24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

The regular Session of the 89th General Assembly will come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks, and will our guests in the gallery please rise. Our prayer today will be given by the Reverend David Schauer, St. Frances Cabrini Church, Springfield. Reverend Schauer.

THE REVEREND DAVID SCHAUER:

(Prayer by the Reverend David Schauer)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

All rise for the Pledge of Allegiance. Senator Sieben. SENATOR SIEBEN:

(The Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Sieben)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Reading of the Journal. Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Wednesday, March 1st; Thursday, March 2nd; Friday, March 3rd; and Tuesday, March 7th, in the year 1995, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Butler moves to postpone the reading and approval of the Journal, pending arrival of the printed transcripts. There being no objection, it is so ordered. ABC News-New York requests permission to tape the proceedings, as does WAND. Leave is granted. Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Fawell, Chair of the Committee on Transportation, reports Senate Bills 192 and 561 Do Pass; Senate Bills 157, 226 and 350 Do Pass, as Amended; and Senate Bill 508 Tabled by the sponsor.

Senator Cronin, Chair of the Committee on Education, reports Senate Bills 366, 529 and 535 Do Pass; Senate Bill 625 Do Pass, as

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

Amended; and Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 17 Be Adopted.

And Senator Sieben, Chair of the Committee on State Government Operations, reports Senate Bill 560 Do Pass; and Senate Bill 271 Do Pass, as Amended.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 206, offered by Senator Cronin.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 355, by Senator Hawkinson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 358, by Senator Hawkinson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 505 is offered by Senator Maitland.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 560, by Senator Demuzio.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And Senate <sic> Bill 567, by Senator Mahar.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

On page 2 of the Calendar are -- on the Order of House -- Senate Bills on 2nd Reading. If any Member wishes to move their bill, we'll go down the list. Senator Klemm, on 62? Out of the record. 63. Senator Klemm? Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 63.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

3rd Reading. Senator Peterson, on Senate Bill 76? Out of the record. Senator Woodyard, on 112? Out of the record. Senator Klemm, on Senate Bill 122? Out of the record. Senator Fawell, on 264? Do you wish the bill read? Out of the record. Senator O'Daniel, on 288? Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 288.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Watson on the Floor? 185. Do you wish the bill read? Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 185.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Executive adopted Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Floor Amendment 2, offered by Senator Watson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. This is an amendment we discussed in the Executive Committee when the bill was heard. It simply strikes the word "dispenses" from the definition of a person deemed to be practicing optometry. This was a concern that the Illinois Retail Merchants brought to our attention. The optometrists had no problem with striking this language, and as a

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

result, it's agreed to, and I'd move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Is there discussion? Is there discussion? Senator Watson now moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House <sic> Bill 185. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. And the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

3rd Reading. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we will be moving to Senate Bills 3rd Reading, bottom of page 2. Let me announce the -- the first few Members with -- with bills out of the chute: Senator Watson, Senator Cronin, Senator Weaver, Senator Butler, Senator Woodyard, Senator Mahar. In that order. Senator Hawkinson, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Just point of inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday we started to go through 3rd Readings. It's not your intention to take up where we left off yesterday?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

I -- I should have mentioned that, Senator Hawkinson. We're going to start at the top of the Calendar again. All right, Ladies and Gentlemen, bottom of page 2. Senate Bill 8. Senator Watson. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 8.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

Thank you, Mr. President. This legislation was amended in -- in committee and is now the bill - the actual amendment, and it -- it repeals a provision that's in the Public Aid Code and the Department of -- or Department of Corrections' Unified Code which would require an intergovernmental agreement to expedite those people who are incarcerated in this State when they apply for Public Aid benefits. My attitude, and I think the majority of the Members of the committee, supported by bipartisan support in committee, is that why should people who are incarcerated or who State of Illinois go to the front of the prison in the line. I think one of the things that we fail in our -- in our correctional system is the teaching of responsibility. And if, in fact, these people want to apply and are eligible for public aid, then so be it. They should have that right, just as everybody else has, but they should not go ahead of somebody who is out in the public sector, who is not a part of the Department of Corrections. So, I say that should be repealed; that those people who are in the Department of Corrections, they have counselors there; they can file in a timely fashion, and they should not their application should not be expedited. That basically is the bill, Mr. President. I would be glad to answer any questions. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Is there discussion? Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yes. Senator Watson, when the Department of Corrections and Department of Public Aid came to this agreement, do you know why they did agree on this? Why two years ago when they had this bill ordered and it was passed, that they felt at that time it was a

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

good initiative?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

No, I -- I do not, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Okay. Has someone come to you and has told you that this is now a bad deal, other than you personally feel that this is a --we're giving somebody too much of a -- a good thing? Has the Department come to you and said that it's not working out? The Department of Corrections says that they're having complications in trying to make this -- this thing work? Has the Department of Public Aid said that there -- that there -- there's too many cases involved right now; they have a -- a overload? Is there any reason that this -- that we should not continue with this, other than some few individuals who personally feel that we are giving a sucker an even break?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, nobody came to me from either agency and said that this was a problem, Senator, but it's a philosophical problem that I have. I mean, why should somebody -- well, I guess I don't need to answer it in that vein, but it's a philosophical problem. These people who -- that are incarcerated in this State have the opportunity to apply just like everybody else does, and they -- maybe they -- you know, they've got a lot of time on their hands in the Department of Corrections, I would assume. They should have. And why not put that time to good use and put -- and apply for the -- your benefits in a -- in a manner in which everybody

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

else is asked to do? That's basically what we're trying to do.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Ladies and Gentlemen, let's have your attention please. Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

So what you're saying, Senator Watson, is that these women who are being discharged and who probably have children waiting for them when they get out should wait another six weeks before they become a viable parent, or at least trying to take care of children soon as they get out. Now they've been separated from their children now for -- for ever how many years, whatever their term or their sentence was. So what this bill did initially was allow them once they were released after serving their time, were able to come out and -- and try to be a parent to these folks and that -- that parenthood was assisted by our system of government which says that they can be eligible for AFDC until they found meaningful employment. So what you're saying is that these women now should come out and not have any kind of support system helping them, which was the impetus of the bill in the first place, that did allow these women to actually come out to be mothers to the children that they had been -- been separated from.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Was that a question, Senator Trotter? SENATOR TROTTER:

...so -- so what you're saying is that they should not come out after serving their time and be -- be made whole by having an opportunity to receive funds from a system that has agreed and has also -- has said that they are eligible to receive these funds. So the Department, who -- who felt the same way as -- as I did two and a half years ago, allowed them to expeditiously do this. You now, philosophically, say it is wrong to assist these mothers, who

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

now have served their time, to be good parents to their children with the help of the system.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

That was a statement, Senator Trotter. Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Will -- will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Senator Watson, do you have any knowledge whatsoever how much money these mothers are given when they leave prison? Do we give them enough to -- to start out with, or -- or do we just release them?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

They are given some consideration - financial consideration and possibly transportation. I'm not sure what that value is. But I think what's being misunderstood here, and by Senator Trotter and I think by the tone of your question, is that there -there's nothing in what we're trying to do here that would prohibit them from being eligible for benefits the day they get out of prison. All we're saying is that they should apply and fill out that application and go through the process in the same manner that those people who are doing it in the private sector, who are not in prison. We are giving special consideration to those people who are incarcerated - men and women. It's not necessarily just a woman's issue. So we're -- we're -- we don't think that they should be treated in a special manner. We think they should be responsible and fill out their application and get it in in a timely manner, like everybody else is asked to do.

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

I guess, you know, my -- where I'm coming from, I -- I happen to serve on one of these marvelous commissions that I get put on all the time, about when we get -- when we discharge some of these people that have -- have been incarcerated for a number of years. And I have said and I have talked, frankly, to Henry Hyde and a few of the others. We've got two problems when these -- when these people get out. Number one, a lot of them do not have housing when they get out because they -- they have no place to go. Their -- frankly, their families will not accept them back and so they're out there on the street. The second problem that we've got is, frankly, most of them also don't have their Social Security card. And what's the first thing that an employer will ask you for is what is your Social Security number. these people have never held a job, and they don't have a Social Security number or have a Social Security card. I have suggested to our congressmen, a) before anybody is allowed out of prison, they darn well ought to have that card in their hot little hand so that they could apply for a job, but the second problem is the housing. I have some very mixed feelings about this, because it just seems to me that -- that if we don't find some way to keep them out, obviously a lot of these people will then turn right back into crime because they have no housing, they have no job and they have no money. And I think if you check, you will find we give them carfare to come back to wherever they came from, whether it's the City of Chicago or whether it's -- it's Wheaton or Glen Ellyn, and fifty dollars. I think that's the amount of money we give them. That's not going to even get them a place to stay for a night, much less two or three weeks. So if you could find out those answers, I would be happy.

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I'd like to direct my remarks to our sponsor of this bill. Have you ever been down to Dixon? May I ask that question. Have you been to Dixon, Illinois - the women's prison?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

The home of Ronald Reagan? Dixon, Illinois? I've been to Dixon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator -- Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you. I'm sorry. Dwight Prison. Have you visited Dwight Prison?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

No, ma'am, I have not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

I wish before you entered this bill that you would have visited Dwight. The women -- and this -- this Legislature sponsored a chapel at Dwight because it's State property, and that chapel has saved women who went in there and did not know right from wrong. But because there is a chapel there and there is a focus to our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, these women have attempted to change their lives, to be better citizens. They've made mistakes, but they want to become better citizens. Now you --

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

you're working on the children. Children don't ask to come here. Now you want to kill out the parents, who after having been possibly converted, say, "I want to do better and make a better citizen of myself when I -- am relieved from prison." And you -or these women who would be qualified for AFDC regardless of their incarceration and to deny them timely access to their benefits has negative effect on them and their children by this legislation. If this bill is enacted, it would not prevent former prisoners who are eligible for public aid to make applications for assistance; it would only prolong the process for them. Although this bill is viewed by its sponsor as a get-tough-on-crime, it would also increase the crime rate, because it may cause people to commit another crime in order to provide for their families. I'm sure, sir, that you do not intend to do that. We're trying to help our We are trying to give these young women another chance in life, and you're getting them -- you're hitting them right the face when they are released and say when they come outside, there will be no assistance to them, whatsoever. encouraging wrong; yet, at the same time, you're seeking to I -- I'm against this legislation, and I think tough on crime. any of you who are cognizant of the fact that young women are trying in spite of their circumstances, you're going to make it worse. And I wish you would think about that twice. Everybody not like you. Everybody do not have the same opportunities that you have had. But they are young women who have had a hard way to come up and that prison has helped them by virtue of the fact that there was a chapel there, and you want to kill them out before Please. I know they apply before -- before they get started. they go out.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Is there...

SENATOR SMITH:

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

They can... Regardless to which way you consider this, please think in terms of these young women who need help.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Is there further discussion? Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you. I think maybe there's a misunderstanding, and, Senator Watson, maybe you can answer this question. This bill has nothing to do with any programs or chapel or anything that's going on currently inside the prison. This has nothing to do with those who leave prison and are having transportation costs. You can still obtain your benefits the day you walk out the door. This bill just says that you have to ask and fill out the paperwork while you're in prison. It's just not going to be handed to you. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I hope everybody was listening because that's absolutely correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Syverson.

SENATOR SYVERSON:

I guess I just want to make sure everyone understands this. This does not change it. This does not take any benefits away. This does not reduce benefits. This does not reduce the time in when individuals can receive benefits. It's just saying, if you're going to be coming out into society, there is some personal responsibilities you have to take, and we're asking these prisoners to take five minutes out of their time to ask a counselor for the paperwork to begin the process of getting onto aid. And it's not taking aid away. We're just not going to turn around and put them on aid automatically. We want them to take

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

the time to ask and take some responsibility to apply for that kind of aid. And that's all this bill does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Senator Watson, I think I heard you a few minutes ago, said that the reason you're putting this bill forward is that you don't want people coming out of prison being put in front of other people who are eligible for these benefits. Is that correct? Because, I'm sorry, I was talking to someone at the time. Is -- is that what I heard correctly?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, in a manner of speaking, that was correct. But I -- I just don't think their applications should be expedited and they should be put ahead of those people that are applying that are in the private sector and not part of the Department of Corrections. I think that they were getting an unfair advantage in expediting their applications.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Yes. And how many people are in that situation from the private sector who are being inconvenienced?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

A great number. A great number.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Well, is it tens, hundreds, thousands? How many people are inconvenienced? If that -- if that is the crux of this bill, then how many people are we talking about?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, in my district office, where -- we oftentimes get calls from those people who have applied for public aid and for whatever reason their application is being -- it's not going through the process in a manner in which they would like to see or we would like to see. So, they are being denied benefits, or access health care, or -- or dollars that could be made available to them, food stamps - whatever -- whatever the program may be - and part of that reason could be because somebody is sitting over in Public Aid expediting applications of people who are incarcerated this State. I just don't think that's fair. I don't think that's fair to the people who are out there who are -- who maybe, for whatever point and period in their life, they've got a tough time right now, and so they go to the Department of Public Aid and they ask for an application and they want -- they want to receive benefits and they need benefits. Why should somebody who's incarcerated and in this -- in the prison system in this State be put ahead of those types of folks? I -- that's what I see what the legislation did, if it was two years ago or however many years ago, when it was adopted. I want to see... (microphone cutoff)... PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

To the bill: I think this is another case of boomerang politics. It's -- it's unfortunate, first of all, that more and more people are having to apply for public aid. That is an evidence that there are more and more poor people in this State. And for us to have some kind of competition between the poor and the poorer, I think is an unfortunate way to go. I don't think that this has anything to do with personal responsibility. think I heard Senator Fawell mention something about getting a -a card -- Social Security card before you come out of prison. seems to me that this is a benefit to the society in general. Ιf people know where they're going, what their next step is, it's a bridge to somewhere. I think that's a benefit to all of us. And I don't see why this has to be passed. I don't think it makes any sense. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Fawell, for a second time.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. And I apologize for standing a second time, but will the sponsor yield for a question? Senator Watson, is this going to stop the prison officials from going to those women six weeks in advance and saying, you are going to get out in six weeks; here's some papers; fill them out; don't wait till the last minute, or you're not going to have your Public Aid benefits? Will this stop that at all?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

No, it does not prevent that at all. They have counselors who -- who are assigned to inmates in the Department of Corrections. I would think it would be good for that counselor to know the exit date of that inmate and make that type of preparation. Nor does

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

this prevent the inmate - the incarcerated individual - from taking the responsibility upon themselves - which I hope that that's something we're trying to teach in the Department of Corrections, is some responsibility - and apply for it in a timely fashion so that money and benefits would be there when they get out -- the day they exit out of the Department of Corrections.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

So what you're trying to do, in effect, is -- is say, "Make sure those people understand when they have six weeks left."

"Fill these papers out. Don't wait till the day before you leave to fill those papers out, because if you do, we are no longer going to put you at the head of the line, above some other woman who has come in five weeks ago to apply for the -- for her public aid and is waiting for those papers to be processed." Is that right? Somebody that is -- that is not incarcerated, who has already done this, and you're not putting someone who waited till the last minute -- even though she knew she was getting out of prison, you're not waiting till the last -- she won't be able to wait till the last minute to fill those papers out. Is that what you are attempting to do?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Yes, it is, and we're trying to teach some responsibility.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

All right. Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator -- I'm sorry. I thought you were finished. Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

I -- I just think, then, this is -- this is a good bill. This

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

is a logical bill. It is true that -- that these people are going to have to start taking responsibility for their own actions. If -- that's not too much to ask, if the counselors are there and the counselors are telling them, "Fill these papers out so that when you get out, you will indeed be able to get your children back immediately and -- and set up a house for them." This is not much to ask. And if, indeed, we are having problems trying to get other people who have gone to their Public Aid offices for assistance and have been put back on the back burner because these people are irresponsible, I think that's not asking too much. And I think it's a good bill and we all ought to be on board.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Watson, you wish to close, sir?

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. Unfortunately, I think, as the debate has progressed here, there's some people who haven't really understood what we're trying to do. And -- and I apologize if I'm not making it clear. If we read the transcript, I think, of what Senator Palmer said, you -- you would believe that she was in support of this because of what she said. We -- we have a competitive system right now. I mean, that's what's out there. The -- the inmate is competing, and unfairly competing, those people who are less fortunate, who are in the private sector, who come into an office somewhere and try to get their benefits. They are competing unfairly. We're giving them an unfair advantage: People who are incarcerated in this State. Doesn't make any sense. I don't understand it. I mean, I -- so I think what she was saying in essence is, correct - it shouldn't be So this should be repealed. Senator Smith, I -- I competitive. agree with you, and I -- you know what I'd like to do? I want to go to Dwight. I want to go in there and see. I try to visit the correctional facilities throughout this State, and I try to make

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

myself accessible to those people, because I share a lot of the same concerns that you do and that you mentioned in debate. т share those concerns. This has nothing - absolutely nothing - to do with -- with an individual's ability to be eligible the that they exit out of the Department of Corrections. Has absolutely nothing. I think there's some people that are -- that misunderstand what's happening here. We're not saying that on the day you exit is the first day you can apply. We're not We're saying you should apply in the manner in which will prepare you to be eligible the day you exit out of the Department I think this is a responsible approach, and it Corrections. hopefully will teach some responsibility to those unfortunate ones who are incarcerated and who have committed a crime against society and are paying their price. That price ends the day they exit. And if they're eligible and those benefits should be theirs, then, fine, that -- that should happen. But they should not go to the head of the line in front of those people who are unfortunately out there trying to make it on their own. I'd appreciate the Aye vote, Mr. President. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 8 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, Mr. Secretary. On that question, there are 43 Ayes, 12 Nays, no Members voting Present. Senate Bill 8, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Associated Press requests leave of the Body to record the proceedings. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senate Bill 17. Senator, do you wish this bill Senator Cronin. returned to Reading for the purpose of amendment? Senator Cronin seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 17 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 17. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Cronin.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. We have two amendments here, Senate Floor Amendment 3 and Senate Floor Amendment 4, which were debated thoroughly in committee yesterday, and I'm seeking their adoption. I'm also seeking, for purposes of clarification, to advance the bill and take a vote on the underlying bill, as well. So if I may reserve my remarks for the bill, as amended, once the amendments are adopted, I would ask the Chair if I can proceed in that manner.

We are taking the -- the amendments separately though, Senator Cronin, and you're offering the first amendment, which is Amendment No. 3. Can you briefly explain the amendment? Senator Cronin, I understand, we'll adopt that -- that amendment. All right. Okay. Is -- is there any discussion? If not, all those in favor of Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 17, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 4, offered by Senator Cronin.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

I would renew the same motion with respect Amendment No. 4. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

Senator Cronin moves the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 4 to Senate Bill 17. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any Floor amendments -- any further Floor amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

3rd Reading. 3rd Reading. On Senate Bill 17 -- on 3rd -- on 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 17. Senator Cronin, do you wish to call that bill, sir? Mr. Secretary, read the bill, sir. SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 17.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 17, as many of you may know, Educational Choice Act. More commonly referred to as vouchers or school choice. We have adopted two amendments, Senate Amendment No. 3 and 4, which become the bill. Senate Amendment No. 3 has several specific provisions that I would go through and offer to you in the following manner: First and foremost, this program is a voucher program and it would be issued during the '96-'97 school year. It is specifically designed to apply to one subdistrict the City of Chicago. City of Chicago has various within subdistricts and this is designed to apply to one subdistrict, as determined by a council that will be set up, as well. The -- any pupil residing within the subdistrict -- the selected subdistrict within the City shall be eligible for a voucher provided: One, they're under twenty-one years old; two, they're enrolled as a

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

full-time student; three, they have a family income that does not exceed 1.5 times the family income level necessary to qualify for the National School Lunch Act, which means about twenty-eight thousand eight hundred and sixty dollars for a family of four. This bill is intended to help lower-income people. Qualifying 1ocated schools: Any public or non-home-based private school within the selected subdistrict shall be eligible to redeem vouchers provided they comply with Title VI of the Civil The voucher amount is as follows: The parents or guardians of each qualifying pupil may apply to receive a voucher be redeemed at a qualifying school for the payment of behalf of the student. educational expenses incurred on Educational expenses mean the cost reasonably incurred by parents or quardians for the services at the school in which their child is enrolled. Example: Tuition, if any, and -- and fees. costs shall not -- shall not include costs incurred for supplies of extracurricular or extracurricular activities. The shall be for the -- for the total amount of educational expense up twenty-five hundred dollars. The amount of the voucher shall not be considered taxable income under the Illinois Income Act. Funding: Funding for the program is provided by a diversion State aid from the school district -- the Chicago School The State Board will withhold the total amount of the vouchers up to a maximum of five million dollars during each year of the program. Chicago is allowed to continue to included former public school students who enroll in private schools within their State aid pupil attendance figures, but the bill quarantees that the State aid for districts outside Chicago shall be unaffected by the program. Deadlines for the bill are as follows: October the year of attendance, parents and guardians apply for the voucher; November 15th, the voucher is issued to the parent or guardian; November 30th, the parent or guardian submits voucher to

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

school; November -- December 15th, school presents voucher to the State Board of Education for payment; February 1st, the State Board of Education pays the voucher amount to the school. administration of this program is as follows: The State Board is authorized to promulgate rules necessary to implement and facilitate the operation of the program, but is prohibited creating any further substantive educational requirements on any school. That is a concern that many in the private school business have. They are prohibited from creating any further substantive educational requirements. There is Council Advisers that is created to advise the State Board on the operation of the program and perform various specified duties. The council shall consist of fifteen members. The Governor and the four Legislative leaders shall each appoint one representative of the public schools, one of the private schools, and one of the The council is charged with selecting general public. subdistrict that will serve as the geographical area for the operation of the program. The council must hold public hearings prior to the selection and is encouraged to select an area with -- with a broad selection of public and private schools, adequate transportation resources, and has demonstrated community and parental support for the program. Other duties of the council include arranging for independent evaluations of the program and determining an equitable way to distribute the voucher funding, in the event the program is oversubscribed. Parents will be notified about this program in the following manner, beginning with the '96-'97 school year: The chief administrative officer of each school within the selected subdistrict must inform parents or quardians of the availability of the vouchers. Mr. President, that is the sum and substance of the bill. I'm happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

Is there discussion? Senator Berman. Senator Berman. SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in opposition to Senate Bill 17. First of all, I want to acknowledge that we received some very good information yesterday in committee regarding the essence of the bill dealing with who will it help, where's it going to help, will it be meaningful. And I want to compliment, publicly, some of the homework the Catholic Conference of Illinois who went in and did some research in the Pilsen neighborhood, the Little neighborhood and the McKinley Park neighborhood in the City of Chicago to determine what was the availability of private school seats in the Catholic schools in that community and what was the overcrowding situation in the public schools. And I think -- some of my colleagues may expand upon this, but I think it was verv relevant that in just those three neighborhoods, which doesn't even represent a whole subdistrict -- in just that neighborhoods there is forty-four hundred students that are in overcrowded schools, but only twelve hundred available seats in the Catholic schools in those three communities. So I think it's very important for those people who are generally supportive of a voucher recognize that there is very limited system to availability as far as helping children that are in the public school system. Let me address some of the specifics in the bill. There are some statements in this bill that I want to put on the record that are incorrect. On page 2 of the Amendment 3, lines 8 to 16, the bill talks about a crisis in Illinois education. Interesting. I don't think there's anybody on this Floor that wouldn't deny -- that would deny that there is a crisis funding of schools throughout the State of Illinois. But this bill only addresses one-tenth of the students in one school district, namely Chicago. Nine hundred and thirty-four other

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

school districts aren't even addressed. for addressing So much the crisis in education in Illinois. Amendment 3 at page 2, lines through 24, talks about national standards have been used to 17 determine that a subgroup of Chicago schools must have a pilot voucher program to assist them. I'm not aware of any, and none -testimony was given yesterday or previously in committee that deals with national standards. I've heard of none. On page lines 27 to 30, it says that current laws and regulations, quote, "limit parents' freedom to select schools that they believe their children with a quality education". Gentlemen, I'm not aware of any laws or regulations that freedom of choice. There's an economic factor, but there is no law or regulations that limit freedom of choice. This bill has been amended to allow, according to the bill, for public school students to use it in public schools. Ladies and Gentlemen, that's baloney. Under existing law, any child, for example, who qualifies for free lunch cannot be assessed any fees - any fees throughout the Chicago public school system. So what does this voucher do? There is no tuition charge in the public schools, and if you are poor, according to the measure, there is no fees So this sentence that says it's available for charged. public school students doesn't amount to anything. ...think very important for the people that have come down here today in support of a voucher plan and, even more importantly, parents that live in districts in Chicago that hope that they will be the trial subdistrict, to recognize what this bill presently does amended. Number one, the bill originally said you would get twenty-five hundred dollar tuition fee. That has been changed. parent will not know - will not know, when they enroll their child nonpublic school system and commit themselves to paying a -- a fee for that school, they will not know how much of a voucher they are going to receive. The reason they won't know that is

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

because, as the sponsor just outlined, the parents must enroll the child by October 1st, they must apply for the voucher on October lst. All of the applications for the vouchers come into this committee that has, under the bill, the power to allocate up to up to - twenty-five hundred dollars, as amended; not twenty-five but up to twenty-five hundred dollars, but no invent -but in no event more than five million dollars. Ladies and Gentlemen, if there are five thousand children that apply for this voucher -- and let me tell you that's not a big number. got forty thousand kids in each one of these subdistricts. So if only five thousand children apply on October 1st and the committee wants to do something for each of those children, that voucher will amount to only one thousand dollars. Parents, what you're committing yourself to without knowing what you're qoing to receive. I have tried to outline or touch upon some of the practical problems in this bill. I think that -- that the technical problem is that it is unconstitutional, but I will leave But I want it for that up to the courts to debate that. record that in my opinion it is contrary to the provisions of the State and federal Constitutions by the use of public moneys for That is a violation of our Constitution. I sectarian purposes. will tell you what else I think it's going to do. Under this bill - under this bill - the bill now applies to private school Now, when I say private schools, I'm including the religious schools. So everybody outside of the public school system within this subdistrict in Chicago can apply for this voucher and use this voucher. And let me tell you what I fearful of - I hope I'm wrong: that the parents who have initiated and have gone to great lengths to raise the money to provide for private school tuition, either in the Catholic schools in any religious schools or in the private schools, they have made a substantial commitment on behalf of their children, and I

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

salute them for that, but what -- they have initiated, what they think is the approach that they want for their children, under this bill those parents that have taken steps to help their children will be the first ones in line and will qualify under this bill, and you will see a relatively small number of public school students that will take advantage or be able to take advantage of this bill. It will be taking public money. And let me just add one other point: When I say public money, this is not State of Illinois money; this is Chicago education money; this Chicago real estate taxpayers' money, which is being put to the nonpublic schools in Chicago. It is not State of Illinois That I think is a breach of our commitment as a Legislature to the taxpayers of Chicago. If we think it's a good program, we as State legislators ought to fund it through State resources, not taking it away from a sorely underfunded public school system in Chicago. For all of those reasons, Ladies and Gentlemen, respectfully urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in reluctant opposition to Senate Bill 17. And it's reluctant opposition because I think we need to do some creative things to improve our school system in this State. It is reluctant because our private schools are an important option for many students in this State, and they do an outstanding job around the State of Illinois, both private, nonsectarian schools as well as parochial schools. Home schoolers also are an important option for students in the State of Illinois. But I -- I guess I want to make just two brief points. The sponsor stated that other districts would be unaffected by this bill. And I don't think that's quite true, and I think there's an important distinction here. The bill provides that

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

other districts' general State aid shall not be increased or decreased. However, they will be affected, because without that provision, when the Chicago schools have fewer pupils, more money would flow to other districts as a natural consequence. If in our areas of the State a student chooses to go to one of our parochial schools, our head count is lessened under the formula and our State aid is decreased. Under this bill, however, we cannot increase our aid, because while their head count goes down, for purposes of the formula, their head count will remain the same in the Chicago schools. So we will be affected adversely in the other districts even though we cannot go up or go down. But importantly, were we riding on a clean slate and a clean Constitution, this bill might very well merit our consideration, but we do take an oath when we're sworn in here, and that oath is to uphold and sustain the Constitution of the State of Illinois and of the United States. And the constitutional law I think direct aid to sectarian schools violates that clear. the establishment clause of the First Amendment to the United States And I don't think this bill can stand that Constitution. constitutional muster. So I reluctantly rise in opposition to Senate Bill 17.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

WCIA requests permission to record this afternoon. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman -- Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The two previous speakers spoke of the Constitution, and if I could, I would like to read from our State It doesn't take long. And I think Constitution. even the headline says it all. "PUBLIC FUNDS FOR SECTARIAN PURPOSES ARE <sic> FORBIDDEN". "Neither the General Assembly nor any county, city, town, township, school district, or other

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

corporation, shall ever make any appropriation or pay from any public fund whatever, anything in aid of any church or sectarian purpose, or to help support or sustain any school, academy, seminary, college, university or other literary or scientific institution, controlled by any church or sectarian denomination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money, or other personal property ever be made by the State, or any such public corporation, to any church, or for any" - any - "sectarian purpose." Notwithstanding that -- both of the previous speakers indicated that will be handled by the courts; I understand that. My concern with this piece of legislation is that the Governor, whenever he introduced his budget, gave K through 12 two-thirds of what they wanted - not enough money. In addition to that, yesterday, we took away a million dollars from education for the purpose of State police training and -- in hirings of the ICC police officers to become State police officers. adding another five-million-dollar hit to education. That's three percent at this time and early in the Session, three-percent reduction in the dollars that this Governor has allocated to Six million dollars - three percent. And we've got a education. long way to go. I'm sure we'll find other ways to take more money from education. And in a State that is sorely lacking from the State level in funding for education, I think introduction and passage of this type of legislation is foolhardy and it's something that we should turn down.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Thank you, Mr. -- thank you, Mr. President. As a cosponsor of Senate Bill 17, I rise in very, very strong support of this bill. We're going to hear a lot today, I assume, from both sides of the aisle on the way the people feel about this issue, about what this

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

bill, in some cases, is not about. I'd like, at least, to make some remarks about what I believe it is about. First of all, I believe it's about competition for students. I believe that there has been a long period of time in this country where we have allowed a public education system to grow up where students have no choice, families have no choice, generally, from economic -from an economic perspective or otherwise, and -- and that -- that what we need to do in this country is re-empower parents. And I don't say empower; I say re-empower parents, because parents had this from the beginning of this country; this ability to make educational choices for their families. This bill is also about public support for education. I didn't say support for public education; I said public support for education - a longtime tradition in the United States. This bill is also a very limited, very modest proposal. I won't go into the details of the bill; Senator Cronin has already done that. But let me just say, very limited in the schools that can participate, and, yes, Senator Berman, it's limited in the number of students that will be able to participate in it. And I would say to you, Senator Berman, after I heard your remarks, I really am not sure whether you were trying to make sure everybody here and across the State of Illinois understands how limited it is and therefore saying that, if it was broader, you would support it. Well, let me suggest this to you: If that is your feeling, I will be happy to cosponsor such a bill and expand the implications of this ...(applause from public galleries)... But there legislation. has indeed been a very strong reaction to this bill. And the applause you just heard is just part of the reaction. I think it's important for Illinois to know that the -- the reaction away from this room, and it's stronger among the public education establishment. And I want to get into that detail. But let me talk about this idea that I'm trying to

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

characterize this as public support for education. It's not a new or novel idea, and it's rooted in basic American principles -Jeffersonian ideals of an educated citizenry. You know, when this nation was founded we didn't have a public education system. We had private schools. And -- and -- and the founders of this country. and their successors. understood, as Jefferson promulgated, that it was essential and important for the future of this nation that we have an educated citizenry. And here in Illinois we already have an example of the public-private partnership that works very, very well, and it's our higher Private universities and public universities share public resources, available for education at the higher ed level today. And it's time that we did it for elementary and secondary education. ...(applause from public galleries)... So this concept of public support for education over decades has developed into the concept of public support for only public education. is it across this State that begs for this type legislation? You know, it isn't just Chicago. It isn't just suburbs, and it isn't just downstate. There are people all over the State of Illinois who are looking for this. And yes, there are mothers and fathers who are raising families all across this State who are looking for this kind of assistance in every district that each and everyone of us represents. ... (applause from public galleries)...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator O'Malley. Senator O'Malley, just one moment, please. Ladies and Gentlemen, in the gallery we are delighted to have you here today. This is a very important issue to you and -- and we know that, but we have some very strong policy on the Floor of the Senate that -- that there be no public display of enthusiasm or rejection from the gallery. And we would ask you please to no longer applaud any of the speakers. And thank you for -- for

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

honoring our guidelines here. Senator O'Malley, you may proceed, sir.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. What is it that these parents across the State are really looking for? Because we all know that we have good school districts across the State, and many of same parents who are looking for this sort of assistance from their State live in those school districts. I believe, and I this is a belief shared by a lot of people, unfortunately over decades there has developed, within our public education system, a very sterile environment. I read, with great interest, in September, 1993, an article that appeared in the Chicago Tribune Magazine authored by Christina Hoff Sommers. It's entitled "Teaching the Values <sic> (Virtues) - A Blueprint for Moral Education". I would like to make a copy of this available to everybody in this room. It really gets to the heart of the issue. I am only going to share with you one specific antidote that she shares in here. She talks about a -- this -- this -- the nature of this article is about the teaching of ethics in America. And she relates a story of a Harvard University Professor who annually offers a large history course on the second World War and the rise of the Nazis. Some years ago, and I'm quoting from this, "he was stunned to learn from his teaching assistant that the majority of students did not believe that anyone was really to blame for the Holocaust." This is in an ethics course with students at Harvard University. "In the students' minds, the Holocaust was like a natural cataclysm: Ιt was inevitable and unavoidable." Ladies and Gentlemen, the Holocaust was wrong. wasn't right. And yet Harvard students, some of the brightest So what are these people in America can't figure that out. parents across our State looking for? They're looking for something that supports the values that they have in their own

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

something that they believe is essential to bring home in education with their children that supports what they do in their homes and what they do in their churches on weekends. there such a strong reaction from the public education community? I've sat in the Education Committee for two years. I've listened to the debate on Senator Cronin's bill. Ι hear they're the defenders of the wall of separation between church and State. This bill is not about religion. It's about parents They will also say that we shouldn't be telling Chicago what to do. Well, I don't want to tell Chicago what to do anymore than anywhere else in the State, but as I said previously, want to expand this, count me on board. I will support it anywhere in the State of Illinois. This plan is completely voluntary. Nobody has to participate in it. There are even those within the establishment who will say those of us who vote for this bill are not friends of public education. Well, I'll stand two years of record here as being a friend for public education. And I'm going to continue to be a friend of education, today especially I'm going to be a friend of but mothers and fathers making selections about important choices their family in the area of education. So what's really the rub within the public education establishment? It's a monopoly like any monopoly they don't like competition, and they certainly don't want to share the public purse. In closing, and thank for allowing me this time to speak on this bill, we don't come here as protectors of the educational establishment. We never come here any day for that purpose. Rather, we assemble here to debate the important issues that affect families across America. believe this legislation will foster important educational alternatives for parents and children across the State I, for one, believe that this bill will allow that to happen, and I strongly urge a Yes vote on it. Thank you very

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

WICS requests leave to film in the gallery today. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Let me -- let me -- Ladies and Gentlemen, we have been, I think, very fair here in allowing the discussion to go on here. What I'm going to do at this point is put the timer on -- the five-minute timer on. I will not interrupt you when the five minutes is -- is completed, but I would -- I would like for you at least to watch the clock so you know about how long you have talked. Further discussion? Senator Trotter. I'm sorry. Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President. On a point of order as related to the timer. Now, does that timer include the -- the respondent to the question asked by a Member? Because if a Member on this side has five minutes and the respondent takes four minutes to answer the question, then you're actually denying the -- the -- the Member on this side of the aisle, or any other Member, the right to have that five minutes. So I would suggest, very strongly, Mr. President, that you do not use the timer in that manner.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Jones, I -- again, I indicated, this is not a mandatory timer today, and -- and I think the point that you make is well taken, and I think both -- both individuals should keep that in mind. Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the -- the Senate. Will the speaker yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

Thank you very much. What I would like to know is, if, in fact, one of these students who decides to go to a private school and takes his twenty-five hundred dollars with him - if he's kicked out in the middle of the semester, does those dollars, or the remainder of those dollars, go back with him to the public school system?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Well, if the student applies and if he qualifies under the standards set out in the law, and if he is awarded a voucher and if he, indeed, enrolls and if the voucher is then redeemed under the -- the -- the time frame that we've laid out -- and I think you will note that we were careful to lay that time frame in such a manner that -- that the student would be enrolled and there would be a commitment there on the student's behalf, and if the student violates some well-known previously notified policy, just like any other school may have, and the student is expelled or -- or something along that nature, some disciplinary action, then yes, then the school would be permitted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

The question was, the dollars that we give the school - the check - will -- if he's kicked out of school for violating whatever policy, will the portion of the proceeds for the remainder of that year, will those dollars follow him back to the public school system, which in this case may be the only system that will accept him to continue his education. 'Cause, by law, he has to still attend school if he's under sixteen years of age. So does -- if he, again, gets kicked out of a private school, catholic school, whatever, do those dollars go back to the public

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

school system?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

It would depend on the specific case, but the school that may redeem the voucher doesn't cash it in until February 1st under this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

One other question. We're not setting up any standards for these schools in which we are sending them to. So it's not just a sectarian school. We actually -- we can actually be funding cults, theoretically, as well with public dollars. So -- no -- I mean, is there curriculum? Do we actually set the standards for these institutions that we are -- that we're sending our children to?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

We have laid out that this bill must comply with civil rights laws. Not be -- no school would qualify if they're discriminatory in any way -- violate any civil rights laws. Furthermore, we've given great latitude to the council that administer this program to fulfill the intended purpose of this. And if there's any question, there is no intended purpose that a school that engages in the practice of cults would be qualified.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

...(microphone cutoff)...bill just -- just for the sake of time, 'cause I know there're some other individuals with

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

questions. It's been said that this is -- that public school systems have a monopoly on education. Actually, just to the contrary, public schools offer an opportunity to individuals. They offer opportunities to those who -- who are not the elite, the cream of the crop, who can't go to the -- the really high echelon private schools and those who may not be Catholics. public school system accepts everyone, and that's why actually directed and given to those public institutions. What we see here is a -- a system being put forth that's going to hurt that public school system. Right now we have a system in the City of Chicago, in particular, and actually all throughout this State, of schools that are woefully underfunded. By taking out an additional five million dollars -- and we're talking about in four years, twenty million dollars out of that system would totally decimate and desecrate -- not decimate, excuse me, and destroy those institutions as we know them today. They cannot afford these kind of reductions in funds, and this is a bad bill at this time, and until we can adequately, as a fund our school system per our own State Constitution without paying the preponderance of costs for those -- educating those children, we should not be passing this kind of legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you very much. Senator Cronin, I'm reading an analysis here and I wondered if some of this is correct. Qualifying schools, it says, a, the applicant does not discriminate on the

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

basis of race, color or natural origin, religion or gender. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

The answer is yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Okay. So if -- if -- if they don't discriminate on the basis of religion, then could the Nation of Islam, Minister Louis Farrakhan's schools qualify and receive vouchers?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

They may.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

So is may a yes? The Nation of Islam and Louis Farrakhan, schools that they run can get these vouchers? Yes or no? I mean, a may is a kind of politicians answer. Even though we're all elected officials, today I'd like a, yes, the Nation of Islam can apply or, no, the Nation of Islam cannot.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Senator Hendon, if the Nation of Islam schools comply with the civil rights laws of the United States, then, yes, they would be eligible to redeem these vouchers, provided that a qualifying pupil elects to go there.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Okay. So -- and in order to certify all they have to do is say, "We don't discriminate. White students just choose not to come here." Is that sufficient certification?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

You know, I think that would probably be up to the Council of Advisers, but I like the direction that you're going in, Senator Hendon. This is empowerment for people who may live in your district and who may want to attend the Nation of Islam schools. So I'm pleased that you see this opportunity for the people in your district.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

I want to make it clear that I do not see this as opportunity for the people in my district. I'm simply trying to point out that if a school is all black, or a school is all white, whether it's the Catholic Church or the Nation of Islam, there is no way in this world, in my opinion, that they can certify that they don't discriminate. There are a lot of ways to discriminate. I also have very serious problems with the separation of church and this state. Clearly, is I'm certain there's going to be a -- a unconstitutional. challenge on the constitutionality of this issue. Lastly, Mr. President, I would just want to say that I feel that this is a bad It's going to destroy Chicago public schools. to be some changes in the Chicago public schools, but to take money away from a system that is already in dire need of revenue is wrong. This is wrong. What we're going to do is take

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

money away from the taxpayers of the City of Chicago and give it to private people. If you can afford to send your child to a private school, you don't need this money. What's going to happen to the little poor children, the little poor parents who can't pay the balance. If -- if the balance is more than twenty-five hundred dollars and you're struggling just to have milk and Pampers and food on your table, especially with all of this welfare reform, who the heck - that's poor - is going to have money to pay the -- the balance of the voucher? Absolutely Further, I would contend that the only reason that the gallery is not full of poor people is because they can't afford to get down here. This is a bad bill. I urge a No vote. I commend you for what you are attempting to do, but this is the wrong way to do it. Thank you very much.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 2

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, some of the debate here reminds me of the time that we were here in the Senate, arguing for the public schools' funding and so forth, and some of the proponents for the -- for that argument from over on the other side who sent their children to the private schools. So, I think we better look at it completely. The people are paying taxes -- whether they send their children to private schools or not, they still are paying taxes to help fund the

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

public schools. Senate Bill 17 represents a good compromise between our objectives of supporting public education but also of creating some new, responsible, constitutional ways of supporting parents who choose to send their children to -- alternative educational programs, and it's a pilot program. It's worth trying it because we certainly haven't done too well with what's going on in Chicago at the present time. You know it and I know it. we have high school graduates who can't even read, what does that Ι tell vou? might tell you -speaking constitutionality, Senate Bill has been carefully drawn to meet the U.S. Supreme Court guidelines, and I might say, most recently, in 1993, the court -- the Supreme Court upheld, as part of a general government program that distributed assistance, neutrally, to disabled students, the provision of a hearing interpreter for a deaf student attending a Catholic high school. By -- so if it was constitutional then, certainly these guidelines and this pilot program is constitutional. And I submit, it's worth trying. can't do any worse, and we might do better to have a pilot program and attribute it to people who -- who can't spend too much money, and are -- and the guidelines have already been set forth in the bill as to the income, and I don't think we're going to hurt it. I think we should try it. Nothing ventured, nothing gained, because I can tell you right now, we are pouring millions in education in Chicago, and all I'm asking here, as the sponsor is, a try, to see it come out a little better. Let's try it. the harm? I -- I speak in favor of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Mr. President, there is one part of this bill that I agree with, and that's the part indicating findings and declaration of policy. The bill says that there is a crisis in elementary and

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

secondary education in Illinois. It doesn't say there is a crisis in elementary and secondary education only in Chicago. That is not in the bill. It says "in Illinois". And so, I'm glad that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, through this bill, acknowledging that there is a crisis in elementary and secondary education in the State of Illinois. And yet, the Governor unveiled a budget that does practically -- almost virtually "The Education nothing to address that crisis, even though he is Governor". Yesterday in the Senate Education Committee, we had an amendment that was voted down that was for the purpose of protecting Chapter I dollars in the Chicago public schools, only dollars that have been available to the Chicago public schools to implement the reform legislation passed by this Body in 1988. It was a revenue-neutral bill that was passed in 1988. since 1988, we have not given the Chicago public schools one additional dollar. We have told the Chicago public schools time and time again, as we are telling them again this year, that must find their own solutions, that the General Assembly, even though it declares in this bill that there is a crisis, General Assembly cannot act - will not act - on that crisis, for that school -- for that school district or any other school district in the State of Illinois. And I find it very interesting that the sponsors could not find a school district in the State of Illinois without a three-hundred-million-dollar deficit where they could implement this experimental program - this pilot program. Why couldn't a school district without the deficit be Maybe that's because we have a growing number of school districts with deficits. The last time that this legislative Body the Chicago public schools deal with its facilities' problems with the crumbling school buildings, the leaky roofs that are falling, the plaster falling on the heads of students - the last time that we dealt with the Chicago public schools was in 1989,

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

when the Capitol Development Board made ten million dollars available - ten million dollars - half of what this bill is going That's what we did, and yet the Chicago public schools have over a billion dollars worth of construction rehabilitation needs that is part of that crisis that this Body refuses to address. And yesterday we couldn't even protect lifeblood of reform: Chapter I dollars. The same individuals who are proponents of this bill voted against protecting Chapter I We are pitting Catholic schools against four hundred and ten thousand schoolchildren in the City of Chicago. And I feel bad about that, because in the gallery and back home there lot of hardworking, responsible families who make tremendous sacrifices to put their kids in Catholic schools - hardworking, good families - and yet many of these families have been misled into thinking that thev are aoina to aet twenty-five-hundred-dollar voucher and that their areas are going to qualify. Well, I say to you that based on the language in this even though the advisory council hasn't even established yet, the decision has been made as to where this subdistrict is going to be, just based on the description in this bill. And so for those of you who think that maybe you chance to be included in there, you're being misled, and I feel bad about that, because we've got some very good people who need and want to send their children to a Catholic school. Let's not be pitting one group against another. Let's deal with the crisis. Let's raise the money. Let's raise the money to do this experiment. Let's get the Illinois Manufacturers' Association to put in as much as they put in to kill the education constitutional amendment in the State of Illinois. Let's get them to contribute to this pilot voucher program, and let's do it in an area where we can get a true partnership going. And let's do it after -- after we've come to grips and we've assumed our responsibility for

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

dealing with the educational crisis in the State of Illinois. That's what should be happening, not trying to create the smoke screen that allows my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to point to the people in the City of Chicago and say, "We're with you. We're really doing something to improve education for you." Well, I want the citizens of the City of Chicago, particularly those in the Chicago public school system, to know that we are subtracting; we are now in a game of subtraction here. It was bad enough when we wouldn't put a single dollar on the table. Now with unfunded mandates, like charter schools - fifteen in the City of Chicago - why was it good enough to put charter schools downstate, but we cannot include downstate in this project? Why was it? Why was it? Why was it? Why -- why -- please, I -- Mr. President, can I get the -- the respect and the courtesy that I deserve?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Yes, sir, Proceed, Senator.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you. Thank you. Unfunded mandates are taking away dollars. Fifteen charter schools. That's subtraction. Fifteen charter schools and other steps that are being taken. This is a twenty-million-dollar bill - twenty million dollars. If you can deal with my three-hundred-million-dollar deficit, then we can sit down and talk. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Body. To the bill: I certainly respect those parents, families, school members and so forth who have come down here today in support of this bill. But I am very strongly opposed to it, and it goes, I think, to the very heart of the struggle in this country for public

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

school education. Some Senators have spoken very eloquently about the tradition of this country, and I would just like to remind you that, in fact, in this country -- and perhaps you might like to read Lawrence Cremin's book, "American Education", to yourselves of how long it took us to create the common school in this country. It was not a given at the beginning of time. in fact, in this country, at various times, we have denied access to many, many groups of people. It has not been that long that people stood in the doorway of schools and denied access to It has not been that long ago when girls were necessarily allowed to go to school. So, I remind you that the most fundamental right in this country that we should protecting is the right of all to have adequate and equitable funding for education. Now, at the same time there is a tension in this country - and interestingly, education becomes the middle person in that tug-of-war - between diminishing resources and kind of tendency that seems to be growing in this country to say there's not enough for all of us versus expanding and sharing resources - something that I strongly believe in. Public schools depend upon public support. That is the fundamental basis of school system. And I agree with Senator del Valle when he asked the question, if this is a partnership, where are the private dollars; where are the private supports for this? Whether we like it or not - and certainly I don't like it - we are very dependent upon the property tax as the means of supporting education. Instead of carving out a tiny niche, why aren't we figuring out how to share the resources much beyond the narrow scope and narrow cast that we have given to such support? But that has not been the case. And let me just say to you, there's a fundamental contradiction within this Body. When I first came down here in 1991, coming out of working very strongly with the school reform movement in Chicago, I participated in the -- up and down the

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

corridor, working with the Republican side on school reform, to help support, at home in Chicago, the grassroots parents' movement to have some control and input into their schools - the local school councils. Remember them? Remember when this Body worked very hard on their behalf? And yet here we are saying, "No, no, let's not support that anymore. In fact, let's take some of the money away from them." Let me remind you of what is in bill, specifically. Number one, the voucher program will be paid for in its entirety by diverting five million in State aid from the already financially troubled public schools - diverting, not adding to. Secondly, the Chicago Board of Education will State aid deducted for the cost of all vouchers, including vouchers for students who never attended Chicago public schools, but they will only be able to count those students who previously attended Chicago public schools for the purpose of apportioning Thirdly, there are no established standards in this State aid. bill, and yet we are very busy saying to the Chicago schools they should have standards. Fourthly, there is no evidence that vouchers improve student performance; there is no objective evidence. And I urge you, if you have some, let us know what And finally, we're going to be micromanaging, because this Body -- this bill establishes a Council of Advisers to appointed by the Governor, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House. We have no business doing that. should go back to what we were doing before: empowering parents, empowering local systems to have some control, and being able to fund adequately and equitably the public system in the State of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of Senate. You know, when we talk about adequately funding the education system in the State of Illinois, the real question would be, "What would be adequate?" How much money is needed to fix the system? I mean, anybody could name a billion dollars or two billion dollars. It's like trying to fix a hole in a roof. leaks this year, so you patch it; it leaks next year, you patch then you have another hole, you patch that one. Sooner or later you need a new roof. Sooner or later you need to put on a Maybe that's possibly what we're saying here. I think that why I'm offended by some comments are -- I don't know district's going to be affected by this whatsoever, because I do have not a wealthy community, by no means, but a lot constituents may not meet this. But the strange thing about it is, a lot of the people from the inner city of Chicago that represent those constituents, on that side of the aisle, are against the to bring money to their constituents. So, I mean, it would be -- why would you possibly turn that away? We -- we come and debate the issue of education for the public school system and I'm -- I'm going to direct a lot of my comments toward Chicago - and we -- we attempt to -- to have teachers' pension fund money directed so that they can -- it can go towards their salary and not towards their pension. We attempt to do all sorts of things But what about -- competency testing for for these people. teachers? Money is not going to fix that system. Ι think this Body - and I've only been here eight years - has proven that time and time again. In addition, every time they're on the line, in the City of Chicago, we've proven that time and time again. I don't see Catholic schools going out on strike because living conditions or kids are not learning or producing. And when we say, what about private dollars; where are the private dollars to go into something like this? Well, my understanding,

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

-- I have a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Senator Cronin, these are taxpayers' dollars that we're talking about here that can -- that is used for this program?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Taxpayers' dollars that will be directed to individuals who then exercise a choice.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

When we talk about private money -- my kids go to a Catholic A lot of parents -- my parents sacrificed, when I was growing up, to put me to a Catholic school and I attempted to do the same for my kids. What's wrong -- are we considering that parents who send their kids to Catholic schools, that's not private dollars? Not only are they paying to send their kids to school, but they're paying to send every kid in the State of Illinois to school, by the mere fact that they pay taxes. But for us to say, "Wait, they don't have a say-so on what goes on", I beg to differ with everyone. Maybe it's time that we take people and open this up to everyone, and if they want to keep their kids in a public school, let them do so. If they want to send their kids to a Catholic or private school, let them do so. The point kids have to learn. They're not learning in the environment they're in today. They're in school for the first period, taken; by the fifth period they're gone. And then is what do the teachers complain about? "Well, we need more money." Half these teachers only are there a couple of days a week anyway.

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

They teach one period, they go on break, they maybe have a study, and they're gone. So let's start thinking about the kids and -- and stop thinking about everything else and putting money into a system that really has shown it really doesn't work. Private money -- I think we ought to give this opportunity to everyone in the State of Illinois and -- and I think it's a good way to go. And for the first time, maybe these kids will learn something. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. If this bill was only about the issue of whether parents of all students - Catholic and non-Catholic - should be funded, get money from the State because they contribute to the State treasury, I think it would be a I think most of us - the vast majority - would simple vote. support that. One of the most difficult questions, I think, on the campaign trail is when parents ask, "If I can pay my taxes, whv can't I get any of my money back for my son or daughter going to a Catholic school?" But the problem that we see is when the State gets involved in education, there are many strings attached. of you here are not from the Chicago district that's going to end up with these two thousand vouchers. And I can gauge that by the fact that you all applauded when Senator O'Malley said we should expand this program statewide. But just look at how this program is being funded. This is an indication of how the State would fund a statewide program for vouchers. The proponents are not adding more money to the State education budget. They're adding five million dollars; they're taking away from what is They're cannibalizing the existing funding for students that we currently say we are responsible for. If we expand it to another three hundred thousand students, four hundred thousand students, the proponents should not kid themselves that

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

there will be a tax increase to pay more money for those extra three hundred, or four, thousand students, in addition to the students we are currently responsible for. What will happen is the current budget, as inadequate as it is, will be divvied up, and divvied up again, so that there will be less and less money available to fund students. For those of you who haven't followed the public schools, who are here, we rank forty-eighth country in funding public schools from the state. Forty-eighth. Do you really want to be thrown into this system where we control you teach, how you teach it, who's qualified to teach? think you're taking on a lot of headaches. The separation church and state is not just to protect government from churches; it's to protect churches from government, as well. Because as money goes to you, so do restrictions, so do certain requirements and obligations. If you look over the past ten years, the school reforms we've had before this -- this year's reforms all required additional testing, additional courses to be taught, additional requirements of teachers, all imposed on the public schools. a few years from now, when the political winds change - and I assume at some point in the future they will, and the in power - why wouldn't these same requirements be installed again? And wouldn't they apply to charter they apply to schools that receive vouchers? you regret the situation you had put yourself in by having your school subject to State requirements once again? Exactly the reason why this country was founded was so that the State could not establish a religion or interfere with your religious rights, would come to pass here in Illinois. We would be the first State to be telling private schools. schools, how to run their schools. That is the last thing that you want. Ladies and Gentlemen, this isn't an easy vote. I think that parents of Catholic schools do deserve some type of funding.

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

do give textbooks to private schools: we do give transportation money to parents of students going to private schools. I wish we could do more. I don't know if constitutional or not. But I would say this: If we could come up with the money in addition to what we're funding elementary and secondary education at at this time, I think this would probably be a good idea, if it was a statewide program, if we could come up with more money to fund all the kids of the State. Because our ultimate responsibility is to help children - not necessarily parents, but the children. I think that is our responsibility under the Constitution. Because those children become adults the better educated they are, the better the State will be, the less crime we'll have, and maybe we can start to fight causes of the problems we have in this State. But I don't think this is the answer. I think this is going to result in a many problems. The funding problem is one; the requirements of -of State control is another. And I think that this bill is going to be a hoax upon the parents of Catholic school throughout the State of Illinois. It's holding out the hope that more is going to happen if this pilot program works. work, will the money be there to help you out in the future? don't think so. And I think that's the major problem with this It makes a promise that won't be kept. And I think that the schoolchildren of the State of Illinois have had too many promises to them broken to add one more promise to that heap. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. I'm going to kind of give an omnibus Reader's Digest answer to several questions that have — that have bothered me, simply because I think they were,

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

perhaps to put it most kindly, based on misinformation. First there's been several mentions about the crisis we have in -in -- throughout the entire State and why are we focusing on Well there's a simply fact, Ladies and Gentlemen: Chicago. Chicago's a mess. It's a catastrophe. It's sinking fast. We have to do something. And to the specious argument that -- that we're taking five million dollars away -- we're going -- somehow they're going to -- require to find three hundred million dollars from us. You know doggone well it's not going to come out of -- out of the Chicago system, because the way it's -- it's controlled and So they're going to be two hundred and ninety five managed. million dollars in the hole if we -- we -- if we didn't do this. And to the comment, Senator, about the leaky roofs, I have to remind you that the State has poured billions of dollars into the Chicago system, and eighty percent of it went into salary increases. And maybe if the teachers passed up one raise one year, they could fix the roofs. But who comes first? the Not the kids. The teachers' salaries come first. note in this -- this program, there's nothing said about salaries. We're not going to buy our way into excellence. We're going "Here. Here's up to twenty-five hundred dollars. Use it to the best way you can possibly do it." And I might add -- I add that -- it costs Chicago about four thousand two hundred dollars in K through 12; whereas, the -- the largest parochial system, it only costs nineteen hundred. And I suppose the argument could be made, "Well, you know, give them the twenty-five hundred." That's what I heard over there. But maybe they only need nineteen hundred to do a good job. And also, incidentally, the average contribution that's raised by each parochial school is about five hundred dollars per pupil. That's the reason why can do it for nineteen hundred dollars, because the -- the actual cost is covered -- or helped, rather, by five hundred from the

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

Secondly, since I'm not a lawyer, I -- I parents, et cetera. don't feel too comfortable in this except to give a opinion and that is, it seems to me that -- that there are eight lawyers giving opinions on this and if we -- if we really got it down to the -- down to the nitty-gritty, they'd probably have twelve different opinions as to why this thing wouldn't work. Т think that it deserves a -- it deserves a trial, simply -- because anybody's word in this room that this take unconstitutional. I respect you as attorneys, but you are not Supreme Court, and I would like to see this end up, finally, once and for all, forever and ever, decided by the Supreme Court. In -let me -- in -- in closing, let me -- I'll cut this short. Senator del Valle, there are -- it isn't fifteen charter schools in Chicago, You will recall there's fifteen in Chicago, fifteen in the suburbs, and fifteen downstate. So we're not -- we're really picking -- we're not really picking on Chicago. But Chicago needs the help, and that's where we're going. A11 of these programs are focused on Chicago, not because we think that we -- we should pick on them, because they're in desperate need of And finally, Senator Trotter, you said that this has the -- this has the tone of being elitist. tell you what: I went to public schools. I've -- I've been given many titles in my life, but I also now find I'm an elitist, since I'm in favor of this and also since I had a public school education. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, for twenty years this -these problems have been kicked around. We're finally trying start something. Let's give it a try. Maybe there's mistakes. But how wrong can we be when you look at Chicago today? It's a mess. It's getting worse. Let's try to help them some way and not -- just cry about we need more and more money. So let's do it. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Shaw.

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

SENATOR SHAW:

Thank you, Mr. President. I hadn't -- no intentions of speaking on this bill, but with the -- in light of somebody brought me a handful of petitions, asking me to support this -this legislation. And the bulk of my district happens to be the south suburb, not in Chicago. But I grew up in Chicago, and I know the need of Chicago, and -- and particularly as it relate to education. I think that what we need to look at -- and some those people who talk about Chicago school system is a mess, it is But those of us who serve in this Body made it that way because we didn't fund education as -- at the level that we should have funded at. And somebody mentioned the -- the teachers only two hours or something. Well, I take offense at that, because I've been in many schools, in Chicago, and around my district, where those teachers are there all day and some of them even spend extra time after school in the classroom, trying to help youngsters. So that's a person that -- a person that would make that type of statement evidently don't know anything about education in Chicago. But to the bill: If we wanted to -- right now we're taking -- this bill attempts to take twenty million dollars out of the school fund, from Chicago, raid the treasurer of the Board of Education of Chicago. If you really wanted to do something - and you all have the majority on that side of the aisle - why don't you give everybody, every citizen, that have children in the schools, a tax credit? But, no, you don't want to You want to -- you don't want to take the money out of the Revenue Department here where it'll impact on the State budget; you want to come to Chicago and take the money out of that fund, where it impacts on thousands -- on the four hundred and ten thousand youngsters that are attending school there. But I think that if you -- if you really was trying to help education, instead of -- in the Governor's Budget Message where you're talking about

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

you're funding it at two hundred and ninety-four thousand dollars, when actually, you're only giving a hundred and ninety-one thousand to elementary and secondary and higher education. That's trying to pull the wool over the people's eyes. And the people down here, they -- that are in the gallery, they don't understand this. All they know is what they read in the paper. But I'm glad that they are here today to hear the debate on the Floor of the Senate about education. You talk about Chicago in terms of we're pouring money into Chicago. Do you realize how much money -without Chicago, you wouldn't probably have a state. And if you don't like putting money into the funding mechanism for this whole entire State, then you should introduce a resolution where that Chicago could secede from this State, as it's now known, and let Chicago become a state. That's what you should do. And because -- everybody get up and use Chicago as a whipping boy. I think that is bad, and I think you're dividing the people and misleading the people of this -- of this State. What should be done, you should withdraw this bill and tell the people that are sitting around here in the gallery, tell them the truth. Don't get up and paint this with sugar, because you're not telling them and they'll go back home and tell their people that the truth, they're going to get windfall money in terms of sending their children to private school. But that's not true. You know it's not true. And when -- a year or two down the road, they're going to know it's not true, and they should penalize you for it. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, we must be kidding when we say that voucher funding represents subtraction. One opponent called it cannibalizing. A recent speaker called it a raid on the

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

Let's say that the education of a child costs about treasurv. fifty-five hundred dollars in the district where this is going to take place. Consider that twenty-five hundred dollars of this money is going to go with the child, exercising the choice of the parents. That leaves three thousand dollars that stays behind with no child to educate. How it that subtraction? Taxpayers in Illinois do send eight hundred and forty million dollars into Chicago, about thirty-four percent of the budget. To get an idea of how much eight hundred and forty million dollars International Monetary Fund pooled about nine hundred million dollars in 1994 to rebuild the country of Vietnam. Every year we send that amount into Chicago and it then attracts in another federal amount of about three hundred and eighty million, if I'm not mistaken, which represents fifteen percent. Chicago's school system is being supported about fifty percent by federal and tax money. With that amount of money and with the results in the most recent study showing forty-two percent dropout, I think that we're required to do something. And I believe that this -- that this pilot program is for everyone, especially for the poor. that everyone in this Body recognizes that those people who are fortunate enough to have the money to make the choice, the can send their children wherever they want to go. But the poor, who cannot afford to make that choice, need a pilot project I enthusiastically support Senator Dan Cronin's bill here, and especially the parents and children who will benefit by pilot project.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. At least, as to this Senator, this may be one of those occasions where the debate may have, in fact, impacted how I will vote. Yesterday, by

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

the way, I think it was one of those days when the debate difference on a particular bill. I walked in here today most likely supporting this legislation. I have supported, this Session, charter schools. I am the sponsor of, along with Senator Geo-Karis, the original textbook bill, and transportation funding. And I'll tell you what made the difference to me, today: the amendment. The original bill I thought was a good idea, at least decent idea that said to a pupil in the public schools, "Let's create a choice for you." A choice that will pay about twenty-five hundred dollars a year for two thousand people to choose an alternative to a system that may not be working well, and give them a chance to be educated. But Amendment 3 changed all and changed my mind as well, and let me tell you why. With now a student and its parents having to first apply, no longer knowing how many will apply, there is no longer a knowledge by those seeking an alternative that the funding will be there for them have an alternative. They may only get five hundred dollars, a thousand dollars. There's no way of knowing until after they have made the commitment to some other educational system. So, I think what's really going to happen is, those currently in the public system who are at a near-poverty level cannot afford to take that choice. And all this is now, with the amendment, is a subsidy those who have already chosen a different alternative than the public schools, who are already paying too much, but paying through a lot of sacrifice, but paying - and we are saying to them, "If you apply, we'll give you some back that you are already So you are not offering an innovative alternative to public school students to find a better way for an education. think the proof of that was in the fact that now - the original bill again said you had to be in public when this started five million comes out of the public school funds. Originally, that made sense to me. If the kids were no longer going to public,

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

let the funds follow the kids. Now you're saying even if all five million were to be a subsidy to those who already chose a private or parochial school - whether that be a Catholic school, a Jewish school, or a -- Nation of Islam school - they are already in those schools, not using the public system, so the monies aren't flowing from monies that we spent last year educating these kids in the public school system. The monies are coming from those kids who are still in the public school system, 'cause the only ones, I think, who will be able to avail themselves of this plan, as amended, are those who had already chosen never to use the public school system, and you're not giving the type of alternative that I think a charter school and other ideas like Joe Kellman School have done, and I therefore could not support it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

you, Mr. President. First of all, I would like to announce that I'm willing to take an oath to ensure that what Senator Shaw said is inaccurate, and that is that we're all lying. I would be willing to take the oath, Senator Shaw, to ensure that I'm not lying. You know, people are saving this is a Chicago bill, and it is. Why are we doing this to Chicago? Some of not be aware, the Chicago Board of Education is second-largest school system in the country. Ι think almost everybody knows that. What may not be known, so well, is that within that system lies the fifth-largest school system in the United States, and that's the public -- that's the private and parochial school system. And within that system lies the majority of the role models, lies the majority of the students who lies the majority of the students that go on to finish school, college. And I cannot understand why there's opposition from Chicago legislators of allowing some students to access that

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

system, a system that's far more successful than the public school system. Now, there are also numbers being thrown out. Let me throw out one. There are four hundred thousand private and parochial school students in the State of Illinois, and as Senator Lauzen said, it costs about fifty-five hundred dollars. You know, I would recommend to those parents who have their kids in these schools, in the public and private, next fall register — just register your students for public school and then try to figure out how the State of Illinois is going to come up with that 2.2 billion dollars to educate those kids. That'll scare the living bejesus out of them. And we're worried about five million? Let's go for the two billion two. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Cronin -- Senator Jones, I'm sorry.

SENATOR JONES:

Senator Cronin, in your opening remarks, you refer -- you inferred something as related to the tuition and the twenty-five hundred dollars. Can you explain that again, exactly what you said? You said the State will pay whatever the tuition is or up to twenty-five hundred dollars. Am I correct? Is that how you couched it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

It's been so long since I started with my opening remarks, I'm not sure exactly what you're referring to. But I can tell you that the -- the administrative council -- the advisory council

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

that is set up in this bill has discretion to award vouchers to qualifying students up to twenty-five hundred dollars. And that twenty-five hundred dollars is indeed taxpayer money, yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Then if -- say the tuition is one thousand dollars per year, the voucher would be only for one thousand dollars for that given school. Am I correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Your -- your insight is very good here, because we recognize that there are many schools in the -- the subdistrict that we have in mind, that may have a tuition that's less than twenty-five hundred dollars. So the argument that some of your colleagues said, that this is a sham and -- and is misleading people, we want them to know that if there is a situation where the -- the tuition may be sixteen hundred or seventeen hundred dollars, as is the case in many elementary grammar schools, that we're not going say that they must get twenty-five hundred dollars. We're going to give them the latitude - the council has the latitude - to award a sixteen-hundred- or a seventeen-hundred-dollar voucher, and then the remaining money can go back into the program to give the access and empowerment to someone else.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

is there any provisions in the bill that says if the tuition is twelve hundred dollars this year, and the next year jumps to twenty-four hundred dollars, is there any provisions in the bill to prevent the tuition from drastically increasing,

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

thereby causing that voucher to go up to the max amount?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Well, each year a student must apply and must qualify. So each year those decisions are made.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Well, since that provision is not there, I can guarantee you this is what's going to happen, is that if the tuition for one year is twelve hundred dollars, I can almost guarantee you, next year it's going to be close to twenty-five hundred dollars, to maximize the effort. That's going to happen. There's no provisions in there, and that doesn't have anything to do with the cost of education, per se, or the cost of educating that child. So if it's not imuthe bill, it's not in writing; so therefore, you answered my question. I know it's been a long time, remember. But I went through the public schools. So, I understand guite well. But that -- that was not a guestion. That was not a question, Senator. So, I stand in opposition to the bill And there are several Catholics in this Body, several reasons. and I'm a Catholic; and I -- I know my parish school, which my children attend - my children attend the public schools equally as But -- but I don't want to castigate the public schools. well. It is our sworn duty as legislators to deal with institutions. I heard remarks made on the other side of the aisle as related to teachers. And I resent the inferences that the teachers -- some only teach -- most only teach two days a week; they're only there for the fifth -- up to the fifth period. That's wrong to make a statement like that. I think the teachers who teach in the inner city are teachers who do their level best

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

to deal with children who suffer from all societal problems, which is thrust in the classroom, and they do their level best, whole. So to categorize all those teachers as such, I think is wrong and -- and -- and it should not have been said on this Senate Floor. As we talk about -- I heard talk about the budget, said they can't manage their money. It's -- it's easy for you sit here and attack a system that has a balanced budget, but I never heard you say the same thing about the two-billion-dollar deficit that Governor Edgar has in the State of Illinois. You haven't said one mumbling word. And if you're going to talk about privatizing -- and maybe that's the direction that we are going. We're going to privatize prisons. We're going to privatize DCFS. You're going to privatize Mental Health. So we're going to privatize education. If that's the direction we're going, let's be honest about it. The two -- the three hundred thousand -- the three-hundred-million-dollar deficit does not stem from mismanagement, If that's the case, then the two billion dollars that the people of Illinois are faced with is due to mismanagement of the Governor of the State of Illinois. You have not said that. But you're going to attack the Chicago public school system, and it's wrong to do that. Furthermore, we continue to talk about funding of education in this State. I recall at one point in the -- in the time where the State was at forty-eight percent funding - close to it. But now we're just the opposite. We rank forty-eighth out of fifty states in funding education in Illinois. That's a sad commentary, for us to stand on the Floor with this hypocrisy as it relate to education. So in other words, you can take five thousand dollars and get just as much with thousand as you can for twelve thousand dollars at some school districts in the State of Illinois. If ever there was example of class legislation, this is it. This is it. For those who talk about education, it was private education and only the

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

rich at that time, when the country was very young, only the rich could afford to educate their children. So public education came into being. It came into being for those who were denied the opportunity, those who did not have the wealth, those who didn't the resources to educate their children, and that's what we have -- we as legislators in the State of Illinois have sworn taken the oath to do. And we still have not done it. And we talk the system being bad. It's not the fault of the child who is born in an impoverished area. It's not the fault of the child does not have the same economic base as some other child born in a more affluent area. But you want to punish in turn, say it's going to improve the education in child. You, Chicago, a system that is facing a deficit for the next fiscal therefore, in order to help them, you don't give them you take more money out. That's not how you fund education, you talk about helping the children. So it is question of choice. It's a question of choice. And in my own parish, and I've said it time and time again to the principal our school, my commitment is to public education. When my child went to our parish school, it was my choice, and I pay taxes else. But I chose to do it -- 'cause we have a very small family parish in the Morgan Park community. My choice. And I and I decided to pay the additional cost. So we cannot stand on this -- on this Floor of this -- of this Body and "Well, say, they're paying taxes." Everyone's paying taxes. always going to pay taxes. And you may not receive everything you pay taxes for, but everything you get you're going to pay But let's not try to say a choice. The private schools have a choice and they choose to take the students that they want. Every student cannot go to a private school, because they have a selection. And you're going to compare apples and oranges -oranges. The public schools must take every child. Those who

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

have learning problems, those who have social problems, they must take it. It's so amazing to me on this -- on this Floor, as we talk about education and we talk about trying to help children in this State, we almost can get one-hundred-percent vote to build a new prison, but when you try to get money to educate a child, then you come up with all the so-called reforms that you need. Most of those youngsters incarcerated in prison are dropouts out of school. They are dropouts. But yet and still - yet and still you say, "Build more prisons. That solves the problem." No, all you're doing is creating a time bomb that all society will pay, and they're going to pay dearly down the road. But let's not talk about Chicago. I see you slip in the City of Chicago. You like the City of Chicago. You use all its goods and services; you use its museums; you go to its restaurants; its lakefront; you do all these great things, which -- which in turn cause a financial -- creates a financial problem for the City of Chicago. But it's bad. It's bad, to you. So let's not play those silly If you want to deal with education, if it's good, Senator O'Malley, statewide, tell your colleague right now - right to get an amendment drafted. We can call the bill back to 2nd and make it statewide for all the nine hundred school districts across And you know what's going to happen? It's going to this State. you will not support it. The south suburbs' fail, because schools, who are in worse shape than the City of Chicago, the Senator's not going to support it from there, because this is hypocrisy that we face here, as related to education. It's very unfortunate when you can talk about how bad, how mismanaged Chicago is because they have a deficit for the next school year. But I want you to tell that man who sits on the Second Floor, that two-billion-dollar deficit. But you don't say he's mismanaging it; it's just the higher cost of doing business. Very unfortunate. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

Further discussion? Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

Yes. Will the sponsor yield to a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

Senator Cronin, is there a provision to qualify that pertains to the income -- the annual income of a family?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Yes. We -- we have specifically outlined that this is for lower-income families, those who -- only those eligible would be those who fall within certain guidelines set out by the National School Lunch Act. And as I said it in my opening remarks, for a family of four, it's about an income of twenty-eight thousand eight hundred and sixty dollars.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

In other words, anyone with a family of four, the total income for the family, and if it goes over twenty-four or twenty-eight thousand, whatever that number is, they're not eligible at all to qualify.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Well, Senator Shadid, I would have liked to raise that level and I would have liked to had it apply beyond a pilot program, and there's a lot of things I would have liked to have done to meet some of these speeches -- opposing arguments over there. If you're looking for a way to oppose it, just vote No. But we had

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

to craft this bill because this was the only way we could get it through this Body.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

Senator, I'm not looking for a way to oppose it. I am going to oppose this bill. I'm bringing this out for clarification so that everyone understands whether they qualify or not and give them the actual numbers of what their income will be or has to be before they can qualify. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. And I rise in support of Senate Bill 17. And just so you know where I'm coming from, I am a product of public schools. proud of that. I think I've received a good education. My family is a product of public schools. My brother has schoolteacher and is retired. I have two sister-in-laws who are teaching - one in Texas, one in Illinois. Why have I come to conclusion that we ought to try charter schools and vouchers? I'll tell you, it doesn't take a Phi Beta Kappa or any genius to figure out why. And generally speaking in Illinois and in suburban area, in my area particularly, our schools are very good. There are some pockets where they aren't so good. But generally speaking in the suburban area and downstate, they do a pretty good So where are the problems in the school system? They always have been, since I've been here, basically in the City of Chicago, for a lot of different reasons. Ever since I've been here we've been trying to reform the system, well over twenty years. And very honestly, we haven't even dented the system. About the only thing we've been doing here for twenty years - and there certainly

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

lot of people with short memories on the other side of the aisle - has been giving them more money. Every year for we've given them more money, into a very unfair, unconstitutional school aid formula, which, quite frankly, stiffs the suburbs. My average school district, in my district, gets six percent. Then you know what they tell me: "Take off the mandates and you can have your money." Chicago gets, and fluctuates every somewhere around thirty-seven percent. And what happened is that the unions, the teachers, the system, have let us down in the City of Chicago. They're the ones that have created this problem. Because you know what? They're not educating kids. Test scores are down; yet, we're sending more money. Secretary Bennett said, after he toured the schools -- I didn't say it. It's not Pate Philip. What does he say? "The worst school system America." Now, I happen to think that was an exaggeration. would probably say it's one of the worst school systems America. But it's not the worst. So -- we're frustrated on this side of the aisle, very honestly, because we haven't been able do anything or change anything other than give you more money. That's about all we've accomplished. And what -- the results the tests scores are worse; the dropouts are worse; the crime is worse. What's better? Absolutely nothing. Absolutely nothing. So it's time for competition. If we can't change it, if we can't intimidate you, if we can't make you better, maybe we ought to give you some competition. You know what? When I competition in the primary, I'll tell you one thing, I work harder I do a better job. We all know that's true. I used to be in the bread business a long time ago. And I'll tell you one thing: Oh ho-ho, we have Do we have competition in the bread business? got competition. Somebody comes up with a new product; we want to come up with a new product. It's makes us better. It keeps us on our toes, and we do a better job because we want to survive. Now

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

you know what? And why don't you on the other side of the aisle, for a change, think about the kids and not the unions and the teachers? How about the kids, for a change? Just one time, think about the kids. And if this kid can't fill out an application and I've seen 'em when I used to work; I'm retired - and the kid has a high school diploma from Chicago and can't spell Chicago, you're going to hire 'em? I would be surprised. And if you don't -- if they don't find a job, where do they end up? I'll tell you where they end up. In jail, or on welfare, and we pay ten times more. The best thing we can do for minorities in the State of Illinois is educate their kids so they have an opportunity to have That's the best thing you could do for anybody. And it's about time. It's about time my Democratic friends over there stand up and be counted and do the right thing, and forget about your union ties, your teacher ties. Give this system some competition so we can look two years from now and three years from now and say, "Hey, you know what? The schools are getting better. The grades are better; the attendance are better; there's less crime." So anyway, I have -- I have come to that conclusion, and I say I'm -- I'm a product of the system. And generally speaking, downstate is pretty good. But there certainly is a superior problem in the City of Chicago, and very honestly, we ought to do something about it. This is a good vote. There ought to be fifty-nine votes up there, without a hesitation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Further discussion? Senator Cronin, to close.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I want to thank Senator Philip. I couldn't say it any better than him. I would like to briefly respond and close. Senator Shaw said he's glad that we have visitors up in the gallery today, where they could listen and...

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Excuse me, Senator Cronin. Senator Jones, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR JONES:

A point of personal privilege. And that point, Mr. President, and, Senator Cronin, I apologize for interrupting you, but you -- we debated the issue based on the issue, and we tried very hard not to interject what group of children we are talking about and I know the Senate President indicated minority children and -and you say you concur with everything that he says. We're not -we're talking about children of the State of Illinois and let's not -- let's not get down to the point where we're going to interject the race of children in the State. I -- I resent that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Cronin, you wish to close, sir? SENATOR CRONIN:

With all due respect, Senator Philip's remarks were excellent. I would like to just start out by suggesting that one of the Senators on the other side of the aisle had a good thought. said that -- he expressed that he was pleased that we had many visitors here, so they could see the system and they could understand, presumably, his view of this issue. And I -- I just want to join him but for a different reason. I'm glad they're here so that they see what we're up against, what we're up against day in and day out, for people who oppose change; for people who are devoted to the status quo, that bow to the altar of the establishment of the teachers' union, of the administration; people who only -- the only answer to improve their schools is to say, "We want more money." Well, you know how much money we spend in the City of Chicago? Seven thousand dollars per pupil. thousand dollars. That's higher than the average in DuPage County. Seven thousand dollars is not a small sum of money. Senator

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

in responding and in closing, he pointed out the crisis Berman, in funding language in the bill. What's wrong with this -policy - a policy of the State of Illinois - that permits a child to choose an education that costs taxpayers twenty-five hundred dollars versus seven thousand dollars? What's wrong with a policy You talk about the school aid like that, if they choose it? formula. We -- we -- we wanted to sweeten the pot for the City of representatives. Wе said that in the event that one of the students leaves the system and goes to a private school, then you know what? The City of Chicago can still count their attendance for school aid. We wanted to sweeten it. We wanted to -- we didn't want it to be punitive, but that wasn't good enough. look at the total expenditure of dollars - 2.9 billion you dollars in the City of Chicago, you divide it by four hundred and ten thousand students, that gives you seven thousand per pupil. If you subtract five million from the 2.9 billion, it comes down six thousand nine hundred and eighty-eight dollars per pupil. You're talking about twelve bucks. Now, I -- I Senator Trotter, and I listened -- and -- and I -- I -- forgive me for using names, but I -- I -- I have to reference their remarks, Senator Hendon, Senator Shaw. I'm aghast. I don't particularly want to be the guy that sponsors this bill. You are really missing the boat. This is for you. This is for the people that you represent. You tell me -- you tell me, we're looking at -the facts are, the demographics are, that there are lower-income in some districts than there are in other districts. And this is an effort to try to empower people. Do I -- would I like it on a wider application? Would I like it in my district? But I can't get the votes to get it You're darn right. own district. If you tell me that you'd support it on a wider application, then -- then we'll -- we'll draft a new bill. believe me. But you tell me -- I mean, Senator -- Senator Palmer

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

talked about the common schools. What's so good about the common schools, with the gangs, and the drugs, and the violence, and the metal detectors, and the teenage pregnancy rate? What chance do people have that are -- that are confined to that system and can't go anywhere else because they can't afford to get out? You know, Senator Jones, you send your kids to parochial schools because you can afford to send them there. You tell me what the people your district say, when they say, "You know what? I'd like to go to the Catholic school, or the Lutheran school, or the Christian school, or the Islamic school, but, you know, I can't afford it. So I have to go to this school, and I got to dodge bullets on the way. I got to go through the metal detectors." What do you say to those people? You know, there was an important point made by Senator DeAngelis. Do we have a vested interest in the private schools? And -- and my -- my information specifically pertains to the Chicago Catholic schools. Do we have a vested interest? The Chicago public schools is the second-largest school system America. Chicago Catholic schools seventh-largest school system in America. You know, if that seventh-largest school system doesn't succeed, there's going to be a lot of problems for that second-largest school system. we have a vested interest in protecting that system? You're darn right we do. Senator Jacobs talked about the Constitution. Klinger v. Howard <sic> (Howlett) case talks about the fact that under the First Amendment -- if the First Amendment applies, State Constitution applies. Senator Welch, you know, talked about these strings attached and tried to scare people, that there's going to be some strings attached. It's a concern, but we have specifically talked about the fact that the State Board of Education shall not impose any further rules and regulations. They are subject to the direction and the -- of the Council Advisers. And you know what? If they start imposing the rules:

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

number one, the qualifying schools don't have to access the program, they can opt out; and number two, I'll be the first one down here to sponsor a bill - if I'm still around - to -- to pull the plug on that system. He also talked about the forty-eighth in funding from the State. I mean, I always hear that and I -- I just can't help myself. Forty-eighth in funding, when you look at all the sources of funding in the State of Illinois, the pupils of the State of Illinois and the schools they attend, we come in at about tenth in the nation - tenth or twelfth. You know, there was a wonderful statement that you said, Senator Welch, and I -- I -- I can't help myself. You said, you know, today, you know, we're decentralizing; we're doing charter schools, learning zones, vouchers, but when the winds of change come and the Democrats are in power, we'll go back to the old system. We'll go back to the old system of central bureaucracy and -- and government knows best, and -- and -- and more money, and more work rules, and more If -- if that's the system that you suggest Democratic Party stands for, I'm glad everyone's here to listen to that. Senator Carroll, I -- I got to tell you, I never counted on your vote. I mean, you tell me that, you know, those who already chosen private schools are the only ones that are going to access this. This applies evenhandedly. This applies to anyone who fulfills or fits the qualifying pupil standards. For constitutional reasons, as for pure reason and logic, that's the way it's got to be. Well, I got to tell you in closing, and I and I have a long set of prepared remarks here, but I can tell you that this is constitutional. We've had some of the brightest And you know what? If it's not, the judges will decide. that's why this is a pilot program. What this bill is about And competition, empowerment, parental involvement. It's is cost-effective and it's constitutional. We need educational choice. The system -- the system needs educational choice. If we

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

don't have choice, if we don't give these kids a chance, if we don't pass this bill today, I am not -- I am not very hopeful about the state of the educational system in the State, in City of Chicago, and America. We have got to do something dramatic. We cannot accept the status quo. This is dramatic to To me, it doesn't go far enough. When this bill passes and becomes law, I hope, and I intend, to do everything in my power to see that it succeeds, that the people who are appointed to the council support school choice, that want to nurture this program. And you're darn right. If it succeeds, I'm going to back here and we're going to see it on a wider basis, more pilot programs, more competition and better schools. Everyone should vote for this. I appreciate your -- your patience, and I ask for your favorable consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 17 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Secretary. On that question -- on that question -- on that question, there are 31 Ayes, 23 Nays, no Members -- 1 Member voting Present. Senate Bill 17, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Berman, for what purpose do you arise, sir?

SENATOR BERMAN:

I'd ask for a verification of the affirmative vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Berman has requested a verification of the affirmative roll call. Will the Members be in their chairs, please. Mr. Secretary, would you read the affirmative roll call, please?

SECRETARY HARRY:

The following Members voted in the affirmative: Barkhausen, Butler, Cronin, DeAngelis, DeLeo, Dillard, Donahue, Dudycz, Ralph

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

Dunn, Thomas Dunn, Farley, Fawell, Fitzgerald, Geo-Karis, Hasara, Karpiel, Lauzen, Mahar, Maitland, Molaro, O'Malley, Parker, Peterson, Petka, Raica, Rauschenberger, Syverson, Walsh, Watson, Weaver, and Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Viverito, for what purpose do you rise, sir? SENATOR VIVERITO:

I'd like to say that I'm a new Member of the Senate. And yesterday on my way to Springfield, I had a -- hit a cake of ice and landed in the ditch. And, of course, I was towed out and I didn't make the Senate yesterday. And I especially wanted to be here today. And I didn't realize my microphone was not on -- and I wanted to -- pardon me -- my voting key was not on, and I wanted to apologize for that, but I wanted to vote in favor of the voucher.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

The record will so reflect. Senator Berman, do you request -do you -- do you challenge the -- the presence of any Member?

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you -- thank you. Senator Lauzen? Okay. Senator Syverson? Senator Peterson? Senator Sieben? I won't challenge his vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

On a verified roll call, there are 31 Ayes, 23 Nays and 1 Member having voted Present. Senate Bill 17, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Karpiel, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Having voted on the prevailing side, I make a motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 17 passed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Geo-Karis.

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, I move to lay that on the table.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Geo-Karís moves that Senate Bill 17 -- that the motion to reconsider be tabled. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the motion is tabled. Senate Bill 20. Senator Weaver? Senator Weaver, do you wish this bill returned to -- to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of amendment? Senator Weaver seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 20 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 20. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. This would maintain the practice of receiving per diem when the Senate is not in Session.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Weaver has moved the adoption of -- of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 20. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the -- and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments -- Floor amendments approved for consideration, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

3rd Reading. Is there any further business to come before the Senate? Senator DeLeo, for what purpose do you arise, sir?

SENATOR DeLEO:

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

Thank you, Mr. President. With leave of the Body, I'd ask that Senate Bill 508 lay on the table.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator DeLeo has moved that Senate Bill 508 be tabled. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the -- and the bill is tabled. Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Klemm, Chair of the Committee on Local Government and Elections, reports Senate Bills 390, 405, 426, 455 and 476 Do Pass; and Senate Bills 444 and 477 Do Pass, as Amended.

Senator Weaver, Chair of the Committee on Rules, reports that the following Legislative Measures have been assigned committees: Referred to the Committee on Education - House Bills Senate Resolution 27, and Senate Amendment 1 to Senate to the Committee on Executive -227: Senate Joint Resolutions 26, 30 and 31; re-referred from Higher Education to the Rules Committee - Senate Bill 698; referred to the Committee on Public Health and Welfare - Senate Bill 698; to the Committee on Revenue - Senate Resolution 32; to the Committee on Government Operations -Senate Joint Resolutions 24 and 28; to the Committee on Transportation - Senate Amendment 2 to Bill 122; and Be Approved for Consideration - Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 365.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Demuzio, for what purpose do you arise, sir? SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. I'd like the record to reflect that Senator Collins is absent due to illness, and also Senator Hall is absent. I understand he's improved somewhat. So I would ask that the record so reflect.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Karpiel, for what purpose do you arise?

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

SENATOR KARPIEL:

For the purposes of amendment, Mr. -- of an announcement, Mr. President. I just would like to announce to the Body that the Senate Executive Committee will meet immediately following adjournment in Room 212. Senate Executive Committee. Please be prompt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Raica, for what purpose do you arise, sir? SENATOR RAICA:

Purpose of announcement, Mr. President. The Committee on Public, Health and Welfare will meet at 2:30, not 2 o'clock \sim 2:30 in Room A-1 of the Stratton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Senator Mahar, for what purpose do you arise, sir?

SENATOR MAHAR:

For an announcement, Mr. President. The Senate Environment and Energy Committee will meet tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. in Room 400.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 8, offered by Senator Geo-Karis.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And Senate Bill -- or House Bill 340, offered by Senator Dillard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Is there any further business to come before the Senate? If not -- Senator Barkhausen, I'm sorry, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

24th Legislative Day

March 8, 1995

To announce, Mr. President, that there will be no meeting of the Senate Financial Institutions Committee this week.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MAITLAND)

Thank you. Is there any further business to come before the Senate? If not, Senator Geo-Karis moves that the Senate stand adjourned until noon, Thursday, March -- March 9th.

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS 89TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE

SENATE
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MARCH 08, 1995

	HB-0008	FIRST READING	PAGE	76
	HB-0206	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
	HB-0340	FIRST READING	PAGE	76
4	HB-0355	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
	HB-0358	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
	HB-0505	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
	HB-0560	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
	HB-0567	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
	SB-0008	THIRD READING	PAGE	4
	SB-0017	RECALLED	PAGE	18
	SB-0017	THIRD READING	PAGE	20
	SB-0020	RECALLED	PAGE	74
	SB-0063	SECOND READING	PAGE	2
	SB-0185	SECOND READING	PAGE	3
	SB-0288	SECOND READING	PAGE	3
	SB-0508	TABLED	PAGE	75

95/04/07

14:02:20

SUBJECT MATTER

SENATE TO ORDER-SENATOR WEAVER PRAYER-THE REVEREND DAVID SCHAUER PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE JOURNALS-POSTPONED COMMITTEE REPORTS COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	1 1 1 1 1 75
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	75
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	77