understand...that's an issue, it's an ongoing issue every year here. Do we not need, perhaps, to move forward with...with a statement, a strong statement in position suggesting only one type of...of school structure in Illinois? With over a thousand districts here and having...the three different structures, that in itself is a problem for all of us to deal with. So, I would submit to you, and this is in the form of a statement, that perhaps we need to move toward a one type school district in Illinois. Secondly, then, this is my question specifically, those school dis-

tricts, a thousand in number, it is a disadvantage to the...many times to...to consolidate because of the formula and all...all of these things, because zero plus zero still equals zero, there's no advantage except to the advantage of the kids and sometimes we don't think about that. Do we need to move forward with more legislation that encourages consolidation? It's a very emotional issue in some of these rural districts to attempt to consolidate, and it sometimes takes the carrot to encourage that consolidation, and we've done some of that in Illinois. But does the State Board and do you in particular, are you recommending any other encouraging factors to encourage consolidation?

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

Mr. Chairman, Senator, yes, we've just started a...a study that, again, we hope to have complete in short order that...that at least will begin to shape our thinking and our proposals to you in the area of school district organization or reorganization. Certainly, we need to be gravely concerned about the quality of education that we're able to offer simply based upon the whole issue of scale. A lot of economies scale from a financial standpoint, but economies have scaled from an...an educational standpoint. Today we have sixty-one high school districts in the State that enroll fewer than one hundred pupils. And so it...it certainly speaks to the fact that this is an area which we must give policy attention and at least remove the impediments from the...further from those districts who choose and believe that reorganization is appropriate and to look at the very real possibility that we ought to provide other incentives for them to make that kind of movement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

Thank you. I want to ask you a question concerning the

upgrading of our teachers, and it seems that the State Board...their recommendations fall short of a Statewide test for certification of teachers. It would seem to me, I'm not...I'm not sure and that's why I'm asking you, but it would seem to me that a Statewide test would be the most objective standard to use to determine if teachers are qualified to be teachers or to renew certificates as teachers. And I was reading in the manual, your recommendations seem to fall short of that. Can you comment on that?

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

Yes. I'd be happy to, Mr. Chairman, Senator. First of all, the State Board of Education is proposing tests that would be used to determine whether initial certification would indeed be granted. First of all, the board believes that every prospective teacher should be tested to assure that they're literate, first of all and, secondly, have competence in their subject matter or subject matters that they will be teaching. They also call for additional attention to the improvement of teacher training programs. That...those are the kinds of initiatives that they're talking about for improving the quality along with the salaries for those people who would be entering in the future in the profession. The board as a part of its quality of personnel study wrestled very much with the question of what we do with the current teaching force, and determined that the most appropriate course of action would be to require that each and every school district have a policy and a procedure to evaluate in-classroom performance of our teaching force. Paper and pencil tests generally tell us what a person knows about their subject matter or something about their literacy; we've all known teachers who are extremely competent in their subject matter but who are dismal failures in the classroom. And so, the approach of the examining and prescribing evaluation policies that are carried out by trained principals

and other supervisors is, we believe, the desired, appropriate course of action. We're also proposing, as I mentioned in my remarks, funds to support inservice training staff development so that we might continuously engage in the improvement of the skills and knowledge of our teaching force.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

...one issue is...it...it seems to me that maybe...you already have the personnel within the school system to do many of these tasks at the present time. I mean, we can...personnel can evaluate and reevaluate and...and do the necessary things in order to determine a teacher's competency at the present time. Why do you need added money, additional money to do that, if you already have the people in the system today that can do that?

END OF REEL

REEL #2

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

...we're not talking about adding people into the system to do that. We're talking about redefining the responsibilities of persons who are already in the system to do that and further requiring that every local board have a policy that meets Statewide criteria for conducting evaluations of teachers in the classroom. The truth of the matter is, if you look at the results of...set of studies over a forty year period by Robert Bush at Stanford University on the role of the principal and the teacher, you find some rather dramatic evidence that we neither train, screen or hire or reward principals for the kinds of things that we're talking about. We generally,...we first of all, train them, hire them and reward them for harmonizing their school with their community; that is,...I guess can be translated as keeping the superintendent and the board out of trouble rather than providing the kind of leadership to instruction that we expect of them. And so the staff development through the Principals' Academy becomes an essential to...to the implementation of the policy reforms on teacher evaluation that we're proposing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate the opportunity as someone who does not serve on the educational community to ventilate a few of my frustrations. I think everybody in this General Assembly who spends any time in their district at all knows that the most talked about subject, even prior to this year, has been education; and we are constantly badgered by questions like, why isn't the State paying fifty

percent? why isn't the State doing its job? how come property taxes are going up? and all the other questions that we don't seem capable of answering, and I have some local newspapers and...every time a board has a meeting, budget time, they constantly put in there that the reason that their budget isn't balanced or they don't have enough money is that the State's not...is not doing its job. And I have to tell you, based on what I have seen so far regarding the so-called reform, none of that criticism is going to stop because we really haven't addressed the issue, the fundamental issues of what I think is truly educational reform. Senator Etheredge and Senator Schaffer have talked about the formula. It's been a constant frustration of mine, too. Let me point out to you, being new to Illinois, that that formula, and you indicated it does produce some degree of equity, and I can point out to you, sir, that in the last six years it has, in fact, increased the inequity because the formula was based on the premise of increasing enrollment and stable real estate values and, in fact, we have had in the last six years exactly the opposite. It's not only nonfunctional, it's dichotomous to the very basis upon which it was created. The other part that has not been talked about though, and the part that we hear...there's two times a year when my phone rings off the wall; one is about the first or second week in January when all the parents in my district who think their kids are real smart get the rejection slips from the U of I; the other one is in August, when the second installment of the real estate taxes comes out in Cook County. We have put education into the position in which the major source of funding is the property tax. And if I might take a minute, I might point out to the members of the Body...and I think, Doctor Sanders, you know this better than I do, the property tax was created even before our Constitution but was...created even before public education, and the property



tax was never designed at its inception to carry the burden of education and it is, in fact, the major source of funding today. So, what we have is a system of over-dependence on the property tax; but more significantly, the ability to provide a quality education in Illinois is based on geographical accident. For instance, I attended a meeting down with Senator Rupp and Senator Maitland in Cerro Gordo, Illinois, and very quietly, in one of the corners, and I think there were about sixty school districts, was a school district which happens to have a nuclear facility in its district which was spending about four times more money than the adjoining district with a homogenous population. Okay? Now, we're asking everybody across the State to produce a quality product; and I would submit to you, sir, if you were in the real world and somebody asked you to design a car and they were going to give you the same kind of car and they would give you one-fourth as much as the next person to come up with the same car, and you would agree to that, then you would have to, in fact, question yourself, when, more importantly, the only way possible that you could come up with a car that resembled the other car is to make it look the same on the outside... 'cause I can assure you, underneath that car would not be the same, and that's what we have in Illinois as well. You said that you would want to defer the RCM. Well, let me tell you what's happening when you get to the reform of the formula and you start putting in the kind of dollars we're putting into today. You only create the problem of making it impossible to reform that formula, because what is happening... and this is... really bothersome to me, the opposition to the reform is coming from somewhat of a... I won't call it, Senator Berman chastised me for using the word unholy alliance once before, but... what you have here is those districts that are the poorer districts, that are more dependent on State aid are one end of the opposition, but, unfortunately, the

other end of the opposition is those school districts who've become very property tax dependent; and if you defer that reform, what you're going to do is make that even worse next year, because you're going to solidify the opposition from those two groups, and we're getting to the point right now, as somebody put, that we can't afford the price of reform today because if I were to calculate our fifty percent without any redistribution, it'd cost us about eight hundred million dollars. By next year the price tag is going to probably be a billion, and the longer we put it off, the worse off we're going to be. So, I don't want to put down what's being done because I think some of the suggestions are...are great, but if we do not go about reforming the fundamental tools for quality education, and that is a different system of distribution and a different system of collections, I think it's...we're going to do exactly what Senator Schaffer...just run up the cost and continue the problems. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

The last questioner that I have recorded here, Senator Poshard.

SENATOR POSHARD:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Superintendent, just a couple of questions. For a number of years now, we've debated this issue of teacher evaluation, and reading the commission reports and the committee reports on educational reform the past year or so, I've noted that in the public mind, at least in my district now, we're somehow equating reform and teacher evaluation with merit pay, and I'd be interested to know if the State Board of Education has a position on merit pay or if this is one more issue that we're going to leave up to local control? A second question that I'd like to ask you along that same line is the idea of minimum competency skill testing for students. We've discussed that issue for years also,

and we seem to always say, well, the local school district knows their children best, so we're going to leave that up to the local school district and we end up with some kind of mishmash of testing opportunities for kids that really, in the end, tell us nothing about the real skills of those students. Is that one more issue that we're going to leave up to local control or are we going to standardize those tests across the State so that we can really see whether or not the students are learning what they're supposed to be learning? The Governor has mentioned a couple of things in his statements on education and I'd be interested in your views on those. He has requested, as I understand it, the collapsing of several of the categorical service delivery agencies into one umbrella-type agency throughout the State in different regions; the gifted education centers, the voc. tech. centers, the teacher education centers, the computer consortium centers. I'd like to know the State Board's position on that. I think the Governor is right. I think there's a lot of cost ineffectiveness in this sense and those probably do need to be collapsed, and I'd be interested in your opinion on how best to do that to save the State some money. And I...I'd also like your opinion on the math-science academy that the Governor has proposed and how the State Board views that academy and...the funding that the Governor has proposed for it. Thank you.

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

Okay. A lot of questions and help me if I miss some of them, Senator, Mr. Chairman. First of all, relative to the board's position on evaluation linked to performance pay. The board's recommendation on teacher...evaluation is not, in their recommendation, directly related to performance pay. They're suggesting that whether performance pay does or does not come to be that a...that a required policy and practice for teacher evaluation should be in place and we must move to

initiate it. Minimum competency testing per students. The board is proposing as a part of its initiatives that in this redefinition process of what the State expects in terms of what students ought to know and be able to do as a result of their schooling that we implement...require assessment programs in each and every district to measure against local district expectations, that included in those assessments, the State develop anchor test items; that is, a test imbedded in a test that would assess student performance against those expectations that we as a State believe ought to be in place.

The last question that you had related to the...more sensible construction of those regional efforts that take place in the State. The board does not have a proposal on...in that particular area; however, personally, in looking at what's happened around the State, I support some more sensible definition of what those regions are so that we bring together in some kind of coherent form the provision of those services. Some very unusual kinds of things, some inefficient kinds of things are happening out there right now because boundaries are not contiguous with each of the efforts and...and I personally support that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

All right...

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

Oh, the math-science academy. I believe, personally, that we must do something more than what we've done in the past to meet the needs of our more talented students in the area of mathematics and science as well as in other...fields. I have not come to a personal opinion as to whether or not in the resources we have to...available, the math-science academy is the appropriate way to go. I am encouraged by the Governor's remarks that that would be the flagship of a larger State effort that would reach out to all kids who would benefit from services, and I'm...very much encouraged

by that latter commitment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

In order to stay within our time frame, I will call on two of the last questioners if they can make their questions concise, Senator Marovitz and then Senator Schaffer. Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you, very much. Mr. Superintendent, just one brief question, so...in the interest of time, we've...we've heard a lot recently about the increased proliferation of substance abuse and alcohol abuse among students in the...in the system. Does the State Board have, presently, any programs...support any programs, create incentives and encourage any programs locally in the districts which would deal with substance abuse or alcohol abusers among school age children?

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, Senator, we do have and I'd be happy to give you greater information...about those efforts at a later point.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

They're...I'm not notably a huge fan of...what I call the golden palace over there. I think you guys spend money with the best of them, but there is one thing you do over there that is valuable and you do fairly well and it's make computer runs, and...you'll learn that those us who've been here a while get a little cynical about formulas. I think Senator Berman understands them and I think Representative Hoffman understands them and then I think the rest of us...now Senator Maitland is approaching understanding them. The rest...to the rest of us, it's all mirrors and blue smoke and

after while, we stop saying, don't tell us about the formula, give us the computer run, and I guess that's my request on your proposal and on the other proposals. We will very much look to your agency for some implications, district by district, so each of us knows what we are doing for or to the people we represent, and I hope that those computer runs will be forthcoming in a timely fashion to allow us to make intelligent decisions based on the impact of not only our own constituents but the equity of the programs on a Statewide basis, and I hope we can count on you for that.

SUPERINTENDENT SANDERS:

Fair enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Sanders, for your presentation and on behalf of the Senate, we appreciate the time and educational process that you've given us today. Senator Maitland, for the purpose of a motion.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Well, thank you, very much, Mr. President. First of all, Mr. Superintendent, from the Minority side, too, we appreciate very much your candor this afternoon. It gives us an opportunity to vent our frustrations and we do so much appreciate your attendance here this afternoon and, Mr. Chairman, at this point, I would move that the Senate arise from the Committee of the Whole.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

All those in favor of the motion signify by saying Aye. The motion carries. The Committee of the Whole does arise.

PRESIDENT:

Committee reports.

SECRETARY:

Senator Savickas, chairman of the Committee on Assignment of Bills,...assigns the following Senate bills to committee: Agriculture, Conservation and Energy - 255; Appropria-

tions I - 226, 256, 262; Elections and Reapportionment - 237; Elementary and Secondary Education - 231, 242, 253 and 264; Executive Appointments, Veterans' Affairs and Administration - 229 and 230; Executive - 248, 263; Finance and Credit Regulations - 251; Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities - ...221, 222, 223, 238, 240, 252, 260 and 261; Judiciary I - 225, 233, 235, 259, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271 and 272; Judiciary II - 234 and 241; Labor and Commerce - 228, 232 and 250; Local Government - 224, 227, 236, 246, 248, 265 and 273; Public Health, Welfare and Corrections - 245; Revenue - 249, 254, 257 and 258; Transportation - 239, 243 and 244.

PRESIDENT:

Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 58 offered by Senator Rupp. It's congratulatory.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar. Resolutions, Mr...Senator Demuzio...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 adopted the following joint resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the Senate, to-wit:

House Joint Resolution 14.

(Secretary reads HJR 14)

PRESIDENT:

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Mr. President, this is...House Joint Resolution 14 which calls us to be in Joint Session to hear the Budget Message of the Governor tomorrow and I would move the suspension of the rules for the immediate consideration and adoption of the

resolution.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Demuzio has moved to suspend the rules for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 14. All in favor of the motion to suspend indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The rules are suspended. Senator Demuzio now moves the adoption of House Joint Resolution 14. Any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. Committee reports.

SECRETARY:

Senator Lechowicz, chairman of the Committee on Executive Appointments, Veterans' Affairs and Administration, to which was referred the...the Comptroller's Message of January the 17th, 1985, reported 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 February the 5th, 1985, reports the same back with the recommendation that the Senate advise and consent to the following appointments.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move that the Senate resolve itself into Executive Session for the purpose of acting on the Governor's appointments set forth in his Message of February 5th, 1985 and the Comptroller's Message of January 17th, 1985.

PRESIDENT:

All right, you've heard the motion as placed by Senator Lechowicz. Any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The Senate is



now in Executive Session. Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Mr. President, with the respect to the Governor's Message of February 5th, 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 the director of the Department of Aging for the term expiring January 19th, 1987, Janet S. Otwell of Evanston.

To be the director of Department of Central Management Services for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Richard H. McClure of Springfield.

To be assistant director of the Department of Central Management Services for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Rose Mary Bombela of Chicago.

To be assistant director of the Department of Central Management Services for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Gertrude W. Jordan of Chicago.

To be director of the Department of Children and Family Services for the term expiring January 19th, 1987, Gordon Johnson of Springfield.

To be director of Department of Conservation for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Michael E. Witte of Springfield.

To be assistant director of Department of Conservation for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, James C. Helfrich of Hammand.

Department of Corrections...to be director of Department of...of Corrections, Michael P. Lane of Springfield.

To be the director of Environmental Protection Agency for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Richard J. Carlson of Springfield.

To be director of Department of Financial Institutions for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Michael E. Fryzel of

South Holland.

To be assistant director of Department of Financial Institutions for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Joanne Mitchell of Chicago.

To be the director of the Department of Labor for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, E. Allen Bernardi of Springfield.

To be the director of the Department of Revenue for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, J. Thomas Johnson of Chicago.

To be assistant director of Department of Revenue for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Glen L. Bower of Effingham.

To be a member of the Illinois Commerce Commission for a term expiring January 15, 1990, Andrew C. Barrett of Chicago.

To be members of the Illinois Commerce Commission for a term expiring January...January 20th, 1986, Calvin Manshio of Chicago, Stanford Levin of...Edwardsville.

For the State Mining Board. To members of the State Mining Board for a term expiring January 19th, 1987, Charles F. Greer of Eldorado, G. B. Wiley of Harrisburg, John Bowen of West Frankfort, Richard Mottershaw of Virden, William S. Smith of Collinsville.

To be the chairman and member of the Prisoner Review Board for a term...expiring January 20th, 1991, Paul Klinicar of Belleville.

To be a member of the Prisoner Review Board for a term expiring January 20th, 1991, Rafael Nieves of Chicago, Salvatore Pisano of Peoria.

To be the chairman of the...Regional Transportation Authority for a term expiring July 1, 1989, Samuel Skinner of Lake Forest.

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 appoint-

ment.

PRESIDENT:

All right...

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules.

PRESIDENT:

All right, the gentleman has sought leave to consider the salaried appointments on one roll call. Objection? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Yes, Mr. President, I would object to Mr. Stanford Levin being included in this entire roll call and I ask that we consider him separately.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

That's fine with me.

PRESIDENT:

All right. All right, the gentleman has...has sought to...leave to consider all the salaried appointments on one roll call which we will do with the sole exception of Mr. Levin, an appointment to the Illinois Commerce Commission. Any further discussion? If not, 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 53 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:

Well, now, Mr. President, I'd like to put Mr...Mr.

Levin's name before the Body. As you know, I...he was recommended for the Illinois Commerce Commission. I believe that there was some discussion in his nominations and it was...approved almost unanimously by the...by the committee and I now would move for his advise and consent.

PRESIDENT:

All right, the question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mr. Stanford Levin to the Illinois Commerce Commission. Discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I...I wasn't on the committee. I was wondering if I could ask a question about Mr. Levin's background?

PRESIDENT:

Senator indicates he'll yield, Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Lechowicz, how long has Mr. Levin lived in the State of Illinois? Do you know?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

That question was raised in committee. In fact, according to the testimony we received in committee, he moved to Illinois approximately November of last year. The question was raised quite vividly by a member of the committee as far as his tenure in Illinois, and it was pointed out and there was quite a bit of discussion between the committee members in reference to what is tenure in Illinois and what is the capabilities of that individual serving on this committee, and it was after a...a heated discussion on tenure in...in Illinois, it was proven that this gentleman would serve quite capably as far as...with his background on this...on this Illinois Commerce Commission, and for that reason it was raised by Senator Hall, it was defended by Senator Chew and a

number of other committee members about his qualifications and his ability to serve and it was...after a heated discussion, it was approved.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Is there any requirement of living in Illinois...a residency requirement for the Illinois Commerce Commission?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

There is none.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Welch. All right. Further discussion? Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. You know, I don't think the question is whether or not this gentleman is qualified. I think the question is, as Senator Welch is trying to put before this Body, where does he live and where did he live at the time that he was appointed. Seems to me that within our boundaries and given our situation with respect to unemployment in this State that we could find someone within our own boundaries who would be qualified to serve on this board. A question of Senator Lechowicz. At what point in time was this gentleman appointed to this commission?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

We have a message stating that he was recommended by the Governor in February. He moved in November. He lived in St. Louis, Missouri and as...as it was pointed out by the...in committee, there's a lot of people that live in Illinois and go to Missouri and vice versa for working, it's

an...adjoining border town...the State of Illinois. He was also a graduate of Southern Illinois University. He went to school here in this State and like a lot of SIU students, find employment maybe in adjoining areas. Based upon his credentials, the Governor saw fit to nominate a consumer advocate to...to this body, and this is what this person is supposed to be, a consumer...a consumer advocate.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Well, Senator Lechowicz, can you tell me if there are any members of the Missouri Commerce Commission who reside in Illinois?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

That's not the question. The question is where the gentleman lives now. He lives in Illinois. The question is where he lived when he was appointed. He lived in Illinois. He may have moved to Illinois a short period of time ago, but there is no...there are no requirements as far as the length of residency in Illinois and if there was and he didn't comply with them, the committee would not recommend him.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Well, do you know where the gentleman voted in the November election or whether or not he, in fact, did vote? I assume he voted.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

That was not a requirement for review of the committee and it wasn't checked.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Well, Senator Lechowicz, you can go back to your district and you can tell the people in your district that you voted for someone because the Governor has sought to skip over all of the otherwise qualified people in the State of Illinois who could serve on this board and went to Missouri, but I'm not going to do that.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

...yes, I'm sorry I...I missed the discussion; however, I would like to point out this Stanford Levin is a resident of Edwardsville. He's registered as a Democrat to vote in Edwardsville in Madison County. This is a Democratic appointment, incidentally. He was screened by the...the selection committee of several candidates and the Governor and the chairman, Phil O'Connor, selected this gentleman. He's been at the university...at Southern Illinois University as an economist, as a professor for over thirteen years. Now let me remind some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, when Dan Walker was Governor of this State; Allphin, the director of Revenue; John Kramer, Langhorne Bond and I could go on and on and on where these people came from out-of-state and served on the cabinet level in the State of Illinois, and those of you on my side of the aisle who supported Dan Walker should remember the appointments that came from the former Governor. I don't know why geography should be a case. You heard here this morning, Mr. Sanders, the State Board of Education, just got selected and he came from Nevada. We're only a...a river away from this appointment. He...he's registered in Illinois. His drivers license is in Illinois. His license plates are in Illinois. I don't know

what more you could do, and for those of you in the northern part of the State, let me tell you this, that if East St. Louis and Madison County...in the early morning, the cars that go to St. Louis and St. Louis County to go to work, if Missouri would say, no, you're not a resident of Illinois...or Missouri, we're going to close the bridges, I'm wondering...how Senator Hall and all those people who go to...to St. Louis and St. Louis County to work would like for them to be shut off because they don't live in Missouri. This man went through the screening process. He's a good man. He's an economist and...and Phil O'Connor thinks that he can fill the job. Don't let geography...now this happens to be a personal vendetta with another man from the university. This is not geography. There's a person at the university that doesn't like Levin and he came to me, and I wouldn't listen to him, I don't go for personal grudges on appointments of the Governor, but he...he went to Senator Hall; and that's the reason why this appointment is being held up, it's a personal grudge against another individual at the college and not the qualities of the man. He's a good man and he should be confirmed.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Friedland.

SENATOR FRIEDLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President. As minority spokesman of the committee, I'd just like to report to my colleagues that this gentleman is a resident of Illinois and he did pass 10 to 1 on the committee. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm interested not so much in his geography as his credentials. I believe I heard you say, Senator Lechowicz, that he does, in fact, reflect a consumer



point of view on the...or will on the Commerce Commission and I wondered if you would just briefly review what his consumer credentials are.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Based upon...thank you, Mr. President. In response to the lady's inquiry, based upon some of the papers he has written on this subject matter as an economist at Southern Illinois University, he has been designated as a consumer advocate in this field. Well, because you were being in conversation with Senator Joyce...that's quite all right, but in answer to your question, ma'am, it was based upon as...number of writings he has written on this subject matter as a professor at Southern Illinois University where he has been associated...with quite...quite a bit of interest in the...in the Commerce Commission that he has written a number of papers in this...in this field and he's been labeled as a consumer advocate.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I wasn't going to say anything about this, but since my name has been mentioned I feel that I should say there was one lone vote cast against the gentleman and it was mine. I questioned him at lengths before and in answer to your question, Senator Jeremiah, the gentleman moved over here in December. He's on sabbatical leave from the university right now. I questioned that. I said, you are going...the Governor is appointing you to a thirty-nine thousand dollar a year job, are you going to quit your university job? And he said, we'll, just wait and see what happens. Then, in questions that...with some of the other members there and I was the

lone person who voted against him. Now, the gentleman has been teaching over here for a number of years and he never once moved into this State, but once he got this appointment, then he moves over. He was not eligible to vote in this State in November because he never moved in here until December.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd just like to respond, too, to Senator Vadalabene. I'm apparently the one who held up the appointment and I don't know anything about the political situation at Southern Illinois University and Senator Hall and everything. I...I didn't ask that he be separated from the pack because of that, Senator...Vadalabene, I know nothing about it; but I think that it...what is important here is not just Mr. Levin's qualifications but his familiarity with the problems we have in Illinois with utility rates. Here in Illinois we have a very highly nuclearized utility industry. I don't know that that's true in Missouri. I certainly know one thing about Illinois that is not true of Missouri and that is that we are the storage area for all of the spent fuel rods for the entire United States of Illinois, and I doubt that Mr. Levin has had much experience in Missouri with that particular problem. I think that being a resident of Illinois for this particular job is...is not the only question that has to be raised, it's the familiarity with our utility industry in Illinois that you would gather by living in our State. That's the important part. If this were another department, it would be different. In most other departments you could transfer knowledge. For instance, Ted Sanders, that's knowledge that's transferable from the State of Nevada to the State of Illinois more readily than knowledge about our utility industry; and our utility industry, I

think, is somewhat unique. Because of the nuclear power questions, because of the many power plants that are having trouble getting completed, because of the year after year history of cost overruns of nearly every nuclear facility in the State of Illinois. I think that a person should be a resident of Illinois, I think that they should have suffered through those continuing rate increases due to mismanagement of these plants in underestimating the cost of building nuclear power plants, and I think that that personal experience of paying those ever rising utility bills is an experience that you can't get in Missouri, that it's one that is probably unique to Illinois and it's one that any member of the Commerce Commission should have lived through and should have in his background to serve on the Commerce Commission when they have these new rate increases coming month after month as they will continue to come; and for that reason, I intend to vote No on Mr. Levin for this appointment.

PRESIDENT:

All right, further discussion? Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Very briefly. Senator Vadalabene, I, too, am unaware of this dispute which goes on between these two people down at the university. I do wonder how we know this guy is a Democrat? Did he vote in the Missouri Democratic Primary or did he give you his word? I don't know about that, but I...what I...what I am opposing and what I object to and it's something that Governor Walker did and it's something that this Governor continues to do and that is to go outside of our boundaries to find people to fill these important State positions. You tell me in the State of Illinois we can't find people who are qualified for these positions, I just can't accept that.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, I want to make this observation. In the Executive Committee on Appointments, there were three that were being appointed. Stanford Levin seems to be the controversial appointment. Now this process with the Governor, I think he told me about four or five months ago that there was a Democratic vacancy on the Illinois Commerce Commission they'd like to fill this post, and you recall we did him get out of committee last year but...on the maneuvering...on the Floor it felt that he could not pass the Senate and through a new Congress now here in the...in the 94th General Assembly had to be referred back. We don't regard St. Louis and...and...and St. Louis County as being out-of-state per se. I don't know what the reason is but some of us who thought that Dan Walker was the greatest guy on earth even had Fogel for the Director of Corrections who had a prison term, and, if you recall, we rejected that one. I don't believe you should hold up a man. He went through the process. He went through the screening. He was selected. You just don't get anybody to serve on the Illinois Commerce Commission that doesn't have any...any economic interest. Don't hold up this man because of a Mississippi River. There's people that have businesses in Illinois that live in Missouri, who have outstanding businesses in St. Clair and Madison County. They don't even live in Illinois but they operate their businesses. Here's a man who went through the process, went through the screening and, incidentally, he wasn't the man that I would have liked to had. I gave the Governor another appointment to make and he didn't make it, he made this one and I believe the Governor should have the people that he wants on board and let them do a good job. Support the appointment of Stanford Levin, the Governor and Phil O'Connor. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Further discussion? Further discussion?  
Senator Joyce, for the third time.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Just one question, Senator Vadalabene, did...did your other appointment live in Illinois...the...the first one that you wanted?

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Well, Mr. President, I'm sorry to see that this debate has taken this vein. The question is whether the gentleman is qualified and able to serve. He's only been teaching at Southern Illinois University since 1972. '72 he's been a professor at Southern Illinois University. I'm not asking whether he is qualified to teach at that institution because I would imagine that the institution itself has its own academic standards in excellence that they review the respective people that work at that university. The question is whether Mr. Levin is willing to serve in the Commerce Commission capacity. The Governor has asked that a Democrat be appointed to that spot to serve in that capacity, and he has asked Senator Vadalabene whether this person from Edwardsville meets those requirements; and according to the Senator from that district, this gentleman meets those requirements. According to the review of the committee, he has met every...requirement by law that is required in that position, whether it's academically, whether it's his expertise in the field where he has written a number of letters and theses on the subject matter that is reviewed by the Commerce Commission, he has passed every criteria, and he should pass this Senate today as well. The criteria of whether he is a resident of Edwardsville or St. Louis, Missouri has been tested and he is living in Illinois, and I would strongly recommend your consideration for his appointment for the

Senate advise and consent of Mr. Levin to the Commerce Commission.

PRESIDENT:

The question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nomination 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 38 Ayes, 9 Nays, 4 voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nomination just made. Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. With respect to the Comptroller's Message of January 17th, 1985, I will read the salaried appointment to which the Committee on Executive Appointments, Veterans' Affairs and Administration recommends that the Senate do advise and consent.

To be director of personnel for the Office of Comptroller for a term expiring on January 19th, 1987, M. Alice Kirby of Springfield.

Mr. President, having read the salaried appointment, will you put the question as required by our rules.

PRESIDENT:

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 54 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 that the Senate arise from Executive Session.

PRESIDENT:

You've heard the motion. Any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The Senate does now arise. Senator Marovitz, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Can...thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Having checked with the chief sponsor, I would ask that...that my name be added as a hyphenated cosponsor to Senate Bill 24 and 29 sponsored by Senator Jeremiah Joyce.

PRESIDENT:

Senate Bills 24 and 29, the gentleman seeks leave to be added as a hyphenated cosponsor. Is leave granted? Without objection, it's so ordered. Senator Topinka, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes, Mr. President. I have had...I have checked with the sponsor and I ask leave at this time of the Senate to be added as a joint sponsor to Senate Bill 245.

PRESIDENT:

Senate Bill 245, the lady seeks leave to be shown as a cosponsor. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Poshard, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR POSHARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to Table Senate Bill 240 for technical reasons that occurred in the drafting of the bill. The LRB has redrafted the bill and I'll be introducing...reintroducing legislation today.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Poshard has moved to discharge the Committee on Assignment of Bills from further consideration of Senate Bill 240 for the purpose of Tabling. All in favor of the motion to discharge indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. Senate Bill 240 is now dis-

charged. Senator Poshard moves to Table Senate Bill 240. All in favor of the motion to Table indicate by...by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. Senate Bill 240 is Tabled. Senator Philip, for what purpose do you arise, sir?

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I'd like the record to indicate that Senator Geokaris is home from the hospital. She is convalescing from pneumonia. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

The record will so indicate. Senator Fawell, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR FAWELL:

I would like to...I am the chief sponsor of Senate Bill 8. I would like to put Senator Donahue and Senator Karpiel as hyphenated cosponsors and Senator Macdonald as a hyphenated cosponsor on Senate Bill 95.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senate Bills 8 and 95, the Senator seeks leave to show Senators Donahue and Karpiel as hyphenated cosponsors and Senator Karpiel on 95. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. It's so ordered. Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

With...with the approval of the sponsors, I've asked to be a hyphenated cosponsor of Senate Bill 179, that's Senator Karpiel's bill with Senator Dudczyk and Macdonald. Senate Bill 78 with Topinka, Macdonald. Senate Bill 210, Marovitz, Smith, Macdonald. Senate Bill 101, Senator Hall. Senate Bill 93 with Senator Watson. Senate Bill 53 with Senator Topinka.

PRESIDENT:

All right, the...the Senator seeks leave to be shown as a cosponsor on Senate Bills 179, 78, 210, 101, 93 and 53. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. The brochure has been



written. Senator Etheredge, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Yes, Mr. President, I would ask leave to add Senator Poshard as a hyphenated cosponsor on Senate Bill 92.

PRESIDENT:

Senate Bill 92, the gentleman seeks leave to show Senator Poshard as a cosponsor. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. It's so ordered. All right, with leave of the Body, we'll move to page 3 on the Calendar. I direct your attention to page 3 on today's Calendar, on the Order of Secretary's Desk Resolutions, Senator Netsch has requested that we address Senate Joint Resolution No. 3. On the Order of Secretary's Desk Resolutions, page 3 on the Calendar, Senate Joint Resolution No. 3, Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Joint Resolution No. 3 recreates the Joint Committee on Public Utility Regulation which, as most of you know by now, is the substitute for the Sunset Commission. It is charged with the duty of reviewing the status of the Illinois Commerce Commission and its regulatory authority and reporting back to the General Assembly before the end of this Session. In the absence of the work of this joint committee, the Commerce Commission and all that goes with it will self-destruct at the end of this year. We have done this before but the resolution extended the commission only to the beginning of this year. This will now extend it to June 30th, 1985. It is a twelve-member commission, as you know, and it...it has only this one limited but extremely vital function. I would now move that the Senate do adopt Senate Joint Resolution No. 3, and I suspect that it requires a roll call because it does involve an expenditure of...a possible expenditure of funds.

PRESIDENT:

All right, question is the adoption of Senate Joint Reso-

lution No. 3. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution No. 3. 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 53 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Joint Resolution No. 3 is adopted. On the same order, Secretary's Desk Resolutions, is Senate Resolution No. 34. Senate Resolution 34, Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes, Mr. President, I would ask at this time that we adopt Senate Resolution 34 commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day to which Senator Savickas has been added on as a joint sponsor.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Topinka has moved the adoption of Senate Resolution 34. All in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. Anything else on that order of business? Senator Kelly, do you wish to proceed? Senate Resolution 39, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Senate Resolution 39 and 40, for that matter,...I believe should have been on the agreed list. What this refers to is that we have five hundred and sixty-six servicemen who are missing in action and are actually known to be incarcerated in Southeast Asia, and what this does is it calls on the President and Congress to renew their efforts to bring back and to...recover our missing in action troops and to bring them back to our country, and I would ask for your support of this resolution which...which does that.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Kelly has moved the adoption of Senate Resolution 39. Is there any discussion? If not, all in

favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. Senate Resolution No. 40, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President and members. Senate Resolution 40...this relates to the subject of starvation and doing something about the problem on...not only in our country but worldwide, and what this does is it calls on the President and Congress to enact legislation which would address this issue. It talks about having our farm land dormant and this is something that's bothered me for some time. When I see on television the starvation that's taking place in Ethiopia and I know even in our own country in many of the large metropolitan areas, to have farmers who enjoy using their energies and their...their equipment to...to farm and then to pay them not to,...this...that's...this is just one part and parcel of this resolution asking that Congress take a look again at doing something about this and to come up...what this is it's...it's a...a small way...in a small pebble, I might add, that I would like to...to do in trying to do something about this problem. It's very frustrating. It's certainly a problem that's probably beyond this Body, but I would ask for your support in at least advising the President and Congress that we do have a bad situation here.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator...Senator Kelly has moved the adoption of Senate Resolution 40. Any discussion? Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Yes, Senator, I think this is a good idea and...and I missed some of what you said. Would you kind of give us a brief thing of what's going on?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Yes, Senator, I just briefly said that what this does is it relates to the starvation that's taking place in the world and in...in the United States and different areas, and what this does is it...it asks Congress to come up with innovative new ways to address this issue and to implement the...the farming community that...which has being paid to keep their crops dormant and I...this...this would ask them to take a look at that subject plus any others which would help to...to improve the situation and...and try to provide a mechanism so we can develop...the greatest farm land in the...in the world is right in the United States and I want to use that to help to feed the hungry people that are starving, whether they be in the United States or in Ethiopia or anywhere else in the world.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Kelly has moved the adoption of Senate Resolution 40. Any further discussion on 40? Senator Karpel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

I wonder...thank you, Mr. President. I wonder if...since we do not have a copy of the resolution in front of us, I wonder if Senator Kelly would mind reading it; because as I remember this resolution from committee, it has some pretty high-powered or supercharged words in the whereases.

PRESIDENT:

Sponsor indicates he'll yield. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Okay, I don't...I don't know how supercharged they are or what, but I...I don't think it's anything...I think it should have been agreed. Okay, I'll read it. Try to go through it quickly.

(Senator Kelly reads SR 40)

And that's it and I'd ask for your favorable support.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Well, on hearing that again, I just wanted to ask...Senator Kelly, are you advocating military force to be provided to all these countries that have a starvation problem? Are you advocating we send military troops to Ethiopia for instance?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Well, I don't say that we should start any kind of a...a war or have any placement of our military personnel for that purpose, but what I do say is that...that there should be...even if they have to take and fly in food supplies and drop them, whether the government in Ethiopia or anywhere else in this world, if they want to sit around and...and not feed their people, I don't think that's their privilege to starve people. They're human just like we are and that means that...that we should lend our...our conscious support to try and to prevent that.

PRESIDENT:

Further...

SENATOR KELLY:

I...I would have to say this, there...there is an indication in this resolution about supplying...as supplying military force and food supplies to those heroic individuals. That word "supplying military force" may present a problem. If it does, then vote against the resolution and it'll die. I happen to think that it's worthy enough to at least receive consideration, but if you don't think it is because it has that word "supplying military force," then vote against it.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yeah, thank you, Mr. President. I...I rise in support of this resolution and I would like the permission of the...the sponsor to be added as a joint cosponsor of the bill...hyphenated cosponsor, and while it may have some strong language but so what, people are starving across this country and we've called upon this country and we pay taxes for this country to send military into other countries for the purpose of protecting them from..."communist aggression." Well, we're talking about saving lives. That's all. Feeding hungry people, stopping the masses of hungry people across the country...the globe to...from starving to death and if it's necessary to do that, I say, why not and I...I...I rise in very strong support of this resolution. We're merely...asking Congress to take some measures to study and...and to come up with some ways of...of responding to that situation and we should do so. We're not passing the law, so they can do it in any means that they feel...and I'm sure that I have the confident of the delegation from the State of Illinois and around the country to vote on and enact some measures that will take some serious action of this...this country being a leader in the world and speaking out in...and denounce the deplorable conditions that exist in countries like...places like Ethiopia and South Africa.

PRESIDENT:

All right, the lady has sought leave to be added as a co-sponsor of Senate Resolution 40. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. You know, I...I do feel some of that...that language is objectionable, Senator Kelly. I didn't quite understand what you were talking about us being alienated. Could you...could you read that...that phrase again? Something about being alienated or...or causing the people to be alienated or...

PRESIDENT:

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Okay. Under the fourth whereas, it says, "The American people have become alienated as the result of the lack of concern shown to our citizen as well as to the hungry people of countries such as Ethiopia where starvation has become the accepted way of life for many."

PRESIDENT:

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Senator Kelly, I don't know about your side of the aisle, but it seems to me that our side of the aisle has always been very concerned about the hungry and...and I really object to that language. I mean, I don't know what people you're talking about don't give a darn, but...but it seems to me that that language is rather inflammatory and...and, you know, I personally would like to see a copy of the...of the resolution, and I would hope four of my colleagues would join with me and let's get a copy and take a look at this thing.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I...I was just about to turn my light off. I'm...I'm concerned only about the...the language of the military and I...I don't quite understand why that's in there.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Yes, Mr. President, I'm...I'm going to take this out of the record and I also intend to eliminate some of these whereases and hopefully...hopefully get everybody in this Body to support this resolution. Thank you.

AB 120  
2nd Reading

PRESIDENT:

All right. Take it out of the record, Mr. Secretary. We are now...now having been...been on record in favor of starvation and against the military, we'll move on. On the Order of...page 2 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, we'll go down the list. 29, Senator Joyce. 39, Senator Hall. 50, Senator Sangmeister. 105, Senator Bloom. 120, Senator Lemke. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 120. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

END OF REEL



REEL #3

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 120.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Are there amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 132, Senator Luft. 139, Senator Rock.  
Read the bill, Mr. Secretary, please. Senator Carroll, with  
leave of the Body, will handle that...for me.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 139.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Appropriations I  
offers two amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Committee Amendment No. 1. Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the  
Senate. Committee Amendment No. 1 is a...is to correct a  
technical error in the title of the bill to reference the  
correct Public Act and I would move its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Carroll has moved the adoption of  
Committee Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 139. Any discus-  
sion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All  
opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Fur-  
ther amendments?

SECRETARY:

Committee Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Committee Amendment No. 2 is an amendment to the State Board of Education's budget. This is based on its revised estimate of claims from local districts in the regular and special education funds. This would, therefore, because of the change, allow a freeing up of some eleven million four hundred thirty-two thousand which may now be allocated elsewhere in the budget. It is our proposal through Amendment No. 2 to therefore take all those special categoricals which we could not fund at the end of June of last year at a hundred percent level but had to, because of a lack of dollars, fund at less than a hundred percent and move those categories up to one hundred percent so that Special Ed., Extraordinary Orphanage Personnel, Private Tuition, Transportation would be funded at a hundred percent along with Voc. Ed. and downstate and Chicago Bilingual Gifted and Textbook reimbursement. I would move adoption of Amendment No. 2 which would reallocate the eleven million four hundred thirty-two thousand freed up in the State Board of Education's budget.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Carroll has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 139. Any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Are there amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Yes, there is a Floor amendment.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Carroll.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. At the request of the Office of the Governor there are three items that need funding as quickly as possible. One is to increase the appropriation on some fifty million dollars for the Lottery Fund for payment of prizes. That fund which we appropriate has run out of appropriation authority, so that if there is a major win in the lottery there would not be the money available to pay them by appropriation though the cash would be there. The second would be...be nine hundred twenty-five thousand for Federal Energy Grants for the poor who are in need of energy assistance. That amount was down to some four thousand dollars in the fund. There is nine hundred and twenty-five thousand of Federal money available that we need to get into the mainstream as quickly as possible. And the third is for Energy and Natural Resources to allow for a study for the super conducting super collider at Fermi Laboratory in Batavia. They need to get that underway by April 1st and this would be the funding mechanism for that. I would move adoption of Amendment No. 3.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Carroll has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 139. Any discussion? Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor of the amend-

ment yield to a question?

PRESIDENT:

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

The last portion that he just mentioned as for as making appropriation to the Department of Energy and Natural Resources to hire a consultant, is that five hundred thousand dollars for a consultant?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Yes, Senator Lechowicz, that is. That was the request that was made in the Governor's supplemental for five hundred thousand for the consultant for the consideration of siting the super conducting super collider. Now, I cannot answer what the super conducting super...collider is, but the institute that gets the contract is Illinois Institute of Technology, IIT, is writing the proposal.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

I totally concur with the concept and the necessity of trying to get that site into Illinois, I just wanted to point out that we're talking about five hundred thousand dollars in General Revenue Funds for a consultant. Now, I thought that was...IIT was working with the Governor's Office and also the group of businessmen that he has assembled to lobby Washington in reference to trying to get this site approved here in Illinois. And is this...have any...is any portion of the five hundred thousand dollars going to be used for that purpose?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Yes. It is my understanding...and, again, this the request of the Governor not of us, but it is my understanding that the funds will be used for IIT to do the study necessary to make the proposal to the U. S. Department of Energy to consider Fermi for this seventy-mile circumferenced super collider that allows the neutrons and protons to get together.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Mr. President, these are obviously items I think that were stripped out of Senate Bill 173 and they obviously are items of importance. But I would just remind the Body and those interested in the question that 173 has a number of items left in it that I think are of...of some time...tight time frame. I think immediately of the money involved for the Southworks in Chicago, the steel plant there that's been shut down, trying to get something moving there. I believe there's some unitary tax money in there owed to taxpayers of this State who will not receive their money because we're not moving at a...a fearfully fast rate, and that bill has any number of things in it that it was a...a...I agree that some of it is not of an emergency nature but we should not allow that bill to languish an undue time. We're going to be gone next week, I think we are making a little bit of a mistake that may come back to haunt us.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President. I rise in support of this motion. That five hundred thousand dollars is a drop in the bucket to what the other states are...are spending as far as trying to get that super conductor. If we can manage to get it, we will be talking somewhere in the...in the area

of three to four billion dollars worth of jobs brought to our State. There are some bourns that have to be made, there are some...some calculations that have to be done so we can present a...a picture that is a...a whole and pristines to our...to our governors and to our...to our President, and I certainly would hope that everyone would...would see the wisdom of voting for this amendment.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Any further discussion on Amendment No. 3? IF not, Senator Carroll has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 139. No further discussion? All in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 145, Senator Carroll. 160, Senator Welch. On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, bottom of page 2, is Senate Bill 160. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 160.

(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. 167, Senator Carroll. 168, Senator Carroll. Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 59 offered by Senator Macdonald and its congratulatory.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar. Introduction of bills.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 274 introduced by Senator DeAngelis.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

275, by the same sponsor.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

276, by Senators Donahue and Demuzio.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

277, by Senators Marovitz, Barkhausen and Netsch.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

278, Senator Marovitz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

279, by Senator Coffey.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 280, by Senators O'Daniel and Poshard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

281, by the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

282, Senator Poshard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

283, Senator Macdonald.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

284, the same sponsor.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

285, Senator DeAngelis.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

286, Senator Barkhausen.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

287, Senators Demuzio and Poshard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

288, Senator DeAngelis.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

289, by Senators Kustra, DeAngelis, Dudycz and others.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bills.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Fawell, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR FAWELL:

I would...thank you, Mr. President. I would like to add...Senator Lechowicz and Senator Vadalabene as cosponsored to Senate Bill 8. I...I'm sorry, Senate Bill 7. And I would like to rerefer Senate Bill 7 from...Higher Ed. to the Senate Executive and Veterans' Affairs Committee. This is with the agreement of Senator Newhouse who is the chairman of Higher Ed. and Senator Lechowicz who is the chairman of...of Senate Executive Appointments.

PRESIDENT:

Well, that...that motion is out of order until the chairman of Assignment of Bills Committee takes a look at that. Senator Barkhausen, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Mr. President, to request leave of the Body, which I have already obtained from Senator Jeremiah Joyce, to be added as a cosponsor on Senate Bill 36, please.

PRESIDENT:

All right. The gentleman seeks leave to be added as a cosponsor on Senate Bill 36. Without objection, it's so ordered. Senator Demuzio, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I have spoken with Senator Savickas who is the chairman of the Committee on Assignment, and Senate Bill 263 that was introduced this morning, the emergency farm credit bill, was assigned to the Senate Executive Committee and he has agreed that that bill should go to the Senate Ag. Committee. So my motion would be to discharge the Committee on the...Senate Executive Committee of further consideration of Senate Bill 263 and ask that that bill be rereferred to the Senate Ag., Conservation and Energy



Committee.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Demuzio has moved that the Senate Executive Committee be discharged from further consideration of Senate Bill 263, that the bill be rereferred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture. All in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries and its so ordered. Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes, because of the emergency nature of Senate Bill 263 and the emergency farm credit, I have asked Senator Joyce, who is the chairman of the Senate Ag. Committee, if it might be possible to have a emergency hearing on this bill tomorrow, and he has indicated that he intended to do that. And, therefore, I would ask that the appropriate rules be waived that Senate Bill 263 could, in fact, be heard...tomorrow at eleven o'clock on the Senate Floor in the Committee on Agriculture, Conservation and Energy.

PRESIDENT:

All right. The motion is to waive the appropriate posting notice and the other rules and call for an immediate hearing tomorrow morning in the Senate Agriculture Committee on Senate Bill 263. Any discussion on that motion? All right. All in favor of the motion to suspend indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The...the rules are suspended and Senate Bill 263 will be heard in the Senate Agriculture Committee tomorrow morning at eleven o'clock here on the Senate Floor. Senator Watson, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to be added as a hyphenated cosponsor of Senate Bill, was it 263? Could I have leave of the Body to do that?

PRESIDENT:

The...the farm bill.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes.

PRESIDENT:

263. The gentleman seeks leave to be added as a cosponsor. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Netsch, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR NETSCH:

At the appropriate time, I have an...an announcement about the Revenue Committee.

PRESIDENT:

All right. We're just about finished here. Resolutions, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution No. 60 offered by Senators Jerome Joyce and O'Daniel.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I would move to suspend the rules for the immediate consideration of...Senate Resolution No. 60.

PRESIDENT:

The gentleman has sought leave to suspend the rules for the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 60. Any discussion on the motion to suspend? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The rules are suspended. Before the Body now is Senate Resolution 60, Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. It's a short resolution and I'll read it. It...it also is dealing with the farm credit problem and this says,

(Senator Jerome Joyce reads SR 60)

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Joyce has moved the adoption of Senate Resolution 60. Any discussion? Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

One question, the...that bill, as I understand it, Senator Joyce, is on the...is on the President's Desk right now. Is that correct?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Yes, that is correct. It passed...well, as a matter of fact, it's supposed to be going to the President's Desk today. It is going through the House.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Well, I realize I do not represent the largest agricultural Senate district in the State of Illinois, although we do have a lot of window boxes in some of our apartment buildings. But, it seems to me that anyone who is an Illinoisan is totally aware of how dependent this State is on agriculture. The farm credit bill that was passed is critical not just to our farm community in the State but to all of us in the State. And it seems to me that not only should this resolution pass but that it ought to be...the resolution ought to be marched right down to the Governor's Office on the second floor and he ought to be asked to get on the telephone, like this afternoon, and talk to the President. He was, after all, as the resolution indicates, the...the President's Campaign Manager in Illinois and he often tells us how he is able to talk to the President about very sensitive issues. I cannot think of an issue more sensitive, and it seems to me all of us as representatives of the entire population of the State ought to encourage, indeed urge,

beseech the Governor to get on the telephone today and talk to the President about this bill. I would strongly support the resolution and would ask that it be carried downstairs.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Joyce has moved the adoption of Senate Resolution 60. All in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. Further business to come before the Senate? Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

I'd like to announce that the Appropriation II will meet immediately. It's going to be very short.

PRESIDENT:

Appropriations II immediately in Room 212. Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you. The Revenue Committee was scheduled for 10:00 a. m. tomorrow morning. There are several briefings on the Governor's Budget that are scheduled at...one at nine-thirty and one at ten and covering all the members of the Revenue Committee, and it occurred to me that the members would like an opportunity to participate in those briefings. What we have done, and this is with Senator Etheredge's concurrence, is as follows. The Revenue Committee will meet at eleven o'clock tomorrow. Director Johnson will be before us for several of the items that we have asked him to report on, including an update of the amnesty program. We will not hear any of the bills tomorrow, we will not have time in that hour's period, and we will reschedule that meeting for Tuesday the 19th when we return at four o'clock in the afternoon. We will meet again at eleven for the purpose of hearing Director Johnson and those matters that we have asked him to report to us on. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Further announcements? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes, I...I would like to announce that the Labor Committee will meet immediately following the Session, and we should be about five minutes. If you hurry to the Stratton Building, A-1, you should be out of there in five minutes. But, please, all of the members, I would like very much for you to be there.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Labor and Commerce immediately upon adjournment in Room A-1. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. The Elections and Reapportionment Committee will have a meeting tomorrow morning at 10:00 a. m. in Room A-1. Appreciate very much the members attending that and the sponsors, of course, of their legislation. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

All right. That's four...three committee meetings tomorrow morning plus the briefing. Do not forget the Joint Session at noon. Senator Luft moves that the Senate stand adjourned now till Wednesday, March 6th, at the hour of eleven forty-five. We'll come in at quarter to twelve and go over to the House at noon for the Joint Session. The Senate stands adjourned until eleven forty-five tomorrow morning.