8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The hour of noon having arrived, the Senate will please come to order. Will the Members please rise, and our friends in the gallery please rise, for the prayer. Our prayer today will be given by Father Kraft, Springfield, Illinois. Father Kraft.

FATHER KRAFT:

(Prayer by Father Kraft)

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Reading of the Journal.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Journals of the First Special Session, Thursday, September 9th; Friday, September 10th; Monday, September 13th; and Wednesday, September 15th, 1993.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Butler.

# SENATOR BUTLER:

Mr. President, I move that the Journals just read by the Secretary be approved, unless some Senator has additions or corrections to offer.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Butler moves to approve the Journal just read. There being no objections, so ordered. Senator Butler.

# SENATOR BUTLER:

Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the Journal of Friday, September 17th, in the year 1993, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journal.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Butler moves to postpone, in accordance with Special Session Resolution No. 3. Any objections? If not, so ordered. We've had some requests for filming the Session today: WPG, WFLD, Chicagoland-TV, WICS, WGN-TV, WMAQ-TV. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Committee Reports.

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

## SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Weaver, Chair of the Committee on Rules, reports that the following legislative measures have been assigned to committees:

Re-referred from the Rules Committee to the Senate Floor to Be Approved for Consideration, House Bill 795.

And Be Approved for Consideration, Senate Amendment 4 to House Bill 525.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Donahue.

## SENATOR DONAHUE:

Thank you. I would like to request a Republican Caucus immediately in Senator Pate Philip's Office.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Cullerton.

# SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I would like to request a Democratic Caucus to meet immediately in Senator Jones' Office.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Thank you, Senator Cullerton. Let me try to give you an idea of the schedule, because we have some Members that -- that do not want to stay overnight, and I can understand that. It would be the intent of the Chair to have the Caucuses over with by 1:30, quarter to two, come out here and take a vote and -- and adjourn, so that nobody has to stay overnight; everybody can go home. So that would be the intent of the Chair. The Senate will stand at ease until a quarter to two.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE)

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

(SENATE RECONVENES)

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The Senate will please come to order. 2nd Readings. Senator Watson, do you -- do you wish House Bill 525 to return to 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment?

## SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, I do.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Watson seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 525 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objections, leave is granted. The Order of 2nd Reading, House Bill 525. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

## SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendments No. 1 and 2 -- or Amendment No. 1, offered by Senators Watson and Philip.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Mr. President, I'd like to have leave to table  $\mbox{\sc Amendment}$  No. 1.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Watson seeks leave to amend -- to table Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 525. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. Ayes have it. Senate Amendment No. 1 is tabled. Any further Floor amendments?

# SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator O'Malley and others. PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator O'Malley.

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

#### SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. I seek leave to table Amendment No. 2.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator O'Malley seeks leave to table Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 525. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. Ayes have it. The amendment is tabled. Any further amendments?

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 4, offered by Senators Watson, Philip and O'Malley.

# PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 4 now becomes dealt with regional original legislation the bill. The superintendents of school and educational service centers. That's no longer a provision. What we do with Amendment No. 4 is roll in a major portion of Amendment No. 1 and Amendment No. 2, together, and we've come up with Amendment No. 4. There are some changes, but I'll basically go through and tell you what -- what the bill does. The -- it establishes a bonding authority of two hundred and seventy-five million dollars, and that's to be divided into two years: a hundred and twenty million the first year, hundred and fifty-five million the second year. It -- it impacts the Chapter 1 Program, by which the money follows the kid, so to speak, and we freeze that for two more years, and that has an impact of around thirty-five million dollars each year for We decrease the School Finance Authority's reserve restriction by some ten million dollars for the Fiscal Year We -- it remains a financial problem of ninety-two million dollars, which we say should be negotiated by the Chicago

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

fill Board of Education and the Teachers' Union to to We've put some reforms in the legislation, many financial hole. of which have been offered by the Mayor and others, but primarily are a part of House Bill -- 2282. Eliminates the supernumeraries after a sixty-day notice of termination, and if they are rehired within a two-year period, they regain their tenure and seniority rights. The principal-in-charge issue, which is something, I that we've heard a great deal about, gives them full authority to direct and supervise all employees, and it eliminates some appeal rights of -- of those principals' orders. Ιt the requirement for approval of a budget by the School Finance Authority from August 31st to August 15th, and the reason behind that is to give some reasonable time, we feel, for a response from the -- from the Board to try to negotiate a contract which is ultimately balanced. We include the Daley initiatives. has had several proposals out before us to be discussed. We include many of those initiatives in this proposal. It reduces the time frame for financial plans that must be adopted by the Board and approved by the School Finance Authority from three years to two years. We allow a second window of opportunity public school teachers to retire -Chicago retirement. It repeals some of the School Finance Authority's reform powers. We felt that the School Finance Authority needs to involved in more of the fiscal matters of the Board of Education and Chicago public schools, and therefore, we've taken away some of those reform powers from them. Requires persons elected or appointed to the local school councils to file a statement of economic interest. We eliminate the subdistrict superintendents, and we allow principals contracts up to ten thousand dollars, with the endorsement of the local school council. Those are primarily what we would call Mayor Daley's initiatives. A work rule change, in which the

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

Finance Authority has asked us to consider, we felt was important and we should include it, and that would say that -changes from seventy percent to fifty-one percent the vote necessary by teachers in a particular building to change work rules. This is very important, as far as the School Finance Authority and, I imagine, the Chicago Board of Education, in regard to some flexibility in the work rules in each individual This says a simple majority would be required to make those necessary changes. We give some broad financial powers to the School Finance Authority, once again going back to the philosophy that we want to see the School Finance Authority more involved in the financial matters of the Chicago public schools. We give them considerable more authority and power. We -- we authorize the appointment of an inspector general to investigate charges of waste, fraud and mismanagement. We -- we tell the Board -- or the Authority to monitor and reserve -- the Authority to monitor and reserve expenditures and oppose hiring controls. We require the Authority to conduct periodic management audits, and we make the -- the School Finance Authority approval over all contracts that would be permanent. We also include a provision that would say that in 1995, there would be a referendum, and we authorize the Chicago's Finance -- the School Finance Authority to place on the ballot in Chicago in the April, 1995 election, the proposition of increasing the Chicago Board of Education's tax rate by up to forty cents. And if approved by the voters, the Chicago Board would be authorized then to levy two dollars fifty-one cents, plus the SFA's difference tax rate. That pretty well sums up the -- the amendment, Mr. President, and I'll be glad to answer any questions.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Discussion? Senator Berman, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR BERMAN:

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

Thank you, Mr. President. May I suggest that we take a roll call on Amendment 4 and debate...

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

That -- that request is always in order. You will have a roll call.

#### SENATOR BERMAN:

And debate the merits on 3rd Reading...

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

I think that's a great idea. Thank you, Senator Berman. If there is no further discussion... Senator Rea, for what purpose do you rise?

#### SENATOR REA:

Point of order. In terms of the last Session that we had, I had -- on the Floor of the Senate, had my name removed and also filled out a slip on House Bill 525.

# PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The record will certainly indicate. Any further discussion? Senator Watson.

## SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thank you. I just move its adoption.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. 3rd Reading. I thought the suggestion was made by Senator Berman, we would have -- that -- to just try to put it on, keep the debate, and only vote on it one time. Senator Berman. I'm just trying to make it easier for everybody else.

## SENATOR BERMAN:

Mr. President, I asked that we had a roll call on Amendment 4 and then we would debate it on 3rd Reading if it carried on the roll call.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

Senator Watson, on the Order of 3rd Reading. You'll -- you'll get your roll call on 3rd Reading. Just relax. Senator Watson. SENATOR WATSON:

Well, once again, I would appreciate a favorable vote. This is a roll call on the amendment. Is that correct, Mr. President? PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 525.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Okay. Now, this is 3rd Reading, final passage, and I want everybody to understand that. What we're going to do now is debate, I guess, the merits of the amendment, which were just explained. So I will go with my explanation of the amendment and answer any questions, and welcome the debate.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Berman. Senator Jones, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, it always has been the policy of this Senate to afford the Members a roll call whenever the Members ask of such, and that was the request that was made by Senator Berman. We did not want to be on record in voting for this bill that's going to rob the poor people of the City of Chicago schools. And for you to deny a vote on that is not acting in the best interest of all the Members. I respectfully request that you go back to 2nd, allow a vote on the amendment. We did not want to be recorded as such. And Senator Berman so specifically stated that we would not debate the merits on 2nd

September 20, 1993

Reading, but we only wanted to have a roll call on such. And I think that we are entitled to such, and I -- I think you're moving the bill to 3rd Reading without even giving him the request that he asked for, which every Member in this Chamber heard. So, Mr. President, I wish you would put the bill back on 2nd and give the Membership a roll call on the amendment.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

SENATOR BERMAN:

Senator Jones, I might remind you, the amendment is the bill. So, it doesn't make any difference whatsoever. You're going to have a vote on it, and you're going to have your say-so. You will get your vote. Further questions? Senator Berman.

# Thank you, Mr. President. Let me just again state that my request for a roll call was -- was made and that you moved the bill without taking a roll call. For the record, let me indicate

bill without taking a roll call. For the record, let me indicate that if a roll call had been taken, I am very well convinced that every Senator on this side of the aisle would have voted No on the motion to adopt this amendment. Now, on the bill as amended, President and Members of the Senate, let me address a couple of points as to the specifics and then address the bill overall. couple of weeks ago, a consortium from the University of Chicago had done an extensive survey of Chicago School Reform throughout the City of Chicago. That survey was published, and it found that over a third of the schools in Chicago - and I'm talking about approximately over two hundred school buildings - have been making substantial progress under Chicago School Reform. That University of Chicago report pointed out that one of the major reasons for that kind of progress in schools that are -- that have some very, very difficult social problems was because of the availability Let me explain to you what that phrase State Chapter 1 money. We in the Illinois General Assembly appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars a year that we call State Chapter 1, and

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

that money goes to every school district or virtually every school district in the State based upon the number of poor children that reside in that school district. Of all the school districts - and there are probably over eight hundred school districts that receive State Chapter 1 money - every school district that State Chapter 1 money, their local school board determines how that money is to be spent. In only one school district, namely Chicago, does that money flow not to the central Board of Education for its appropriation and expenditure, but rather to the local school building where that money is determined how it's going to be spent in Chicago at the site of that school building by the determination of the local school council, which includes parents, community representatives, teachers and the principal. Because it is site-based determination of the needs of those poor children in that school, this study has shown that substantial progress - educational progress - has been made at over hundred school buildings in Chicago. House Bill 525, as amended, would take ninety million dollars of that Chapter 1 money fifty-five million dollars in this fiscal year and thirty-five million dollars in the next fiscal year - take it away site-based appropriation, away from the determination of what those children need at that particular school and give it Pershing Road, the headquarters of the Chicago public school system, to plug its budget needs. I would suggest to you that this is in direct opposition to what Chicago School Reform is all about. Ninety million dollars taken away from the determination of parents, teachers and principals for the needs of children at that particular school and it's sent downtown. I keep hearing about bureaucracy from my friends on the other side of the aisle, and you are giving ninety million dollars to be determined of it's going to be spent by the "Pershing Road Bureaucracy". That is one reason to vote No on this amendment. Another reason to

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

vote No on this amendment. There is a proposed referendum to determine whether the real estate tax levy in Chicago should be Now, there's increased in order to better fund Chicago schools. nothing wrong with referendums. I -- part of my district includes communities that have gone to referendum, and they have increased their local property taxes to increase the funding of schools. But there is something that bothers me about this mandated referendum. One, it's mandated. Since when do we mandate any referendums in Springfield? But in this amendment, it's mandated. Springfield is going to tell Chicago when to hold its referendum. And the date of the referendum. I find it very interesting we're dealing now... This is September. There is some elections, not in Chicago, but certainly elections in suburban Cook County that are going to take place November of 1993. That's not the date that's being suggested here, or mandated here. There's going to be a primary election in March of 1994. That's not the date for this mandated referendum. There's going to be a November 1994 That's not the date for election in Cook County and Chicago. mandating this referendum. But for some reason, and I defer to my Senator O'Malley, to explain why, it was picked to have this mandated in the primary or the election of the Mayor in City elections of 1995. Now, I'm sure that there's no political reason attached to this, when we are faced with problems not only in Chicago, but probably three hundred other school districts that don't have balanced budgets. Why don't we have these referenda this November, next March, or next November of '94, instead of elections in Chicago in '95? I would suggest to you Ladies and that that's another reason to vote No. And lastly, Gentlemen, I don't think it's the role of the Illinois General Assembly to dictate the terms of collective bargaining agreements, and that's exactly what we're doing here. I've spoken to members of the Board and the Union in Chicago. They tell me that they are

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

making progress. They are meeting as we are debating this. I suggest that what is proper for — is for us to not take any action, certainly not to pass House Bill 525 as amended, because it's a waste of our time. It's a waste of the taxpayers' time and money. The House isn't even in Session, and I don't understand why we're doing this. Allow collective bargaining to move forward as Illinois law provides, then we should respond, after the collective bargaining has been completed. For those reasons, Ladies and Gentlemen, I respectfully urge a No vote.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator del Valle.

#### SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I also urge my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and even those on the other side of the aisle, to vote No on House Bill 525. Senator Berman has outlined for the importance of Chapter 1 funds to our schools, but I think it bears repeating that the lifeblood of School Reform in Chicago, as documented by several recent studies conducted by reputable institutions of higher education in the State of Illinois, lifeblood is what we want to drain from the system at this time. That is a total contradiction to what we all state around here, in terms of how we feel about public education and the need improve public education and making education a priority. But let me tell you, Chapter 1 funds are being used to keep kids coming to school. They're being used to make sure that kids are safe when they're on their way to school, that kids are safe when they leave They're being used by LSCs who have determined that there's a need to beef up security at a school, so kids don't get shot outside the school building, so kids - little kids - can walk to <sic> school safely. LSCs are using Chapter 1 funds to deal with the cuts that the Board made of truant officers, to get kids to school. LSCs are using Chapter 1 funds to address the

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

priorities that they have identified through a local school management model, the very model that every one around here says we need to develop further. And yet, we're talking about ninety million dollars. We're talking about taking, probably, the final step, the final step that'll truly destroy the Chicago public school system once and for all. Is that what the real plan is here? Is the real plan to put the final nail in the coffin? the way some of us see it around here? That's wrong. The referendum. Mr. President, there was a glimmer of hope, of light at the end of the tunnel when you indicated just recently that maybe we ought to consider a dollar-for-dollar exchange away from property taxes over to an income tax - a glimmer of hope. But what do we do in this bill? We're saying no. We're once again going in the opposite direction, and we're saying that property taxpayers that are already paying too much to support public education in the State of Illinois are going to have to pay more. We talk about caps, caps in Cook County. We talk about caps in other parts of the State. But what is this? I don't understand. Why is it that we tell the public one thing and then we turn around and try to legislate another? Subdistrict offices. This bill eliminates the subdistrict offices. They have been reduced to almost nothing, but what is left is important to ensure communication, to ensure training opportunities for LSCs. going to wipe out those subdistrict offices, and we're going to force six hundred schools to deal directly with the central office on a day-to-day basis. What sense does that make? I don't know. I urge you to vote No on this bill.

## PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator O'Malley.

## SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 525 as amended, before us today, has a number of provisions in it

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

and a number of provisions that are absent. Senator Watson did a I want to mention very good job of detailing the entire bill. some of its provisions very shortly, and then I want to spend some time on one in particular. First of all, it has the Daley reform initiatives; something that we've heard about for months now. there are no State funds involved in this. We've heard that And what -- and the amount of money that's provided for funding provides sufficient capital to balance the school's budget. This also doesn't have pension diversion of any kind, and this is the only plan alive now that does not have a pension diversion of some kind included in it. I think that's very important for all of us to carry out of these Chambers and make sure that the citizens of Illinois know that we're making a commitment today that we're not going to do anything with pension funds. The fourth item that's in there, and we've heard a lot discussion about it, is the referendum - the mandated referendum for Chicago. Let's look at the facts. The Chicago Board of Education now has the authority to have a referendum, and they've had that -- they've had that authority for many years, and yet, they've never exercised it. This is one of the very few school districts that I know of in the State, and it's probably the only one, that hasn't had to address a referendum question in decades. What's more important, however, is those people who decide what happens with money haven't been in front of the voters either. Who am I referring to? I'm talking about the Members of They aren't elected. What's the Chicago Board of Education. value of a referendum, or what's the value of an election when we're talking about school board members? We're talking about something as simple as accountability. It's a simple word, it's an important word; because, when we have to present ourselves to the voters, we have to explain why they should support us, why they should vote for us, why they should get behind our

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

...(machine cutoff)...submit to the initiatives and support us. Members of this Assembly that the one thing in Illinois that should bring us together more than anything else is education. And yet, in the time I've been here, the thing that I have found that divides us more than anything else is education. divided regionally. We have downstate school districts. We have suburban school districts. We have Chicago. You know, I tell people back at home, all that has to happen is a downstater has to stand up and say: "Guess what? If you tinker with this part of the school aid formula, this is going to cost your school district I'm not picking on the downstaters when I say that. suburbanite can say the same thing. But what happens, we all line We decide, "Uh-oh. That's going to hurt our up regionally. school districts; therefore, we can't vote for it." Or, "Maybe we can vote for it, depending on the impact it will have." The before us today, in particular the provision that has the referendum question included, is an effort to change that. It's an effort to make the Chicago public schools more like other schools in the State of Illinois. You know, when we left here two Fridays ago, when I got home, sitting on my desk at home was my neighborhood newspaper. I hadn't had an opportunity to read 'cause I just got home, but I want to share the headlines with everybody. For those who -- for those who can't read it: Schools Seek Ninety-Cent Hike." That's the headline. "Big Cuts Ahead If Increase Fails." What's the advantage of this First of all, I want to address what my good friend, Senator Berman, said. He said: Why was this date selected to have this referendum? Why is the election going to end up being out in 1995? Why not have it in 1994? And, Senator del Valle What are -- what are we trying to do? Put the nail in the lid of the coffin? Well, I submit to you, the date was selected, Senator Berman, for precisely to avoid or attempt to avoid the

September 20, 1993

reason that Senator del Valle is talking about. Because I submit to you that if in 1994 you had this referendum, it would fail miserably. By having it in 1995, we have an opportunity to debate the merits of the existing system. It'll encourage the Board, or it should encourage the Board, and the administration to whatever -- everything that it possibly can to approve -- to improve the system in anticipation of the referendum. And it's going to allow the citizens of Chicago, for the first time in decades, to express their opinion as to whether or not they continue to support a public school system as it is constituted on the date of the referendum. This is an initiative that allows the citizens of Chicago to have something to say about their schools. That's the same opportunity that other citizens across the State of Illinois have. And I submit to you that it's high time that that opportunity was had. In closing, there are plenty of reasons that we, as lawmakers, should do something here today. We were called into a Special Session by the Governor, and this is the first time any legislation has been brought forward that has substantial support in either Chamber. But I submit to you that that isn't the reason we should do something here today, And if anybody wants to know why there's some not by itself. reasons, there's four hundred and eleven thousand reasons Chicago that deserve our attention, and let's not lose the focus here. We're talking about that many students in Chicago. They're our kids. They're your kids; they're my kids. They're twenty percent of the population of students in Chicago. Let's do the right thing here today. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Hendon.

#### SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the sponsor yield for a question?

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

He indicates he would.

SENATOR HENDON:

First of all, Senator Watson, what is the effective date of this legislation if it passes? What -- what would be the effective date?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

The exact language is, "This Act takes effect upon becoming law, except that if this Act passes by an affirmative vote of less than three-fifths of the members elected to either house of the General Assembly, then this Act takes effect July 1st, 1994."

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

So, if -- if -- as it appears, it's going to be, to me, that only that side of the aisle votes for this and it does not get enough votes to become effective immediately, then this bill is actually not -- is not going to do anything to solve the current crisis because it won't be in effect until '94. Is that correct? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

We -- we're establishing July 1st, if we only get thirty votes - that's correct - of 1994. Our attitude is that there's still two months left of the school year that there could be a positive impact in this particular school year by taking effect July 1st, 1994. We're also establishing parameters here, Senator, I think -- and hopefully some guidance not only to Chicago Board of Education, but maybe to others who might be interested -- or the Chicago Teachers' Union, certainly, but may even others who are

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

about to make a decision that we think could be derogatory to the whole system. We're trying to send a message to those individuals also.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

...(microphone cutoff)...fact, if this legislation is not going to even take effect until 1994, isn't this an exercise in purely political masturbation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

You have further discussion, Senator Hendon? SENATOR HENDON:

I have a number of questions, and I will -- I will make that clear, because to pass a bill that -- that is going to do absolutely nothing for this current crisis is a waste of time. Now, we've come down here for three weeks - three weeks in a row - three times, wasting our time, wasting the taxpayers' money, and here you're going to have a -- a bill that won't even be in effect until 1994. Yes, that is political masturbation. That's exactly what it is, because you're just playing with ourselves to be down here for -- for something that's silly. Now, I have another question. What was the purpose of -- Senator Watson, of Chapter 1 dollars in the first place?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I'm sorry. I couldn't understand the individual. I mean, if he would...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Hendon, repeat your question, please.

SENATOR HENDON:

What is the purpose, what was the mission, what -- what were

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

Chapter 1 dollars, the intention of that money, what was it for?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

To serve underfunded kids, underprivileged kids, with problems, financially.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Hendon.

## SENATOR HENDON:

I'm very glad that you gave a direct and succinct answer to that, because it shows why I am so happy and so proud that God didn't -- didn't make me a Republican. Glad I wasn't born with this philosophy. What you're about to do - and I -- I don't even know how you can sleep with yourselves at night. I really don't. You're going to take money from the poor kids. That's what you're going to do. And I'm sure -- that is probably what you do, to relieve your mind. It's a good thing that that wasn't caught on -- on -- on the recorder, but I have good ears; I heard it. you're doing is you're raping and robbing underprivileged kids. That's what the Chairman of Education just said. This money is specifically to help the poor children be -get a good education. And what do you want to do? You want to take ninety million dollars away from the poor children. You want to... Okay. We took -- took out the pension on the teachers. you're going to take care of the teachers, but you're going say that is wrong. These dollars are screw the children. 1 specifically for the children. To take the money from children that you're supposed to be helping makes no sense at all. It is vicious. It is cruel, and it is the -- the reason why most people feel that the conservative philosophy is warped, because of this type of mentality. It is wrong to do this to the children. If we are going to address this problem, we need to address this

September 20, 1993

statewide so that the children downstate and the children in your area and the poor children will all be on equal footing and can all get a -- a good, decent education. But to just bash Chicago and then just take the poor children's money and take it from them is vicious, and it's cruel. And thank God, He didn't make me a Republican, because I don't have to live with a -- such a warped justice, such a warped sense of -- of -- of any sense of -- of kind of philosophy that you -- definitely, clearly are displaying here today. It is wrong, and I urge a No vote, but I know you're going to vote Yes. I know you're going to vote for it, because that's the way you are mentally thinking. And I'm telling you, that thinking is wrong. And our Governor, who is supposed to be the Governor for the children, to -- for him to allow you to do this, because I know he has some power. At least I think he has Sometimes I believe the Governor's name is Pate some power. Philip, not Jim Edgar. But if he has any power, it is him who -who this is going to come down on. Because if he allows you to take this money from the poor children, we're going to guarantee that the parents of those poor children don't give him any votes when it comes to his re-election.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Philip.

# SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Now that everybody's thoroughly confused, I will try to shed a little light on exactly what we're doing with Chapter 1. And why are we doing it? Because there's a crisis in the City of Chicago schools. And the real issue is kids, getting kids back in school. What this simply does is freeze them at the same level they are today for two years. In other words, they're losing no money whatsoever. In fact, Ladies and Gentlemen, they've had a surplus for two years. They have forty million dollars on hand that they

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

could have spent for broken toilets, soap, toilet paper, pencils, paper. They have a surplus of forty million dollars. We're taking half of that surplus to get the schools open. So just that everybody understands, we are not taking any money away from them at all. They get exactly the same amount they had last year, and we're using half of that surplus to run the schools and get 'em open.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Demuzio.

#### SENATOR DEMILITO:

... (microphone cutoff)...and Ladies and Gentlemen of Senate. I really hesitated as to whether or not to jump into this fray, but I want to make some comments. Senator Philip, you said recently, "Why are we here?" Why are we here? The Governor called a Special Session a week before school was to open. never even allowed the collective bargaining process in Illinois to work. The teachers are -- today are neither on strike, nor are they locked out. They're sort of on an extended vacation of some sort for a while, put back to work by result of the federal judge. I have three school districts in my district who have filed to strike. One did strike, and the collective intentions bargaining process worked, and they went back. They solved problem last Saturday, and school opened. Sixty such school districts in Illinois have filed intentions to strike under the collective bargaining process. We didn't have a Special Session for those sixty. We didn't have a Special Session for the three -- are still negotiating in my district. Why are we here? What's wrong with the collective bargaining law that affords us the opportunity to come to Springfield and inject ourselves right into the middle of negotiations between the Chicago School Board and the Chicago Union? I think it's Nobody said anything about calling a Special Session ridiculous.

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

for the three or four or five school districts in my district that were damaged by the flood, or in Senator -- or the other Senators - I won't mention anyone by name - who happen to have a district along the Illinois River. Why are we here? Why are we injecting ourselves into this process? The Governor now serves as a chief negotiator for both the Board and the Union on the one hand, the Illinois General Assembly, the Democrats and Republicans, on the other hand. He's sitting down there sort of as a federal mediator, trying to mediate this dispute. Is this his plan? No, it isn't. Let me just say that we ought not to do anything with this proposal until there is some reconciled event that happens in that says that the School Board and the Union can get the City together. Why should we set the parameters for what their negotiation's going to be here? We all of a sudden say, "Okay, you can borrow so much money." And so they go out and they borrow and they bargain for it. Why should we do that? We gave that authority to the local -- locals to do that in Illinois. We ought not to be in this process. And you know what? You talk about pension money. The first amendment you had, you gave Chicago the money on a perpetual basis: fifty-five million dollars a year, until a few minutes ago, when you tabled it. Senator Watson, had a proposal in there for twenty million dollars for a new transportation program for downstate Illinois that gave us twenty million bucks, and you tabled that. So now we're talking solely and exclusively about one school district in Illinois. T'm willing to do my part to afford Chicago the opportunity to put their youngsters back into school. No loan guarantees. No more State money. People have the illusion in guarantees. Illinois that somehow or other we are going to give Chicago a pot of money. What they're asking for is flexibility to resolve their own problem. I am prepared to give them that flexibility to resolve their own problem, but I'm only prepared to do it after

September 20, 1993

the collective bargaining process has run its course. It has not. I would urge every Member of this Body not to vote for this proposal today. Let the Union and the Board continue We shouldn't set the parameters. And once they've negotiate. decided what they're going to do, then they ought to come And only then should we be involved in the here and ask us. Senator Philip, collective bargaining process in Illinois. are we here? Answer your own question. We ought not to be here. The Governor called us here. He's the one that now is in the middle of this dispute; he's the one that ought to solve it. think we ought to vote No on this, go home and let the collective bargaining process continue to take its way in Illinois. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Raica.

# SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of Demuzio, you know, other districts have this Senator problem with the school strikes and everything, and that in our Caucus too. But I think one of the reasons that we're down here is because the Democrats continually have said yes to the Chicago school teachers. Every time they wanted more money, you said yes. We -- we stood here and because we want to make the system better. We want to make it work. We want the money to go to the kids. We want to make the system better. So the reason's very simple that we're down here. Senator Berman, you stated that you have no idea why we're here because the House isn't here. Well, that's a perfectly good reason why we should all probably just go home, because the House I remember Senator LaPaille sitting here a couple doesn't care. of months ago saying that Senator Philip -- and jokingly, I said, "I want to be like Mike." Well, I don't think anybody on

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

this side wants to really be like Mike today, 'cause we can sit back home and do nothing too and let everybody fight it out. But the big problem is, the teachers want the Democrats to solve the for them the monev problem: give problem hundred-and-twenty-million-dollar raise, don't give them hours, let them teach less hours. What the hell? I mean, thev got it made now anyway, right? And let's face it. They've been kind of good for you as far as the PAC funds go too. So now, have to make a decision. What do we want to do? Senator Hendon, we could sit here all day and discuss all them kind of about the kids in your inner-city district. I remember standing up here arguing trauma to the Democrats on that side of the aisle, and it was the minorities that killed it. And I couldn't believe why you would stand here and want to kill a proposal that would help out your constituency. But here we are again, discussing the school problem and what we're doing here. The Mayor had a lot I've said that right along. Senator Philip I don't good ideas. think at all has disagreed, and even the Governor, when he spoke to us, didn't disagree with a lot of the Mayor's proposals. that's what's before us today. Chapter 1 money - Senator couldn't have said it any better than he did. They had forty million dollars they didn't spend. to give them Do we want another forty million dollars they -- they are not going to spend, or do we want to give it to the kids? Do we want to make the system work and get the teachers in the schools and do the Destroy a public school system, Senator del Valle? Ι thing? don't think anyone here can destroy what's destroyed yet. The only thing we could do, I hope to God, is make it better. How many kids got shot the first three days they went back the Senator del Valle? And we want the system to work? We could do exactly what the House is doing: stay home. Valle, hello. Or we can just discuss back and forth with their

September 20, 1993

Minority Leader what we're going to do, whose philosophy "I don't know why we're here; the House isn't here." 'Cause he told me that when we came out on the Floor. So we've decided to do something - come up with our plan that can give the school district money, let the kids back in school and maybe make some changes in the system. I remember being on this side of the aisle a minority, going back home and preaching, "If we had control, we would want to do this, this and this." See, the only difference is, we're the -- we're the majority this time and the changes that we want to make is "correct the system". the minority actually making the same type of speeches, except you're with the teachers instead of with the kids. this is all ado. And go ahead and shout about it all; that's all -- all you want to do. Fifty-five million out of the teachers' You did it last time. I didn't vote for it this time, and none of us on this side of the aisle were willing to put our butts on the line again and do that, 'cause that's the wrong way to do it. All the retired teachers in my district, in suburban areas, everywhere, says, "Don't use our money." So we're So we can come back here when the Democrats in the House have their way. And you know what? That's the proposal And you know what? You'll have all your votes on the table. on that side of the aisle for taking fifty-five million dollars out of their pension so that we can help out the Chicago school system. No, they won't. No, they won't. They're not going to No, they won't. And here we are in kill each other anymore. fantasyland, adventureland. We can keep on shaking our heads all long. You want something that works? This is going to work. This is going to work 'cause we're trying to make changes in the So, we can have the philosophy or "Be like Mike" and sit home or do nothing, or come here and try and make a change. Well, I'm glad that we're on this side trying to make a change, at least

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

for the good this time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Shaw.

#### SENATOR SHAW:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. One of the problems that I have with this -- with this bill is the effective date of the bill. Now, I don't know whether it's intent of this Body to pass this bill by thirty votes and put part of this bill into effect, or wait until July 1st, 1994. suspect that you will get thirty-six votes on this bill. under the Senate Rules, I believe that you would need thirty-six votes to have an immediate effective date of this legislation. But if it's the intent of this Body to help the schools out and help the children that you are talking about, why do we want to wait until July of 1994? That does -- that does not make sense to That does not make sense to me. The -- you talk about the property tax referendum. What -- I think the people of Chicago enough -- pay enough property tax already, whether they -it's a referendum or not, and I have no objections to a referendum. But what you're attempting to do here is put citizens, who are on fixed incomes, out of their home. what the other side of the aisle would be attempting to do. referendum passed - and I don't suspect it will - but certainly those senior citizens who are on fixed income, they're property tax would skyrocket, probably, and the little money that they are now receiving from their pension would go to try and pay some additional property tax. Many of those people have no children -no youngsters in school, and I don't think that -- even though they have paid, but I think they have paid their dues. that the people of Chicago who pay the State income tax, who play the Lottery, is entitled to a fair share of that money going into the public school system to help the children of Chicago.

September 20, 1993

That's what we should be talking about. But aside from that, we are here today to circumvent the collective bargaining process. In 1984, I believe it was that we passed the Collective Bargaining Act, giving the teachers and every labor union in this State the right to collective bargaining. Now for some reason, whether it's political or otherwise, we want to come back here today and circumvent that process. I think Senator Demuzio made it very clear, and I think Senator Demuzio is right -- is: here to do this to the children? And even if there was -- if this was the solution to the problem, why do we have such a late effective date, July of 1994? I don't understand that. When they -- when the people of Chicago and the children of Chicago have an immediate problem - an immediate problem - why are we doing this to the four hundred and eleven thousand youngsters in that school system? You would think that the people of Chicago didn't pay any taxes, didn't pay any income tax. And now the other side of the aisle is going to attempt to punish the citizens of Chicago. That is not right. And what you should do, Mr. President, is rethink your position. This is not the solution to the problem of Chicago. This is not it. If we -- you just wanted to call us down here just to say -- report to the media that you are doing something, or you have some quick-fix solution to the problems of the children of Chicago, that might go over well in the media. certainly, with the people of Chicago, that does not go over very good, and particularly those youngsters that are looking for I ask you to rethink your position, and I ask the education. Members on this side of the aisle to vote No on this legislation. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Geo-Karis.

## SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, first of all, I'm tired of hearing the other side bashing Governor Edgar,

September 20, 1993

who has tried very conscientiously to try and get things done and have us work together. Second of all, the Gentleman who used a very unsavory word and called it "M" -- political "M", I say -- I have another word for you. I think you've been watching too many Seinfeld movies, and I think it's time that you looked at the reality of the facts of life here. If we weren't concerned and if the Governor wasn't concerned about four hundred and eleven thousand students being out of school, we wouldn't be here in this The Governor called the Special Session. Special Session. wondered whether he should or not. And then I hear this business about collective bargaining should be left to the Teachers' Union and to the Board. Let me tell you: Collective bargaining is not supposed to be the kind of bargaining that will keep the kids out of school until more and more perquisites are entered into because of the leadership of the Chicago Teachers' Union, which has common sense at all and doesn't give a darn about the kids being out of school. And you know it, and I know it. If they did, this thing would have been settled long ago. And then we talk about No, I don't think it's right to take money from the pensions. pensions. And people who have earned a pension should Then we have supernumeraries, where people -- teachers who haven't been reassigned, they get salary and benefits for a long time, and we're trying to correct that and limit it to sixty days. what's wrong with that? And then you don't want a referendum. Well, let me tell you: My districts have referendums. So, what -what's wrong with your district having a referendum - your school district? There's nothing wrong with that. Let the people make a decision what they want to do about educating their children. We are not giving you a program that takes any State funds, but we're you to go ahead and vote for this amendment -- this bill, asking as amended. And -- Senator Shaw, you say, why do we have to wait. Because your side is being stubborn, doesn't want to cooperate and

September 20, 1993

give us thirty-six votes. But I hope we can get at least thirty on our side so we can show that we're responsible and we're accountable. What's lacking in the Chicago school districts today is the fact that there's not enough accountability and not enough supervision. Because when the kids can't be taught to read, write and spell, when they're graduating from high school, there's something radically wrong. And we've tried some — to make some meaningful — reforms. And what are you doing about it? You're sitting back and blaming the Governor, blaming us. Well, I'll tell you: This is one time of many times that I'm very glad I'm a Republican, because I'm trying to do the responsible thing. And I urge passage of House Bill 525, as amended.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Palmer.

## SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Body. I'd like to begin by asking the sponsor a question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

He indicates he will yield.

## SENATOR PALMER:

And I draw your attention, Members of the Body, those of you who have the bill - because it always pays to read things in full, read the small print, as well as the analysis - I call your attention to page 56, lines 14 through 19 of the fourth amendment. Senator Watson, I am looking now at the applicable dates, vis-a-vis, State Title I aid, and please correct me if I am wrong. Twenty percent in school year 1989-90. This is the amount that would be given to the schools. Forty percent in school year 1990 through '91. Sixty percent in '91-92. Eighty percent in 1992-93. And then - this is very curious - we skip and say one hundred percent in school year 1995-96. What happened to 1993-94? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thank you, Senator. I appreciate that question. If you would turn onto page 58, there's an explanation. What that is, Senator, is the actual freeze of Chapter 1 money for those -- for '93-94 and '94-95.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Palmer.

#### SENATOR PALMER:

I want to draw your attention to the continuation of page -on 56, from lines 19 on down to 31. Let's be very clear what Chapter 1 monies are used for. And I am quoting here from the bill. These monies are to be used "at the discretion of the principal and local school council for programs to improve educational opportunities" so forth and so on... including "early childhood education, reduced class size or improved adult to student classroom ratio, enrichment programs, remedial assistance, other educationally beneficial improvement and attendance expenditures which supplement the regular and basic programs" and Let me say to you, Members of this Body, there's a certain irony to removing, freezing - however one chooses define it - the Chapter 1 monies. Before I came down here, I spent a great many years working with the School Reform Movement, and I have continued to do so down here. And I have been struck by the fact that the School Reform Movement has made it a point to be bipartisan, to work both sides of the aisle. So it is ironic that your side of the aisle, who I know knows very clearly what these monies are used for, because I, myself, have arranged meetings in Chicago where we, in a bipartisan fashion, sat down and you heard from the lips of local school council members, principals, from parents that the Chapter 1 monies, as Senator Berman said, have gone directly to the betterment of

September 20, 1993

So there is an conditions of children in the schools in Chicago. irony here that, of all the funds, we would attack the Chapter 1 monies. I suggest to you that the citizens of Chicago did indeed They did so in November of 1992 when vote for their children. they voted for the referendum - bipartisan-sponsored referendum that was denounced, was not supported. We came within three points of passing that. And that made sense. I also suggest to it is not the place of this Body to shift micromanagement of the schools in Chicago from Pershing Road to the Illinois State This is not our purpose, and we should not vote for Those who say these are surplus monies, you are wrong. You are absolutely dead wrong. These monies are there for the schools to make decisions about major purchases and about other matters that cost money beyond the duration of one year. Do not take away their monies. This is not a -- an amendment that we should vote for, and I am appalled that we would even propose such a misuse of our time here in Springfield. I say, vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Lauzen <sic>.

## SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thank you. I -- the question was asked, and I think it needs to be -- a response. And I've attended several of those meetings with Senator Palmer, when we've met with local school councils in -- in Chicago to discuss their concerns about the young people of the City, and those young people who are -- unfortunately, seem to be held hostage at this particular time. I've attended those meetings, and the local school councils - she's quite correct - in many cases, are working as they should under reform, and reform is working in many portions of the City. Not all, unfortunately, but in many portions. And maybe one of those areas, and maybe many of those areas, in which reform isn't working is the area in which Pam Zekman -- I don't know. Those of

September 20, 1993

you from Chicago, I'm really surprised to hear the... I'm really surprised to hear the remarks of several of the Members here who represent the City of Chicago. Pam Zekman who is -- works for WBBM, Channel 2 News in Chicago, has done of investigative reporting on the actual expenditures of dollars that are supposedly supposed to go, yes, to those young people, those deprived young people of the school system of Chicago that you've Yes, that's where that money's supposed to mentioned, Senator. go. But where is it going in many of those local school councils? Where's that revenue going? A hundred and forty-two thousand dollars of it went to a retreat for teachers to go to Lake Geneva. Forty-two thousand dollars of it went to a retreat for teachers to go to New Mexico. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are going contracts of former employees - principals, members of the former School Board, employees of the School Board of Chicago - going to fund their contracts. That's where that Chapter 1 money is going, Senator, and don't you get up here and misrepresent what Channel 2 News has already found out. And there'll be more on this, I'm sure, in the future.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Why, thank you, Mr. President. Question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

He indicates he would yield.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator Watson, following on the Chapter 1, if you look at page 56 of your amendment, page 56, starting at line 17. In the middle of that line it talked about the allocation, and it says in -- in -- in the school year, starting on 17, 1991-92, eighty <sic> percent of the money will be transferred. Then it says in school

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

year 1992-93, one hundred <sic> percent. But then it moves on. It jumps from one hundred percent, and it goes to -- in school year 1995-96. But what I want to know, will there be any money at all after this year, because this bill does not say it? In other words, there will be no money. There's a two-year gap period there where there will be no Chapter 1. According to the way this amendment is drafted, no Chapter 1 money at all would go to the schools in those two years.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, once again, I want to refer, Senator, to page 58, that actually implements a freeze. Beginning with line 15, on page 58. If you would read that language, I think you would answer your own question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator, this Section -- it does not say that. It says the same amount that was allocated in the year, that was no money allocated at all.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR COLLINS:

And that's the gap period.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, you read on line 20, and you will find that it says in the fiscal year beginning in 1992. That is the implementation of the freeze.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Any further questions? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

I'm sorry. What line you said that was on?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Which line, Senator Watson?

SENATOR WATSON:

Line 20.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Well, that's exactly what I'm talking about. It says in 1992 the amount... See, zero, it does not exceed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Okay. Now refer back to page 56, and page 56 says eighty percent in that year '92-93.

SENATOR COLLINS:

No. But it... But...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

But, Senator, that's a contradiction. That's what we're saying here. Now, I don't know whether this is technically defaulted or not, but this is a document that I thought that a lot of time and energy went into to make sure that — that it was what you wanted to do. Now, it may be technically flawed. But, then, I have another question that I'd like to ask you. On page — page 10, dealing with the — the staffing plan, the — increasing the authority and responsibility of the Finance Authority. Given the fact that Chicago is merely asking for no new money, but to use part of the levy of the Finance Authority's, which is used for their operation, to — to secure the bonds, are you expecting to hire — the Finance Authority to hire more staff to carry out the duties that they — that you have outlined in this Section of the bill starting at page 10 and continuing through page 11?

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator, what we're doing is actually repealing many of their reform powers, but trying to beef up the financial authority of the School Finance Authority.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Any further discussion? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator, how -- how many staff persons does the Finance Authority have now, actually doing -- accountants and the kinds of thing that you're talking about them to do here? And how many more people will they have to employ?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, right now, they spend approximately three hundred thousand dollars on their reform powers, but how many staff that may be, I'm not sure.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Based on the additional responsibilities that you've given the Finance Authority under this bill, they most certainly will have to increase their budget, because they're going to have to hire some more people. Again what we're doing is expanding the bureaucracy and less dollars are getting down to the children. I don't want to talk and really didn't want to become a part of this circus, and I had indicated that I wouldn't say anything at all. But I did want to call your attention to some of the technical problems of this bill. But the real question is: Why are we here? Inasmuch as I'm on my feet, I thought maybe I would express

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

that we are my version of why we are here. The primary reason here: For the past, really, sixteen years, we really have not had a Governor in this State that have had the political will or the commitment to make education a -- funding of education a priority in this State, and that's why we are here. And we are here at this particular time on this particular date - I think several people indicated that - this is just a political game. This is -this is busywork, to make the people of the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois think that we are -- have a commitment are sincere about opening the schools in the City of Chicago. We all know that's not -- true, and so the people out there it But why are we here without a plan? We're here because the Governor of this State and the Leadership did not put forth You rejected our plan that we put together on the Democratic side here, and you didn't have a real plan of your own. The time is long overdue for the kinds of plan that only last from one year to -- to a year. And the children of the City of Chicago is faced with the same uncertainty every year, and the teachers who work for that City, the same uncertainty, as to whether or not a) the students will be going to school, and whether or not the teachers employed there would have a job. The whole question about bashing the teachers in the City of Chicago for being overpaid, that is unfair and unjust. The suburban areas around the City of Chicago, most of the teachers are paid much more than they are in the City of Chicago. The reality of this situation is that if you want quality teachers to teach in the City of Chicago, midst of the other problems - social problems - that -- and other needs of those children that are being unmet, then you're going to have to pay those teachers to go into that area and teach, and and most certainly you're going to have to pay good teachers to do the job. I'm not here -- and I don't feel, maybe, as strongly as some of my colleagues about our not doing anything because

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

has not been a collective bargaining agreement; although, I support collective bargaining. In fact, being the chief author of the first collective bargaining law in this State for public employees, I most certainly support the right of collective bargaining and teachers to bargain. But my priority here is to deal with the problem of the fact that the children of the City of Chicago is denied equal opportunity to a free education in this State. That issue must stop, and we cannot allow it to happen Whatever plan that we come up with this time, it ought to be a long-term plan so that they are not faced with that uncertain future next year. If not, I'm going to be leading a banner for a class action suit in the federal court myself. Ιf that's what it takes to quarantee those children the right and to stop you from playing political football and using them as a pawn year after year after year as to who's going to get the votes out of the City of Chicago, then I will lead the challenge for a class action suit. I submit that we ought to vote this proposal down, go home and take care of the people's business.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator...

END OF TAPE

TAPE 2

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

...Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Mr. President, I move the previous question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

September 20, 1993

Well, Senator Cronin, we have nine more speakers' lights lit up here. So, after they have been called, why, I will consider that motion. Senator Lauzen.

## SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ladies and Gentlemen, the citizens who elect us feel that there should be an integrity and a consistency between what leaders say and what leaders do. Fundamentally, if education is as important to the leaders in Chicago as they say, why are State taxpayers all around the State asked to eventually pay more in State taxes, when these leaders who believe in education don't ask their own Chicago citizens to pay a proportionate real estate tax to support their own system? It also bothers folks back where I come from when they're called vicious and selfish, when they're already sending in eight hundred and forty million dollars a year into the Chicago school system. I hope that it's not a case that when we talk about the education referendum, that as long as someone else pays the bill, we're all for education. If we are all...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Can we have a little order, please.

## SENATOR LAUZEN:

If we were all shouldering a proportionate share, maybe there would be a greater inclination for folks around the State to pitch in. According to a Taxpayers' Federation of Illinois study of the fifty-nine largest communities in Illinois, Chicago rated fifty-eighth among those fifty-nine as far as their real estate tax burden. In -- for instance, in my district, in Aurora, a hundred-thousand-dollar house, the tax is two thousand and nine dollars; in Chicago, hundred thousand, thirteen hundred and seventy-six dollars. Then when you do research off of the actual tax bills in Aurora East, Batavia, Geneva, Naperville, and Lisle, and compare the education rate divided by the State assessment

September 20, 1993

equalization factor, you'll find a range between 4.69 in Indian Prairie in Naperville, and 3.86 in East Aurora; yet, Chicago The same pattern holds true also in suburban Cook County 2.13. when those rates are compared. When you take a look potential referendum, the question is, naturally, how much is it going to cost taxpayers in Chicago to support education as If you take a look at how much is being asked to borrow this year, a hundred and twenty-eight million -- or, a hundred and twenty million, and you compare to the total amount that's raised in real estate taxes in the City of Chicago - it's 1.275 billion hope that no it represents about 9.4 percent increase. And I one's going to argue that we should have a classification system in the -- the rest of the State of Illinois that shifts the real estate taxes off of resident property taxpayers over to business. For those reasons, I urge a Yes vote on this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator LaPaille.

### SENATOR LaPAILLE:

Today the Illinois Senate's in Thank you, Mr. President. and we're not here for "teacher appreciation day". think with some of the speeches we are here on "dump on Chicago What a role model we are making for our students teachers day". that are back in Chicago. In many families in the City of Chicago, that's the only role model a student has, because they come from broken homes and families and they go to school, and their teacher is a role model. But here we are dumping on them, dumping on them for political reasons and for feel-good politics. And we're here because of spin. We need to spin a story for the next couple of days, so the Governor and your side can had something we offered, and those bad Democrats shot it down." And we're spending taxpayers' money just to do this spin. suggest that perhaps you should have just faxed us this plan, and

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

thirty cents a fax, it would have cost you eight dollars and ten cents for us to send it back to you saying, "No, we don't want to get involved in the collective bargaining process here in Illinois State Senate. That's not what we were elected to do." And I think many of you are sitting in your seats right Why are we here? Why are we putting thinking the same thing: ourselves in the middle of a collective bargaining process? in your hometowns every day and every year with your policemen, with your firemen, with your teachers, with your And do we rush into Special plumbers, with your carpenters. Session to help solve a collective bargaining problem in any The answer is no. And there was a plan at one your locales? point that would have put us around the table. Speaker and Minority Leader Jones recommended that we have unilateral talks - remember this, about three, four weeks ago? - and that the four leaders, the Governor, the Mayor, and the Chicago Board of Education, as well as the Teachers' Union, all sit around one table. And perhaps if your side and the Governor had said yes maybe we would have solved this problem two or three weeks ago, but you said no. So now we're in the outside trying to look in and saying, "Here's our plan." Well, today it's Tomorrow it could be policemen around Chicago Teachers' Union. the State; it could be firemen around the State; it could be Sears workers; it could be Chrysler workers; it could even be County Forest Preserve workers, that we're putting our fingers into their collective bargaining agreements, and getting involved in something we should not be involved in. We're tinkering, and we're tinkering very, very dangerously today with the collective bargaining process in Illinois. I want to commend Senator Watson. He's worked hard. He understands these issues, and he's drafted a But Senator Watson does not live in the City of Chicago or plan. represent the City of Chicago. I don't think he knows the

September 20, 1993

feelings of local school council members or Chicago teachers' unions, or children who are excited, perhaps, when they do get Chapter 1 funds to buy a computer, or to get a reading teacher in, or a tutor, to help them out. He lives two hundred and seventy miles south of Chicago, and I would submit to you that you would not want my colleague, Senator Hendon, drafting a plan for the city schools of Greenville. Likewise, he does not want drafting a plan for the City of Chicago schools. In conclusion, this plan today is a sure formula to increase property taxes in the City of Chicago, in that bungalow belt on the northwest side, on the southwest side. And it's a sure plan, if it passes, there will be a Chicago teachers' strike, or there'll be an uprising by local school council parents, who give of their and volunteer so feverishly, to make Chicago schools number one. This plan should be defeated. We should be on hold. We should've never even came into Special Session. And I'm not going to point fingers at who called the Special Session, or who encouraged the Special Session. We should have been on the outside waiting till it was over; then we should've came down to fill that void. Thank vou very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator DeAngelis.

## SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, if somebody was visiting this Chamber from another country and was asked: "There are two parties in this State. One is symbolized by an elephant, and the other is symbolized by a jackass." They would know immediately who was who. I have to tell you, I -- I've been here fourteen years and so much of what has happened has been so forgotten by the other side. I could go on and on, but let's just hit a few key points. Senator del Valle, if I remember correctly, and I think I was the only one that voted in 1985 against that school

September 20, 1993

reform bill, the purpose of that bill was to give more local control. Now all of a sudden - now all of a sudden - they don't want to eliminate the subdistricts, which is a barrier between local control and the home office. I really don't understand Senator Berman and Senator Hendon - wow, shoo - concerned that. about Title I, both of you. Everyone is. But let me tell you, Senator Philip said, Title I funds are not being reduced; they're being increased with this bill. And you know, maybe you have be a jackass to understand this, but is it better to offer ninety million with closed schools or twenty million with open schools? And I've got to tell you, if there's a warped feeling on this side, that logic defies any explanation whatsoever, and I would submit that if there's any warped thinking, that's it. ninety million and keep the schools closed, or take twenty million and make sure that four hundred and eleven thousand kids are school. Referendum discussion. What a discussion this is. I got tell you something. Three years ago -- and the reason we are here, Senator Demuzio, is that three years ago in the middle of a political campaign, somebody decided it would be better to keep the schools opens with an agreement that couldn't work. In I'll tell you how much it couldn't work, 'cause, acknowledging that agreement, in that agreement it said, if the money's not go back and renegotiate. Well, I got to tell you there, we You've got to be a jackass to think you can do something. That's why we're here. And to turn what happened? too. And around and suggest that a referendum is political, I can't think any more political than what goes on without the referendum. Collective bargaining. Collective bargaining. Senator Demuzio, I don't know what you were trying to say with your solution. All of here would wish that collective bargaining had, in fact, done the job. But then you say you shouldn't be down here, 'cause let collective bargaining do it. But then on the other hand, we

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

should be down here, because when collective bargaining gets done, should come down here and do the work that collective bargaining wants us to do. But the Governor is the one that called the Session, but we -- he shouldn't be calling the Session. Well, who in the hell should call the Session? collective bargaining is done, is that it? The two leaders, okay, Shoo. Senator Shaw, God bless you for your concern about senior citizens, but I want to remind you about a little incident that occurred in the spring. There was a bill, Senate Bill 5. fact, Senator Hendon requested to be a hyphenated sponsor and was. That bill passed out of the Senate, 33 votes. Three Democrats voted for it. You weren't one of them. That bill would have assessments for senior citizens in the State of frozen the And I would submit to you, if you have that great concern, that you ought to revisit that roll call, and maybe you ought to even show a little more concern by asking the Speaker of the House why he's holding the bill. 'Cause that would take care the problem you're concerned about. And again, with this convenient lapse of memory that occurs. Political will. I got to tell you, that one is the real froster. Senator Collins, I don't know how many years you've been in this Body, but I got to tell you, there hasn't been a year that hasn't gone by that Senator Maitland hasn't had a bill, or I haven't had a bill - and Tom Dunn and I had a bill - to change the whole system of funding. And you know what that would have meant Chicago this year, if you go back and review it? Three hundred But you know what? The political will and fifty million dollars. Why? Because there was concern about how it would Now, let me tell you, the chief affect this and affect that. opponent of every one of those is now a candidate for Governor the State of Illinois, who was the Chairman of the Revenue Committee, who suddenly has seen the light. "We ought

September 20, 1993

looking at income tax, rather than property tax." Well, where in the hell were they when this was coming up, and Chicago would have benefited? And I got to tell you, if you, as a statewide candidate, want to demonstrate your political will by saying that we don't have political will, I'm going to put in a class action suit that's going to require that the Comptroller have a cosigner. Last, and more importantly, the one thing that is being overlooked in this whole discussion today is that we have offered a solution. What the Democrats have offered is what they've rhetoric, irrelevant conversation, demagoguery. historically: I got to tell you something right now: You've done it again. What you've done is fill the place with hot air, and all you're trying to do with your rhetoric is put perfume on manure. I suggest you put your money where your mouth is and vote for this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator DeLeo.

## SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I have just some very, very brief comments, and I think that I'm so tired of the finger-pointing coming from the City of Chicago, coming from the media, coming from special interest groups. We have lost our focus. We have totally lost our focus. Everybody has made comments here today, and there are some very valid points. In Amendment No. 4 we — there are some very, very valid points in Amendment No. 4. But let me go back to one very simple concept: We are supposed to fund education, not run education. That's what our primary responsibility is, to send the dollars to Chicago, to these school districts. We got a little pothole and we're trying to fill it up with boulders. We don't know, until the contract is done, how big that hole is going to be. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, we all have the same, same goal here, is to

September 20, 1993

get the Chicago schools open, but for God sakes, let's -- let's find out what the hole's going to be. You know, in the '80s - and the majority of this Body has been here in the '80s in one House or the other Chamber - in the '80s, we had money in that treasury. Everybody that came down here we opened our arms and gave them money - money - because we had a treasury with a plus balance. don't have a plus balance. This is the '90s. These plans that have been floated out here the last two weeks are good plans. Emil Jones' Mayor's plan is good. Pate Philip's plan is good. We're not plan is good. Because it's creative financing. them money. Vince Demuzio said people have the perception they're going to come down here and we're going to bail out the Chicago We're not bailing out anything. We're trying to public schools. get -- be creative. There's cuts that have to be made. There's changes that have to be made. There's LSCs, Chapter 1 monies. There's a million things that -- everybody's got to give a little bit to get these schools open. There isn't one person in Chamber that doesn't want to see the children in schools. let's not lose our focus. Let's go back. We fund education; We have the Finance Authority that we education. don't run Board. We have the created in the '80s. We have the School have the CTUs. Let them run We have the LSCs. We Come back here, give us a number, what their hole is, try and take these great ideas - no pension money. There's some great reform packages in here. There's some things that everybody in this Chamber can agree on. We're a little too And you know what, Ladies and Gentlemen of this premature. We're getting the blame for something that we shouldn't be having the blame. Let's find out what they need and come here and fund it. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator McCracken.

September 20, 1993

### SENATOR McCRACKEN:

The Governor called a Special Session because Mayor Daley had the courage to take on the Teachers' Union on behalf of the children of your City of Chicago. That is why we're here today. His work program changes, which he had sought last spring and which the minority party defeated on numerous occasions, were resurrected in the Daley plan to save the schoolchildren of City of Chicago. Those and others are incorporated in the Republican plan before you today. So the claim of intervention rings hollow. It was the Mayor who had the courage to ask the Governor, who agreed to do so. That is why we're down We're not down here on some fishing expedition to take advantage of the City of Chicago's problems. We're here to try to correct them. We are here at the -- at the invitation of the Chief Executive of the City of Chicago, the body -- or the person That's why we're here. who appoints the Chicago School Board. And to talk about intervention, I haven't heard one Democrat get up and say, "What's wrong with these federal courts intervening in this strike, or in this labor dispute?" I, for one, am offended by the federal court's intervention. It belongs, if anywhere, no further away from Chicago than Springfield. And when your Mayor asks us to get involved, to solve this problem, to take on the Union to the extent we have to for the sake of the children, that's why we were here. And we are not going to apologize for it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Molaro.

## SENATOR MOLARO:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senator McCracken, I'll be the first Democrat to say it: I'm offended by the federal court getting involved; that's one. Thing number two, Senator DeLeo started, and I hope we continue it:

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

Everybody in this room is trying to get it solved. I want to say one thing: I -- my district -- my ward happens to have the Board of Education headquarters, and my district, I'm told, has the most public schools in the State of Illinois - 12th District. I have to say one thing about the Union. I think everybody was in room. I voted for vouchers, and I voted against the Union when it come to the twenty-day rule. So, no one can call me a stooge for the Union. However, we don't have a Union member who's a Member the Senate, and I have to just defend what one of the Senators said earlier. I think the Union has good intentions in what To say that the Union is not for the children is trying to do. kind of rough. The thing I want to talk about with other freshmen is just real quickly, we're stuck with what was done years ago in this Body and across the hall with Republican and Democratic In 1968, votes, Republican and Democratic Governors. decided, in their infinite wisdom, to have collective bargaining and to have a union. Sometimes we have to look at what exactly is a public employee union. I still can't figure out exactly they're trying to do, because we tell the CTU to go in and negotiate with the Board of Education. That's what -- that's The Union goes and negotiates with the Board. this up. When the Union acts like a union, we start screaming at Springfield, saying: "How dare you go to bat for your membership? How dare you try to get for your membership the best possible deal? If you're trying to get the best possible deal for members, you must be against the kids in the City of Chicago." And that's crazy. The Union's out there being exactly what should be, and that's a union. Jackie Vaughn and her people and all the people of the Union are out trying to get the best deal They'd be crazy if they didn't. What's their membership. rotten is the system. We have them negotiate with the Board of Education. We tell the Board: "Here's what you get, 2.5 billion.

September 20, 1993

So when you go and negotiate, you can't talk money. You don't have the authority to talk money." Everywhere else in private industry, when you're there with the negotiators, the negotiators are the -- are the owners of the company. They can decide to give more money anytime they want. So now when we call for a Special Session, what we're telling the Union and the Board, we're telling them: "Hey, Springfield may bail you out. We might you more money." So how could the Union and -- negotiate in good faith? How can the Board actually negotiate in good faith when they don't even know what kind of money they're talking about? 'Cause Springfield may come up with three hundred and fifty million, two hundred and forty million. We may come up with five hundred million dollars. So the Union can't, if they're -- if they're sharp union people, and if they're true advocates, they got - and they are - they got to come out and say, "Well, we want what's coming to our membership." We have to let them know, or maybe somehow figure out a way, and we all know somewhere down along the line we're going to solve this problem. I am just hoping that somewhere along the line when this problem - temporary problem - is solved, we won't do like we always do, strictly crisis management: solve the problem of the day, move on and forget about it; that we somehow get together and start looking at things such as the School Board. Are they there to Who does the Union protect the children or the taxpayers? negotiate with? The people at large or a school board that's not in charge of money? We should look at these problems because I think we're here because of the fact that we have a problem without a solution; that we have a Rubik's Cube that is absolutely unsolvable. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

September 20, 1993

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. With the exception of a couple of speakers on the other side of the aisle, you've attempted to tell us all the reasons in the world that the Chicago schools should not open, and I find that, quite frankly, very shocking. Senator Demuzio - and a number have responded to your question, and I am too - the Chief Executive of this State called us back to Springfield because he was concerned about the boys and girls in the City of Chicago. We're not starting out with this problem at ground zero, an index of zero. from a deficit position - a We're talking about starting out dramatically, serious deficit position that requires some sort of I'm almost sick to death of reading about all the State action. comments with respect to the General Assembly, and the Governor, and the Mayor, and the School Board, and everybody else, by the Chicago media. Some justified and some not. But I would submit Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, that unless we'd establish some broad parameters within which they can negotiate to, once that agreement is reached, or tentative agreement is reached in the City of Chicago, we will come back here and never solve the problem. This give us -- gives them something to work They have a known quantity of revenue. Absolutely do. Without it they have absolutely nothing. Chapter 1. It's to be concluded by some of you on that side of the aisle that with this change in Chapter 1, that that money all of a sudden falls into some sewer someplace, because it goes to Pershing Road. In fact, that money goes back to the school. Maybe slightly differently, but at least it goes back, hopefully, to boys and girls, probably with as much assurance as -- as it is now going. But the fact of Senator del Valle and the matter is, the money goes there. I was around here for '85 Reform. I was one of the cosponsors. I worked on that issue for two solid years. not an easy sell in my Republican Caucus, because you know why?

September 20, 1993

Because eighty-five percent of '85 Reform directed itself to at-risk boys and girls. Boys and girls who were in need: and girls who were at risk of academic failure. And I sold the concept in my caucus on the point that if we directed money to those boys and girls, that they would become good students as well. And it's working. Not funding it to the level be, but the Chicago School District, Ladies and Gentlemen, gets a preponderance of that money. And that point cannot be forgotten. I wish every Democrat had a chance to be in the leadership meetings with Senator Philip and the Governor, when he's when we sit and talk about the number one issue: How do we get four hundred and eleven thousand boys and girls in the City of Chicago back in the classroom, and keep them there? We are there for that purpose. Senator DeAngelis, you made the point. We have a plan. We have something that will get the boys and girls back there and keep them there. We care for the Chicago school They deserve a quality students as much as we do for our own. education like ours do, and I would submit to you that this plan will realize that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Jacobs.

## SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senator DeAngelis, first of all, the symbol of our party is a donkey, not a jackass, and everyone knows that an elephant - all elephants - have bigger asses than jackasses or donkeys either one. We have jackasses in both parties. I think we've clearly identified that today. We probably had today gridlock at its best. And I'm wondering with all of the bashing of the teachers, the School Board, the Union, and the words of who's responsible and who is irresponsible, who is for the kids and who is not for the kids; maybe we're losing sight of one thing. We have not been

September 20, 1993

able to get this issue resolved over the past couple weeks with the process we're using. And I don't know about you, but I know many of my constituents back home are saying, "What the hell did we elect you for? Every time we turn around all you're doing is going down and voting on something, or you're going to react to something that five people got together and decided for you." Maybe it's time that we take this process back. Maybe it's time that we sit down and discussed this in open forum, as we have now - it's a good exercise; I still believe in it - and try to come up with a solution. I look at this a little bit today and -- and I say, well, we're not playing politics with this amendment, but yet I see language in here that I have never, ever seen in my time of seven years - maybe I've missed it - in the enactment stage of Section 99, which says that if it doesn't get thirty-six votes, and it gets less than that, that it's going to be -- take place in July of '94. What that tells me is you know darned well that you got your votes; that you're going to get your simple majority. You're going to get it out, but you're not going to get the Then it's going to go to the other side of the thirty-six votes. And we'll all make the asses of ourselves again, if you rotunda. will. And it will go down the tubes, and we'll be right back page one again. This is an exercise, folks. It's an exercise in futility. It is not helping the kids. I think it's time, that we take a little more interest and take the process back, and discuss this in open forum and come up with a good solution. This happens not to be a good one. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Jones.

## SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. And I raised that question several times with my esteemed colleague, Senator Philip: Why are we here today? Why are we bringing

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

Members down here, wasting taxpayers' money, paying all this per diem, when all you really want is a show for the media? A theater-in-the-round, more or less. Because when Senator Philip called me last Thursday, I asked him, I said, "Why not all four of us come together, including the Governor, and resolve the issue? Let's not go down there with a one-person plan to try and solve Chicago schools." The Governor called a Special Session. And let say this to you freshmen legislators: I've been here twenty years. There have been other Special Sessions, but this first time that the Chief Executive have called a Special Session and didn't have any plan whatsoever. Senator Syverson, vou the same thing. "There is no reason to go down there if there is no agreement" - Rockford Journal Star, week and a half Senator Philip said the same thing just this past week: should we go down there if there is no agreement?" Look at that clock right there. It's broken. But one thing that clock will do for you, you will get the correct time at least twice a day. That's more than we get from the other side. Governor Edgar last year, "Mayor Daley, I'm for the third airport." Year before last that was. "I'm going to help you get the third airport." I'm still seeing where those votes are coming from for Lake Calumet. He said in the spring of this year, "I'm for riverboats for Chicago." I never saw those boats come about. And in the meeting in July, when we were in overtime, I kept insisting, The Governor, must resolve the problem of the Chicago schools. Senator Philip said, "We're going to have Special Session. we're going to do riverboats, and deal with the schools at that time." I said, "No, it got -- it must be done now." No support. is the first thing the Governor said when he called a Special Session? "No riverboats." One thing you learn in this Body, your word must mean something. No good word come from the Second Floor. And I always raise that question. I want to

September 20, 1993

resolve the problem. I do not like the fact that the other side of the aisle and the Second Floor is playing politics with the education of the children in the Chicago public school system. could've resolved the borrowing in July. And I put the same borrowing plan before Senator Philip and the other leaders, the support was not there because you want to hold the children of Chicago hostage. You're talking about a Democratic plan. had a Democratic plan. We had a plan that included this old game that the Governor's been playing all these years. The shell We put money in from the Lottery; we put close the back door. money in from the riverboats, and the Governor, like a thief the night, keeps pulling it out the back door. That's what we've been going through. And you talk about wanting to help Chicago. If you want to help Chicago, give Chicago what the rest of the State has. Let them solve their own problems. Not one dime being requested of the State of Illinois to solve Chicago's But there have been times, you know, when about taxes. There have been times when even DuPage County and some downstate, you want to solve some internal problems. been supportive of you doing such. We -- we even passed legislation to give DuPage County some -- some -- some water Lake Michigan. Had I been in on the deal, you would still be paying, because we did not hold the people of DuPage County But you're wanting to hold four hundred thousand children hostage so you can push forward your own political That is wrong. And let -- you talk about Chapter 1. agenda. took me fifteen years to get that language in place where the dollars are directed - fifteen years to get that done. And the way this bill is drafted, you're going to take all the money all the money - and use it as General Revenue Fund. So let's quit playing these silly games. This is a theater; you want to put on a show for the media. Well, you got your show, at the waste of

September 20, 1993

taxpayers' dollars for them to pay for it. If you were the genuine, if you were sincere, you would have dealt with this issue in July. But, no; you wanted to play silly games. Not one dime not one dime - is Chicago asking for. At the conclusion of fiscal year for the Board, it had a surplus, but the other school districts across the State of Illinois owe over a hundred and twenty-six million dollars. And I hear a lot of talk about the pension, but some of you have a very short memory. before last. Governor Edgar took a lot of State dollars and used the -- used that to pay for the State employees' pension. Four percent, he used. But you won't hear him talking about that. Let's quit playing these silly games. esteemed colleague, Senator Philip, when you called me, I said, "The House won't be in Session. There is no agreement." your own word - and I guoted you - you said, "Why should we even be here?" Senator Syverson <sic> talking about the tax rate the City of Chicago. But if you look at the City of Chicago, the burden of the taxpayers, the homeowners supporting all these folks from all across the suburbia area coming in there to raise the tax rate. Transportation, congestion and so forth. So -- and I it. I know what Senator Hendon is talking about. Those same cars see cruising with the suburban license plates -- stickers. let's guit playing those -- stop playing those silly games. We are not asking for anything - anything - that the other school districts across the State of Illinois has. And -- and esteemed Revenue Chairman, -- I'm sorry. I mean. Assistant Majority Leader. I thought the other fellow had the Chairmanship, Rauschenberger. But what I'm saying is -- is this: Give Chicago what it is entitled to, and quit trying to hold the children hostage on the pretense that you want to help them. If you wanted to help them you would have voted for the plan in the Executive Committee that the Senate Democrats put forward. So I encourage

September 20, 1993

the Members - all Members on this side of the aisle - the show is over. This is the last call. It costs the taxpayers - I don't know what the per diem is - to see this show that my esteemed colleague wanted to put on. But again, this is not the last call as far as the act is concerned, because we must come back when all parties agree, and I urge every Member in this Chamber to vote No on House Bill 525.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Any further discussion? If not, Senator Watson, to close. SENATOR WATSON:

Well, thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. I guess I'm kind of disappointed with the previous speaker. I was hoping that we would see some bipartisanship in an attempt to solve the problems of the public schools of Chicago, but obviously, that maybe isn't the case here today. You know, you have a school system in which you graduate less than fifty percent of those young people who that's a -- that's a school district that's got To me some problems. And that's a school district that's broke, and we need to fix it. And we don't fix it, Senator Jones, by simply sending more money. And that's the message that you've given the people of Illinois today, is just give us more money. not the answer. We try to address that in House Bill 525. We create some reforms that we think are necessary in order to create a better education system for the young people - the four hundred and eleven thousand young people - of the City of Chicago. I want to go through and address several of the questions that were -that were brought up, and some of the comments by Members on both sides of the aisle, and the issue dealing with the Chapter 1 And I want to reiterate what President Philip mentioned; that we are not taking money away. We are freezing that revenue hundred and thirty million dollars, and in fact, we are increasing it by twenty million dollars, because there was forty

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

million dollars that wasn't spent in Chapter 1 funding. And that money that was spent, remember. Remember Channel 2. WBBM. Remember them, and the message that they've sent to the people of Chicago and the message that you're sending by not supporting this issue; that the Chapter 1 money is being contracted away with --Thousands and hundreds of thousands of with former employees. dollars for trips to Lake Geneva, to New Mexico. Is that what you want? Is that what you think Chapter 1 funding's for, is for some teacher registration and convention in New Mexico? No. But that's what we're doing, and that's what's believe it is. The delay of the effective date. Seems being done now. much concern about the delaying of the effective date. We have a budget for the City of Chicago public schools of 2.6 billion The bonds that we're talking about is a hundred and dollars. twenty-one -- hundred and twenty million dollars the first year. The School Finance Authority has said that their plan is to issue those bonds in the latter part of the year. They can operate on existing funds. So that hundred and twenty million dollars could be made available during those last two months of the school year. Several of you commented about the effective date and the language that's in here that says if we don't receive the thirty-six votes necessary to make this immediate. I want to refer back to July 2nd. And many of you have referred to this debate, July 1988, in which one of the former speakers talked about making lemonade out of lemons. And that individual knows who he is. let me -- let me just tell you what he said here, and this is one "Although there's a delayed effective date, the pluses: everyone will know that we, speaking for the people of the Illinois, are requiring, as far as reform is concerned, and I suggest to you and I suggest to them - the people of Illinois many of these steps in this reform plan can begin immediately. They don't have to wait for the law." So this has

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

been done before. And -- and later on in debate former President Philip talked about the implementations of this legislation -former President Rock talked about the implementation of the Chicago reform package at a later date, because the effective date You know, one of the speakers talked about my was delayed. concern, or why -- why is Frank Watson, from Greenville, Illinois, concerned about the public school kids of Chicago? Well, I to tell you: Why don't you come down to my district and go to the Vandalia Correctional Center? Why don't you come down to my district and go to the Centralia Correctional Center? Why don't to Vince Demuzio's district and go to the Graham you Correctional Center? And unfortunately - unfortunately - many those residents and inmates in the correctional system are a product - a product - of the lack of education in the public schools of Chicago. That's why I'm concerned about it, because my taxpayers' money and your taxpayers' money goes to fund the correctional system. And you tell me that the Chicago public education system isn't broke. It needs fixing, and that's what we're attempting to do. Collective bargaining. I've sat the House and the Senate for fourteen Education Committee in years. For fourteen years I've seen us cram down the throats of local school boards mandate after mandate after mandate. where's it coming from? It wasn't coming from us. We've finally the Republican Education Committee, as put a halt to it. In myself as Chairman and the other five Members, we've said enough is enough. Mandates have come to a halt in the State of Illinois. But the -- but the piosity -- just the remarks and the attitude of some of those on the other side of the aisle, unfortunately, lead champions of me to believe that all of a sudden they are the You know, Mayor Daley came up with a plan. Daley - whether it's political or not - tries to solve the problem of the public schools of Chicago. Many of his provisions are

September 20, 1993

embraced in our proposal. From the City Hall of Chicago, it's a bipartisan effort. He wants to see the schools reopen. should be a bipartisan effort on the Floor of the Senate Politics seems to enter into it, and any time I've talked to anybody about this - I don't care whether it's been on the in -- with these -- Pershing Road or with the Mayor's people - I said, "Why is it always political? Whv decision has to always be worried about the implication of politics?" We're talking about four hundred and eleven thousand Many of you didn't even schools of Chicago. students in the mention it on this Floor, and that ought to be our concern, of creating an environment in which those kids have got a future, an opportunity. Senator DeLeo, I have to congratulate you on many of your remarks. There is no State money involved in this program. We think that this is a problem of the City, and we're trying to help resolve that. But there's no State dollars in here. And when you say that it's premature to talk about this, we were under a temporary restraining order. The 23rd of September the curtain comes down. And what happens at that point? We think we ought to be a part of the solution, and that's what we're doing here today. You know, we talked about -- one of the previous speakers mentioned this report: "A View from the Elementary Schools: The State of Reform in Chicago." He talked about this report and importance of the reforms, and -- and the speaker was correct: Reforms are working in many of the areas of the City. But this report doesn't bear out, necessarily, what the speaker It talks about, in its summary, was referring to. short-term trends in student achievement are not very informative at this particular point, and that they will be doing a report the future to discuss the implementations of Chicago School Reform and what they're doing for the young people. Test scores. have we seen in test scores? Not necessarily a major improvement.

September 20, 1993

Attendance, no. Graduation rate, certainly not. But maybe, Ι guess, somebody just feels good about this report and about what's happening in Chicago. And that is important, but it's the young people who ultimately will pay the price. And one of the speakers says, "What are we doing here today?" Well, I just want to make it certain that at least some of the Members of this Body, and hopefully the majority, and hopefully thirty-six, are concerned about those people who are caught up in this trap - those four hundred and eleven thousand kids - who want to opportunity, like you and I have had an opportunity, to succeed in life; to have a future. And that's what this is all about. that's what you're going to see a roll call from this side of the aisle, is the vast majority of us are concerned about that future for those young people. And I urge you to vote Yes.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

The question is, shall House Bill 525 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, 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, the Ayes are 30, the Nays are 29, none voting Present -- 28, excuse me. 28 Nays, 30 Ayes. The bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar No. 1, there appears House Bill 795. For what purpose Senator Donahue arise? Senator Donahue.

#### SENATOR DONABUE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to request a change of -- sponsorship, please, for House Bill 795. It now reads Donahue-Berman. I would like to change it to Watson-Berman.

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Donahue has moved to change sponsorship of House Bill 795 from Senator Donahue, dash Berman, to Senator Watson. Without objection, so ordered. Senator Berman, for what purpose do you

September 20, 1993

arise?

SENATOR BERMAN:

Well, I -- I always like to follow the lead of Senator Donahue. So I'll just ask that my name be removed as a cosponsor, without even knowing what's going to happen to 795.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there leave? Leave is granted. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 795.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee or Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. For what purpose Senator Demuzio arise? SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would just like -- rise to inquire as to what the schedule for the remainder of the day, and perhaps some knowledge about when -- when we're coming back, if ever.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Next Wednesday will be a perfunctory Session day, unless the Members are otherwise notified. Next Wednesday will be perfunctory, unless otherwise notified. For what purpose does Senator Hendon arise?

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just rise to inquire about three pieces of legislation that I filed dealing with this crisis

8th Legislative Day

September 20, 1993

calling for elected school board in the City of Chicago, and other two bills. Has it been sent to committee? I can't -- I don't see anything here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

The Secretary informs me that you have filed no bills. Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

The -- the bills have been filed. They were filed on Friday, but I will -- I will yield to -- to just see if...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

If you'd check with the Secretary, Senator Hendon. If there's no further business, Senator Philip moves the Senate stand adjourned. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. We stand adjourned.

REPORT:	TIFLDAY
PAGE: 00	01

## STATE OF ILLINOIS 88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

94/11/29 14:02:51

# SENATE DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX SPECIAL SESSION # 1

SEPTEMBER 20, 1993

HB-0525 RECALLED HB-0525 THIRD READING HB-0795 SECOND READING HB-0795 OTHER SUBJECT MATTER	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	3 8 60 59	
SENATE TO ORDER-PRESIDENT PHILIP	PAGE	1	
PRAYER-FATHER KRAFT	PAGE	1	
JOURNALS-APPROVED	PAGE	1	
JOURNAL-POSTPONED	PAGE	1	
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	1	
AT EASE	PAGE	2	
SENATE RECONVENES	PAGE	3	
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	61	