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I. Introduction

In a mere two months, one can never become cozy enough in the Indiana Statehouse to call it home, but its pillared hallways and darkly gleaming dome do in time become familiar. The handsome legislative chambers and sweeping marble stairways are part of the symbolism embodied in the Statehouse, a center where a system of government designed "of the people, by the people and for the people" fulfills the duties inherent in guiding a state of 5 million persons.

To say that this tall stone edifice facing Indianapolis' famous Monument Circle is a powerhouse where only the elite rub elbows is to ignore the fact that the "elite" is a mixture of farmers, teachers, lawyers, doctors, businessmen and homemakers. Drawing on a wealth of knowledge from their respective backgrounds, Indiana's state senators and representatives work out legislation on the third floor while the governor and state attorney general perform their share in the intricate choreography of checks and balances in their quietly elegant offices a level below.

The movements between the state's highest office and its two adjoining branches are not always peaceful, however, as the men and women whose responsibilities
lie with state government would be the first to admit. A maze of special-interest, constituent and political party loyalties, the political game at the state level requires an adeptness at negotiation and the clairvoyance to know which side of the fence to be on when the final count is taken. The confusion belies what looks to be neat rows of political ideologies lined up facing the presiding officer in each legislative chamber. The appearance of party solidarity, though often called into action when the vote is close, turns out to be a facade delicately pieced together by compromise and the weight of glib yet powerful party leaders.

It is not a domain one enters lightly. Passing by the life-sized, stern-faced statue of former Gov. Oliver P. Morton, one mounts the wide stone stairs and passes into the high-ceilinged hall. Tall wooden doors flank the sides of the spacious passageway, leading into efficient glass-partitioned offices. A replica of the Liberty Bell, its famous crack starkly dark against the polished silver, rests solidly in the center of the three-story rotunda, while unseeing patron muses pose on the walls above.

Of all those objects in the Statehouse bearing human form, however, the statues are the only ones remaining fixed. Men and women move ceaselessly about the echoing halls, checking watches as they try to fit a legislative session, a committee meeting and a chat with lobbyists into a too-short time span. For those
whose titles do not rank them among the 150 lawmakers, there is still plenty to do, as desks piled high with typing, news releases and legislative research notes can attest.

Despite the nonstop activity, however, the atmosphere remains comparatively relaxed. Votes are quietly wooed over sandwiches at the Press Club or with drinks during an informal caucus, while advocates of every political persuasion join together in the dark recesses of hotel bars at the end of the long work days. A friendly chat with the doormen outside the Senate and House chambers can turn up tidbits of information as important as the rhetoric that takes place during a legislative debate, making a mockery of those with illusions of privacy.

In such a situation, it is not always easy to remember that the role of the press is primarily an adversary one. Surrounded by public figures trying to remain in their constituents' favor until after the next election, reporters must constantly guard against being lulled by the politicians' public behavior. The story behind the scenes can prove different than what is put forward for the media's consumption, leaving it to the reporter to ferret out the truth for the voting public.

The Statehouse's parade of characters can draw the journalist into cultivating his own "public image," especially with everyone so obviously observing everyone
else. Neither sex is completely oblivious to the need to appear attractive, or, at the very least, distinctive. The Statehouse's courtly decor cannot entirely quench the free-wheeling spirit floating beneath the tediousness and decorum of the governing process, however, and for those seeking fame and adventure, the chandeliers struggling to light the recesses of far-flung corridors can be as bright as the lights of a glittering Broadway or gaudy Las Vegas.

I was one of those who flocked starstruck to the state's capitol. Assigned to cover the state legislature for the Bell State Daily News, I floundered through the first unsure weeks and gradually learned to understand the many-faceted political process by which Hoosier laws are made.

The experience was unforgettable. While senior Darb Dockser covered activities of the House of Representatives and junior Charlene Hires concentrated on the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance committees, I wrote on the passage of bills through the Senate. Influenced strongly by the personalities of the 50 men and women elected to fill its high-backed leather seats, the Senate spent months changing pages of legalese into sharply-contested statutes and resolutions.

Reporting on this side of the legislature was more than just listening to speeches and attending press conferences, however. Both monied interests and simple causes were represented at committee meetings, where a
bill had its initial hearing. Keeping abreast of a bill's movements through first, second and third readings was a continuous challenge, especially when the day's agenda wasn't met or when a senator waited to call down a bill until he could garner more support. Many bills had been introduced during previous sessions, entailing research into the long history of change and slow acceptance that some bills had had to face. In addition, other journalists proved to be good references, providing a pool of past experience on which to draw.

Extensive legwork was only the beginning of the reporting process, leading relentlessly to the ever-present pressure to get the story written before deadline. Fingers pounding on our two decrepit typewriters, Barb, Charlene or I would type out the stories we had decided on for the day, analyzing and editing each others' work. The copy was then ready to be fed directly into the VDP when our Daily News liaison would call, giving us total control of everything short of the headline and layout.

With this general knowledge of the atmosphere in which I worked during January and February, I submit the following samples of my writing for the Daily News legislative bureau. The writing varies but the intent was the same: to give our readers the best possible explanation of their state government.
Indiana Senate convenes, starts actions by suspending bill rule

INDIANAPOLIS—The marble halls of the Indiana Statehouse were relatively deserted early Monday morning, but by the time the Indiana Senate and House convened, lobbyists, legislators and staff persons alike were echoing the view expressed by one returning legislator: "I've been waiting for this for a long time."

Following a delayed start, the Senate opened with the introduction of Randy Worland, legislative aide to Lt. Gov. Robert Orr. Worland, a senior at Ball State, also worked at the statehouse last year as a political science intern.

Senate President Pro Tem Robert Fair, D-Princeton, moved that the Senate rule stating only one bill may be introduced in one day be suspended. The rule has caused problems due to the lack of time left to accept bills. The 50-member Senate voted 40-6 to suspend the rules and allow an unlimited number of bills to be introduced before today's deadline.

Over 250 Senate bills were brought up for first reading following the introduction of two concurrent resolutions: one recognising the nearly 250 high school senior class presidents serving as pages for the day and the other in honor and recognition of Edmund Baker, a former senator from Vanderburgh County.
Senate passes several resolutions Tuesday

DN Legislative Bureau

INDIANAPOLIS — The Indiana General Assembly passed several concurrent resolutions in floor action Tuesday.

The Senate became fully quiet for the first time Tuesday during a resolution introduced in memory of the University of Evansville basketball team and their coach, Bobby Watson, who crashed en route to Middle Tennessee State University Dec. 13.

Senators Joseph O'Day, D-Evansville, and James Harris, R-Newburgh, co-sponsors of the resolution, praised the young team members and asked Senate members to join them in "deeply and sincerely" mourning those involved in the accident. The resolution was passed by a standing vote of silence and later was passed by the House.

Beth Green, a former secretary of the Senate, and James Farmer, an assistant to former Gov. Roger Brannigan, were recognized in two separate resolutions for their work on the Indiana General Assembly's 100th anniversary.

A centennial dinner and dance were held Monday evening in the Indianapolis Convention Center, and a history of the General Assembly is being compiled. The resolution concerning Green was later passed by the House.

Senate President pro tem Robert Fair, D-Princeton, moved for adjournment at 11 a.m., and Lt. Gov. Robert Orr set the time for today's Senate opening at 1:30 p.m. The late time is to allow for the funeral of the father of Sen. Thomas Teague, D-Anderson.

The House approved House Concurrent Resolution 21, sponsored by Rep. Donald Nelson, R-Indianapolis, memorializing George Loi, former House member, who died this summer at the age of 38. The House also approved House Concurrent Resolution 22, sponsored by Rep. Phillip Warner, R-Elkhart, which commended the participants in the 1977 Elkhart County Fair.
Bill would provide aid for College of Business

DN Legislative Staff

INDIANAPOLIS—State funding amounting $3.3 million would be appropriated to Ball State's proposed College of Business through provisions of Senate Bill (S.B.) 320, sponsored by Sen. John Mutz, R-Indianapolis.

Robert Bell, vice president of business affairs, said the monetary appropriation would replace the original request for authorization to sell bonds worth $3.3 million. This would mean receiving the money immediately rather than working with the bonds over a 20-30 year period.

Granting over $45.6 million to the trustees of the state institution of higher education, the bill, if adopted, would fund capital projects at Purdue, Indiana, Ball State and Indiana State Universities as well as at Indiana Vocational Technical College (Ivy Tech). Totals other than Ball State are:

- Indiana University, $22,567,250;
- Purdue University, $15,540,400;
- Indiana State University, $3.3 million;
- and Ivy Tech, $954,000.

The overall amount granted to the five institutions totals to $45,66,650.

If passed, the bill would become effective immediately and would replace laws passed last year authorizing the issuing and the selling of bonds and land purchase agreements entered into by the state institutions of higher education.
New bill not to affect students voting by ballots sent to BSU

By KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau

INDIANAPOLIS—A student at Ball State may eat, sleep, wash, drink, study and play in Muncie, but come November, he probably votes in his home county, often by absentee ballot.

A state bill prohibiting the mailing of absentee ballots to an address in the voter's county of residence would not affect students who vote by absentee ballot, providing they have the ballots mailed to their Muncie address rather than their home address.

What Senate bill (S.B.) 201 would affect, however, according to author Herman Fanning, D-Terre Haute, and second author Ernest Niemeyer, R-Lowell, is the abuses that occur when more than one ballot gets sent to the same address, often a vacated one. A similar bill sponsored last year by Sen. Fanning passed in the Senate but failed to pass in the House.

In testimony before the Senate Elections and Apportionment Committee, Rep. Darrell Felling, D-Terre Haute, cited Indiana Attorney General Theodore Sendak's ruling that absentee ballots should not be mailed out within the county. The ruling is being contested in a Madison County case but has not yet been resolved.

Rep. Felling went on to say that a new law is needed to "clean up the language" of the existing two laws dealing with absentee ballots, adding that, with S.B. 201's passage, "we would have a consistent statewide ruling." Committee Chairman James Lewis, Jr., D-Charlestown, concurred. "Whichever way we're going to go, I think we should clarify the law," he said.

An amendment correcting a 60-day county residency clause to agree with the state's present 30-day requirement was the only amendment added to the bill, which passed out of the committee with a vote of 5-3.

The bill's main opposer, Sen. Elden Tipton, D-Jasonville, objected to the bill with complaints that "there is not nearly as much hanky-panky going on as the non-partisan side would have people believe," calling those who listened to such alarm "naive." He added that the population is increasingly mobile and hence is not surprising for absentee ballots to go to vacant houses. Sen. Thomas Teague, D-Anderson, voted against the bill pending the outcome of the court case in his district.

Sen. Fanning assured the committee that the bill's passage would not affect servicemen, students or those who specially arranged to have an absentee ballot sent to their residence in the same county for health reasons, such as the elderly.

Sen. Teague spoke in favor of another bill discussed during the committee meeting proposing the creation of a state election campaign. S.B. 138 provides that individual taxpayers may designate that one dollar of their gross income tax be paid to the fund and credited to a specific political party, similar to a system presently set up on the federal level.

Sen. President Pro Tem Robert Fair, D-Princeton, sponsor of S.B. 138 and a similar bill which failed to pass last year, told the committee that the rising cost of campaigning made such a bill the best way to fund those who otherwise could not run for office. The committee passed the bill 5 to 1 with two members abstaining.
Indian state senators may make up only one-thousandth of one percent of the Hoosier population, but the proposal for most on the agenda dealt with a question familiar to many: how soon do we get paid?

Senate Bill (S.B.) 39, sponsored by Sen. Merton Stanley, D-Kokomo, would confine legislator paydays to a two-month period, Jan. 15 and Feb. 15. The present law spreads the paydays out over several months and has been suspended for several sessions in the past to allow for the earlier pay period.

No amendments were added to the bill, which passed quickly, 45 to 0. Only five senators were absent for the first final vote on legislation of the 1978 session.
Eligible for final readings

Six bills pass second reading

By KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau

Urging Congress not to expand the seven-year ratification period for the Equal Rights Amendment, House Concurrent resolution 35 was assigned to the House Human Affairs Committee during Friday's session in the Indiana House of Representatives.

Six bills passed second reading and will be eligible for their final reading this week, among them House Bill (H.B.) 1072, co-sponsored by Rep. Leo Viosard, D-Muncie. The bill proposes increasing the penalty for delinquent property from 8 per cent to a penalty of 10 per cent.


Also coming up for third reading is H.B. 1097, allowing change of venue cases from another county to be docketed either in the Boone Circuit Court or the Boone Superior Court.

H.B. 1097 would allow a court to enter a judgement against a person obligated to pay child support requiring that person to pay all unpaid obligations to the person entitled to receive. Both bills are sponsored by representatives John Donaldson, R-Lebanon, and Craig Campbell, D-Anderson.

A law requiring the driver on the left to yield the right-of-way when two vehicles enter an intersection at the same time will go into effect if it passes third reading this week, H.B. 1098 is sponsored by representatives G. Edward Cook, D-Plymouth, and Thomas Coleman, R-New Castle.

The sixth bill, H.B. 1144, sponsored by representatives Norman Gherig, R-Auburn, and John Thomas, R-Brazil, deals with inheritance tax redetermination for a change in deductions. Only one bill is scheduled for third reading so far this week in the Senate. Senate Bill (S.B.) 53 would assign cutoff dates for the Indiana Administrative Code.

In other business, the Senate passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 21 to commemorate the Jan. 15 birthday of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., as well as S.C.R. 19, passed in commemoration of former senator Clyde Matthews, District 43.

House Resolution 15 mourned the passing of Ralph Tucker, former five-term mayor of Terre Haute and a 1948 candidate for the Indiana governorship. The resolution was passed by a standing vote of silence.

The Senate is scheduled to meet again at 1:30 p.m. today followed by the House session at 2 p.m.
Senate considers new rent laws

By KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau

INDIANAPOLIS—Well, you finally got it, your own place at last. No more floor staff pouring your beer down the drain, no more communal shower stalls, no more late night munchies with no refrigerator to raid. All it took was a deposit, a lease, some money for utilities...

Renting a place to live is admittedly not as easy as it first appears, but landlords and tenants may be getting new laws to follow with the introduction of Senate Bill 171 sponsored by Sen. Patrick Carroll, D-Bloomington.

The bill, which passed out of the Senate Judiciary Committee Monday by a vote of 5 to 3, is an amended version of a bill that was defeated 25 to 26 during the Senate's 1977 session. Monday's committee vote was split along party lines, with Democratic members voting to recommend the bill and Republicans voting against it.

Highlights and recommended amendments to SB 171 include a provision stating that documents sent by registered or certified mail from the landlord to the tenant or vice versa shall be considered a legal notice whether or not the notice is accepted. Also, if a rental agreement contains provisions prohibited by the proposed law, the tenant may recover damages as well as reasonable attorney's fees.

A hotly contested section of the pending legislation deals with unsigned rental agreements. Acceptance of a tenant's rent without signing an agreement obligates the landlord to follow the tenant's written rental proposal, while the tenant's acceptance of possession and payment of rent obligates him to follow the landlord's.

Sen. Leslie Duvall, R-Indianapolis, suggested amending the section or striking it altogether because of possible conflicts if either party accepts the other rental agreement. Both proposals were voted down by a narrow margin.

Landlord responsibilities would include: complying with building and housing codes, keeping the premises in a "fit and habitable condition," maintaining facilities and appliances supplied with the rental area, adequate waste disposal facilities and running water, reasonable amounts of hot water and reasonable heat, unless the last provision is within the exclusive control of the tenant.

Obligations of the tenant include: keeping the premises clean and safe, proper disposal of waste, proper maintenance of cleaning facilities and appliances, avoiding negligently or intentionally destroying, defacing, damaging, impairing or removing any part of the premises or allowing another person to do so, consideration of neighbors, and keeping the dwelling unit locked to prevent intrusion of strangers.

The bill further provides for tenant's privacy, breach of contract, fire damage, termination of tenancy and retaliatory actions by either party. The bill will now be scheduled for second reading in the Senate.
Worland serves as Orr's aide, gains knowledge from Senate

By KATHY BARKS  
DN Legislative Bureau

The Indiana Statehouse stands with aloof dignity in downtown Indianapolis, the whirl of activities happening beneath its copper dome a mystery to many. To those in the know, however, the legislative process is an exciting one, and few have a better inside track on statehouse business than Randy Worland, legislative aide to Lt. Gov. Robert Orr.

Worland, a Shelbyville senior majoring in political science and history, applied for the job after serving as a Senate Republican intern during the 1977 legislative session. Working under senators Keith McCormick, R-Lebanon, and Joseph Harrison, R-Attica, Worland researched bills and performed other duties for the legislators.

This year, however, he is working in the Senate, rather than for the Senate. "I think I'll learn a lot more," says Worland of his new job. Sitting to the right of Lt. Gov. Orr during every Senate meeting, he is able to observe the workings of the Senate members and hear their debates, many of which he missed last year as an intern. He also keeps a record of each session for Orr and greets the ministers who give the prayer at the beginning of each day's session.

Working for Orr helps Worland "get a better insight" into the reasons behind each piece of legislative action, much of which the state's second-in-command keeps track of through his staff. Of particular interest are bills pertaining to the Department of Commerce, which Orr heads as part of being the lieutenant governor.

"I make sure I keep the bills in people." Commenting on the amount of back-scratching that goes on among legislators, Worland admits that a certain amount takes place, but adds, "The Indiana Senate is a very pure branch of the government."

Lobbying pressures do not often affect a legislator's stand on an issue, either. "A senator knows who are good lobbyists and bad lobbyists," says Worland. Lobbying serves a purpose by keeping legislators informed on how a particular law would affect citizens in the state, he adds, helping the state lawmakers to better represent their constituents.

Although not as many bills were introduced this year due to the shorter 30-day session, the amount of work involved can still be staggering. "You can get mixed up on so many things," says the knowledgeable senior, whose busy schedule usually keeps him informed on most issues.

"I think the committee hearings are one of the best ways of learning about a bill," he states, adding that there much of the evidence pro and con on an issue is presented.

"A lot of time you walk out of a committee meeting with a different opinion than when you walked in," Worland continues. Although from his seat at the Senate podium it often appears that the senators aren't paying attention, he knows that many of the legislators already have a good idea of what a bill is doing simply by attending committee meetings.

Voting in the Senate is often close, but the experienced legislative aide seldom sees a vote that strictly follows the 28 Democrat, 22 Republican split of the Senate.

Worland says that the Indiana legislature is one of the most competitive partisan state governments in the country, with a Republican governor, a Democrat-controlled Senate and a slightly Republican-controlled House. And even that balance may not be the same after November's elections.

Politics and Worland seem to fit together quicker than one can say House and Senate, his enthusiasm so apparent that it's not surprising to hear that one day he may run for a political office himself. Presently planning to graduate after student teaching next fall, Worland says he thinks he can bring a lot to a high school social studies class with his legislative experience.

The political scene is in his blood, however, and he plans to work in republican campaigns this fall as well as student teach.
Indiana Senate lauds former Senator Humphrey in tribute

DN Legislative Bureau
INDIANAPOLIS—Eulogizing former Sen. Hubert Humphrey as a great man, statesman and true American, both Democratic and Republican members of the Indiana Senate joined in a silent tribute to the former vice president during Monday's session.

Claiming a "moment of silence is as appropriate for Hubert Humphrey as anything can be," Senate President Pro Tem Robert Fair, D-Princeton, went on to praise the outspoken congressman for his high ideals and public service in his long political career. Fair was followed by Sen. Martin Edwards, R-New Castle and Senate Minority Floor Leader, who sponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 22 with Fair.

Speaker of the House Kermit Hurrous, R-Peru, led House members in a short prayer in memory of Humphrey. The resolution also passed in the House after tributes by House co-sponsors Henry Lamkin Jr., R-Indianapolis, and Michael Phillips, D-Boonville.

Sen. Julia Carson, D-Indianapolis, noted that Humphrey has always upheld minority rights, and Sen. Louis Maheran Jr., D-Indianapolis, commented on the late senator's optimism and tolerance. Senators Joseph O'Day, D-Evansville, and Elden Tipton, D-Jasonville, also spoke a few words before the resolution was passed by a standing vote of silence.
Kinghorn sponsors policy bills

By KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau

INDIANAPOLIS-The Ball State Administration neither opposed nor favors an Indiana Senate proposal to allow public university faculty collective bargaining rights, announced administration representative Thomas Kinghorn.

Kinghorn, speaking to the Senate Education Committee Tuesday, suggested several amendments for Senate Bill 296 for reasons of "clarification." His proposals were opposed by Richard Lawrence, Ball State professor of chemistry and president of the American Federation of Teachers, Local 3153, Ball State.

Lawrence claimed that one amendment would weaken the bill by allowing only full-time faculty the chance to be included under the collective bargaining bill. Kinghorn denied that all part-time employees would be prevented from participating in collective bargaining, but Lawrence expressed doubt in Kinghorn's statements.

Kinghorn's second amendment would include Ball State's 46 department heads or department chairpersons, under the heading of supervisor, in the same category as university committee.

Many testimonies were heard in support of SB 296, including those made by representatives from the Indiana Federation of Teachers, Indiana State Teachers Association, Indiana University Student Association, Independent Association of Colleges and Universities and the Indiana chapter of the American Conference of University Professors.

Lawrence referred to a petition circulated among Ball State faculty last year asking permission to select a collective bargaining agent. The petition was not accepted by the Board of Trustees, due to a "lack of enabling legislation," said Lawrence.

At the upcoming Jan. 25 Board of Trustees meeting, Lawrence plans to again ask permission to select an agent. He feels the Board should be more open to the proposal this year, although he commented, "There's opposition."

The Ball State chapter of AFT will hold a meeting Jan. 26 to discuss the Board's decision. Scheduled for 4 p.m. at the Universalist-Unitarian Church in Muncie, the meeting will give union faculty members a chance to talk about Kovach's proposed bill, according to Lawrence.

Referring to recent disagreements between Ball State faculty and administration, Lawrence commented, "I hope this bill will assist in alleviating these problems."
Public employee collective bargaining bill nears Indiana Senate acceptance

By KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau

INDIANAPOLIS—Indiana public employees came another step closer to obtaining collective bargaining rights Wednesday as Senate Bill 56 passed through second reading.

The bill, sponsored by Sen. John Bushemy, D-Merrillville, was bombarded by amendments offered mainly by minority party Republicans. Of the 18 amendments suggested, nine were adopted, eight were rejected and one duplicate amendment was dismissed as out of order.

Municipal and county health institution employees are included in the new legislation along with other public employees. However, local policemen, local firemen, faculty members of any university, certificated employees of school corporations and confidential employees are excluded.

Senate members watched the electronic tally board closely as each amendment went through roll call vote. The debate centered mainly on certification of employees' organizations, fact-finding arbitration, dues deductions, agency shops and contract length.

Organization certification drew the most debate, as Sen. Robert Garton, R-Columbus, introduced an amendment to require a majority vote of all bargaining unit members to select a bargaining agent.

Bushemy countered that the majority should be required only of the total number who vote, not of those eligible to vote. Sen. William Christy, D-Hammond, backed up Bushemy's statements by pointing out that circumstances may sometimes interfere to keep persons from voting.

The paradox of requiring all bargaining unit members to pay dues while not requiring their majority votes to select a bargaining agent, was commented on by Sen. Joseph Harrison, R-Attica. After sponsor Harris' concluding remarks, the amendment passed, 25-21.

Two amendments dealing with fact-finding finally were resolved with the adoption of the second one, sponsored by Sen. Merton Stanley, D-Kokomo, by a vote of 39-8. The amendment removed from SB 56 compulsory fact-finding by either party, but leaves fact-finding as a possible solution in binding arbitration.
Collective bargaining bill fails in House meeting Thursday

By KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau

INDIANAPOLIS—An attempt to narrow collective bargaining rights to full-time faculty failed in committee Thursday as Democrats rallied against Republicans to drive the bill through virtually as presented by Sen. Robert Kovach, D-Mishawaka.

Teachers employed more than half time by an Indiana state university, including those at Ball State, Indiana State, Purdue, Indiana and Vincennes universities, would be eligible to participate in collective bargaining action under Senate Bill 296.

In addition, an amendment to include department heads or department chairpersons in a "supervisor" category, sponsored by Sen. Morris Mills, R-Indianapolis, was voted down, leaving the decision up to the Indiana Educational Employees Board as to where a department head would fit in the collective bargaining unit.

Jim Mendenhall, Lawrence junior and Ball State Student Association vice-president, testified against the bill during discussion before the vote. "The people who have been left out have been the students," he stated.

Pointing out that higher faculty salaries would mean higher student fees, Mendenhall voiced the opinion that the bill should be amended to allow student input in the faculty collective bargaining process. Exclusion, he insisted, would take away from students' rights.

Asked if there was any chance of amending the bill to include student input, Mendenhall replied, "Right now we are not sure whether or not we will be able to propose amendments on the floor of the Senate."

He added that the Ball State SA's main concern was that the Senate be aware of students in the collective bargaining process, including those with a different viewpoint than that offered in favor of the bill by Jeff Rogers, IU SA.

Ball State administrative representative Thomas Kinghorn, who worked with Mills on some of the unsuccessful amendments, commented, "Our motivation is to provide a minimum structure so we can have some way to administer (the collective bargaining)...We don't think you'll get a good deal as students without some type of structure."

The administration is trying to amend parts of proposed SB 296, said Kinghorn, in order to clarify the bill for easier reading, where Senate Republicans may try again to amend the bill more to their approval.
Public employees’ bargaining bill comes to final reading

By KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau

INDIANAPOLIS—The public employees’ collective bargaining bill, an oft-seen, though not always welcome visitor on the Indiana Senate floor in past years, once again wended its way through opposition on final reading with a vote of 30-19.

Senate Bill 56 will now make its way to the House of Representatives where opposition from the Republican-dominated chamber killed the bill last year.

Senator John Bushemi, D- Merrillville, defended his bill to tough questioning by those in opposition to the proposal. “The question really remains whether we’re going to set up a system to resolve conflicts between public employers and public employees, and I think this bill does that,” stated Bushemi.

Many senators who question the bill’s sponsor were concerned with whether the legislation would stop strikes and attempts by public employees to manipulate money out of city and county governments who had only a set amount of funds with which to pay their employees.

“Some part of the city budget will be sacrificed to pay for increased salaries for public employees,” said Senator Joseph Harrison, R-Attica. He also pointed out that most Hoosier citizens don’t like the idea of deficit spending that could accompany the bill.

Admitting that the proposed legislation may not be strong enough, Senator William Christy, D-Hammond, none the less defended Bushemi’s bill, commenting, “I think legislation similar to this is a must.”

Other bills on their way to the House include SB 201, sponsored by Senator Herman Fanning Jr., D-Terre Haute, dealing with absentee balloting.

Designed to clarify conflict between two existing laws, stop a pending Madison County lawsuit concerning the matter, and stop flagrant voting fraud, the bill would prohibit each county’s voter registration office from sending ballots to persons residing within that county.

Exceptions would be made to accommodate the handicapped, elderly and ill who could not get to the polls. The proposal passed 26-21.

The landlord tenant legislation, SB 171, passed (See ‘Collective bargaining,’ page 3)

Collective bargaining (continued from page 1)

through second reading today after being defended by sponsor Senator Patrick Carroll, D Bloomington against any amendments.

Senator Michael Gery, D-W. Lafayette, also had a bill engrossed after amendments were added to his proposal to include sales tax on the gas pump, rather than on the total sales price of the gasoline purchase. He was joined in sponsoring SB 11 by Senator Woodrow Wilson D-Monroeville.

Controversy edged through the Senate upon second reading of legislation giving renters a proposed income tax deduction. SB 50, sponsored by Gery, would take into account varying rent rates by giving the renter a deduction of $40 or two percent of his rent, whichever was lower.

The Senate passed four other bills on third reading and engrossed over a dozen bills on second reading. Senate President Pro Tempore Robert Fair, D-Princeton, moved for adjournment until 10 a.m. Wednesday.
‘Sunset legislation’ threatens universities

KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau

INDIANAPOLIS—Ball State University and its Board of Trustees were on opposite sides of the fence again Wednesday, when Sen. Graham Richard, D-Fort Wayne, called down Indiana Senate Bill 43 for third reading. Dealing with what is commonly known as “sunset legislation,” SB 43 would require the state legislature to review state agencies once every eight years with the option of terminating them.

Ball State and its programs are included with other Indiana State Universities in a section stating that they may be terminated, but state universities’ boards of trustees are in a section permitting review, but not termination.

“*That distinction is procedural,*” said Richard. “It’s not a question that we like board members better than we like administrators.”

He added that the probability was relatively low that any university programs would be terminated, but that the legislature would “use the mechanism as a way of constructively reviewing” the program.

Senator Lawrence Borst, R-Indianapolis, questioned the distinction made between the universities and their boards of trustees, asking if they weren’t the same thing.

Richard responded that the distinction was made merely to keep the trustees as a functioning entity despite any changes that could be made to university programs. He added, “There is no question in my mind that (the universities) will be abolished and I don’t think that was the intent of the (Legislative) Council.”

Senate Minority Leader Martin Edwards, R-New Castle, attacked the bill, which would also pertain to all state agencies other than state universities. He called the proposal a “slap in the face” to the legislators and added, “It seems to me it shows a lack of faith and trust.” The bill passed 33-14.

Landlord-tenant legislation, SB 371, also passed the Senate Wednesday on third reading, despite opposition from many minority party members.
Collective bargaining

Legislation passes second reading

By KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau

INDIANAPOLIS—University faculty collective bargaining legislation struggled through second reading in the Indiana Senate Wednesday as Republicans bombarded the bill with seven proposed amendments.

Only two amendments were added to Senate Bill 296, however, as sponsor Sen. Robert Kovach, D-Mishawaka, argued successfully to leave the bill similar to its recommendation by the Senate Education Committee.

A vote of 49-0 passed an amendment requiring that a collective bargaining agent be elected by a majority of the collective bargaining unit members eligible to vote, rather than a majority of those who vote. The second amendment required that binding arbitration not be mandated, but instead be considered a bargaining alternative.

Both amendments were sponsored by Sen. Roger Jessup, R-Fairmount, who said his main point in introducing the amendments was to make SB 296 compatible with SB 56, a proposal advocating public employee collective bargaining. The Senate passed SB 56 Monday by a final vote of 30-19.

Kovach, regarding the future of SB 296, foresees it passing out of the Democrat-controlled Senate but does not have high hopes that it will pass the Republican-controlled House. "I'm optimistic, but I'm not counting on it," he said.

Those who oppose his bill, Kovach commented, are expressing more their differences on the philosophy of collective bargaining than they are on the inadvisability of the bill itself.

Sen. Robert Garton, D-Columbus, was among those who objected to the bill, stating Wednesday, "If this bill becomes law, we are looking at an open door to unlimited hikes in student fees."

Kovach countered the charge, pointing out that he has voted down student fee increases in the past and adding, "We've had salary increases in the past and still held the line on student fees."

In a separate interview, he made reference to suggestions that the bill include university students in the collective bargaining process, but he did not introduce any of the suggestions during the bill's second reading.

"You can't get students involved in three-way negotiations," said Kovach, adding that he could see letting them in as observers but not as participants, as those wishing student participation intended.
Check-off system proposed for small Indiana universities

By KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau

INDIANAPOLIS—Student groups at Indiana small state universities may soon have an additional way of raising funds if Senate Bill 184 meets with approval in the Indiana House of Representatives.

Passing the Senate Tuesday by a vote of 32-14, the bill proposes setting up a check-off system at Ball State, Indiana, Purdue, Indiana State and Vincennes universities, according to sponsor Sen. Patrick Carroll, D-Bloomington.

"It's a purely voluntary arrangement," stressed Carroll, adding that although the inclusion of a check-off procedure at each campus would be mandatory, no student could be made to pay fees to a student group unless he purposely checked off a particular group or groups during fall quarter registration.

In order to qualify for participation in the check-off procedure, a student group must be non-profit, non-sectarian, non-partisan and composed solely of students. In addition, each group must submit a petition signed by 35 percent of the university campus student body to a student activity committee and be verified by that committee.

At Ball State, this would represent a petition signed by nearly 6,000 of the over 17,000 students registered at the university. Asked if this did not seem like an abnormally large percentage of the student body, Carroll pointed out that the new system would be better than what most universities have now.

Each campuses' student activity committee would be composed of two faculty members selected by the faculty, two administrators selected by the administration and five students elected by the student body.

Student elections would take place between March 1 and May 1 of each year with elections being supervised by the dean of students and student association. All nine members of the committee would serve for the period of one year, beginning their term each May 1.

There are some potential catches in SB 184, such as the requirement that each student group pay its portion of the costs of processing the check-off procedure. This could result in a group paying a large portion of its check-off funds in processing costs, if its fund drive is not successful.

The bill provides that a student group may raise its fee by advising the student activity committee one academic period (at Ball State one quarter) in advance. In addition, a student group may request removal from the check-off procedure or can be removed by the committee if less than 10 percent of the student body elects to pay the group's requested fee.

Sen. Morris Mills, R-Indianapolis, objected to the bill on the grounds that the state legislature has no business interfering in university affairs. Although not directly in opposition to student check-off, he commented, "We could have a whole general assembly dealing with university problems," if law-making for university matters is allowed to get out of hand.

Most senators supported the bill, however, among them Sen. Rodney Piper, D-Munieie. The bill now awaits a hearing in the House.
Bargaining rights bill amended

By KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau

INDIANAPOLIS—A bill intended to open the scope of bargaining rights for teachers turned into a vehicle designed to settle impasses during contract negotiations upon the addition of an amendment during Thursday's session of the Indiana Senate.

Sponsored by Sen. Thomas Teague, D-Anderson, Senate Bill 386 would add teacher workload, safety, assignment and security, and appropriations for teaching supplies to present Public Law 217. Presently only salary, wages, hours, and salary and wage-related benefits are negotiable items.

Although the new areas listed in the bill can be discussed in teacher collective bargaining under present law, the passage of SB 386 would allow them to come into negotiations. The proposed legislation would not make the new provisions a mandatory part of bargaining, however.

Sen. Merton Stanley, D-Kokomo, added an amendment to the bill to include a final offer process in negotiations. The final offer amendment is patterned closely after the final offer section in SB 56, a public employee collective bargaining bill passed by the Senate early last week.

"It seems to me that this may be the best way...to arrive at a solution at immediate collective bargaining," he charged that the amendment would place the final decision in the hands of persons not responsible to the community and its needs.

Agency shop was prohibited for teachers by an amendment sponsored by Sen. John Larson, R-Valparaiso. Although Teague opposed the amendment on the grounds that the decision should be left to a court case on the issue pending in Madison County, Senator members passed the amendment 25-91.

As the bill was offered by Senate President Pro Tem Robert Fair, D-Princeton, a state election campaign fund would be created into which individual taxpayers may designate one dollar of their adjusted gross income tax liability to the political party of their choice.

Money not designated for a political party would be distributed equally among political parties.
Senate bill amended to cover final offer process for faculty

By KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau

INDIANAPOLIS—Following a pattern set earlier by public employee collective bargaining legislation, Senate Bill 296 was amended Monday in the Indiana Senate to include the final offer process in faculty collective bargaining.

Although it had previously passed the second reading, the bill was called back by its sponsor, Sen. Robert Kovach, D-Mishawaka, for purposes of adding the final offer amendment. Teacher organizations throughout the state were reported against Kovach's amendment, but the Senate passed it 27-22.

"Last week they were in agreement (with the amendment)," said Kovach, referring to the Indiana Teachers Federation and other teacher organizations. He added that although the amendment limited the scope of the faculty collective bargaining bill, it was the only way to keep the bill from dying in the Senate.

The final offer process would mandate that each side submit two final proposals if an agreement cannot be reached through regular arbitration. The Indiana Education Employment Relations Board would select one of the four proposals as the one to be used as binding arbitration.

SB 296 is expected to come before the Senate for final reading today.

A bill labeled "Contrary to sunshine (legislation), contrary to government, (and) contrary to freedom of information" by Senator Robert Garton, R-Columbus was narrowly defeated on third reading by a vote of 23-24.

SB 81, sponsored by James Lewis Jr., D-Charlestown, was designed to remove the requirement that the wages of teachers and others paid by public school funds be made public in the school corporation's annual report. The requirement would only be repealed in nonurban areas.

"I believe in disclosure," said Lewis. He added, however, that the purpose of his bill was to
(continued on page 3)

Senate bill

(continued from page 1)

Indianapolis, and Patrick Carroll, D-Bloomington.

Stiff opposition arose over the proposed cost of the project, however, as a $573,319 price tag was attached to the setting up of the fourth district. The bill's passage was guaranteed by a vote of 27-22.

"It's going to bleed the taxpayers of Delaware County," stated Piper. "Judge Alva Cox told me that all their money was being spent on the appeals court." Although most clients pay their own initial court cost, the county and its taxpayers pay the cost of appeal cases.

Both SBs 81 and 313 will now be sent for consideration to the House of Representatives.
Democrats table Senate tax

By KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau

INDIANAPOLIS—Reacting against Democratic spending with what one senator termed “foxhole desperation,” Indiana Senate Republicans fought to pass an amendment Tuesday giving some of the state’s estimated $375 million in surplus funds back to the taxpayers.

The Democrats used their majority party power, however, and moved that the amendment be laid upon the table. The motion passed, 28-21, following the party split in the Senate.

The action taken was an exact party reversal of the treatment given Monday to House Democratic amendments to the budget, where over 40 amendments were tabled. The Republican party is the majority party in the House of Representatives.

The ruckus started when Sen. Wayne Townsend, D-Hartford City, called Senate Bill 408 down for second reading. The bill would give certain low and middle income taxpayers credit on their taxes for utility bills paid, depending on their number of exemptions and gross income.

Sen. Lawrence Borst, R-Indianapolis, introduced three amendments, only one of which passed. His first amendment proposed giving each taxpayer a tax credit of $40 in addition to the utility tax program, raising quite a few incredulous questions and comments from Democrats.

“I first thought it was joke,” said Townsend. He accused Republicans of first yelling that the Democrats were spending too much, then “falling all over yourselves trying to give the money away.” He added that many persons, from the governor on down, were “overreacting” to the budget’s unexpectedly large surplus.

Republicans replied by asking to see the Democrat’s finance program, which so far has remained under wraps. “I don’t think there is one,” stated Borst.

He explained that his amendment would give the average family of four $160, costing the state $200 million.

“I really didn’t think they (the Republicans) had the nerve,” said Sen. Merton Stanley, R-Kokomo. He was joined in his criticism by Sen. Woodrow Wilson, D-Monroeville, who charged that Borst’s proposal “does not fit the needs of the people.”

It’s like giving everyone the same size shoe,” stated Wilson, arguing that income and other factors were not taken into consideration.

Republican senators who would rather keep the surplus as a guarantee against higher taxes or unforeseen expenses in the next several years admitted to supporting Borst “out of pure frustration” in an attempt to curb Democratic spending.

Democrats always increase the amount that the Republicans want to spend,” said Sen. Leslie Duvall, R-Indianapolis. “The only way I can keep the money out of their pockets is to lay it upon the table.”

After the rump riot personally, the Democratic amendment proposal was referred to a minor committee.

Republicans voted to lay it upon the table instead. The amendment was tabled.

The amendment was tabled.

The amendment was tabled.

The amendment was tabled.
**Senate passes collective barg**

By KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau

INDIANAPOLIS—The hour was late and the vote margin narrow but faculty collective bargaining legislation, Senate Bill 296, passed the Indiana Senate Tuesday 26-24.

"This bill is similar in intent to Public Law 217," stated the bill's sponsor, Sen. Robert Kovach, D-Mishawaka. PL 217 gives collective bargaining rights to primary and secondary school teachers but has its differences as well as its similarities to SB 296.

The most important difference is that SB 296 does not have a no-strike provision. "The language on no-strike provisions often lacks teeth," said Kovach. pointing out that no-strike provisions did not always succeed in preventing strikes.

A final offer provision was added to the bill during second reading Monday and provisions for final and binding arbitration as well as fact-finding were deleted during an earlier amendment session. The final offer amendment helps SB 296 be consistent with the state's other collective bargaining legislation, but drew a lot of opposition from senators who object to what they claim are pitfalls in final offer agreement.

Sen. Leslie Duvall, R-Indianapolis, claimed that the final offer procedure would place the decision of settling on a contract into the hands of an arbitrator not responsible to those who have to pay the potential costs of increased faculty salaries.

Under the proposed legislation, the Indiana Education Employment Relations Board would choose the final contract from a selection of four final offers, two of which are submitted by each side during negotiations.

The implications of SB 296 were also objected to by Sen. Morris Mills, R-Indianapolis, who quoted an article on a New York university as evidence that collective bargaining would unduly protect untenured teachers and make it virtually impossible to fire minority teachers unless they were proved to be utterly incompetent.

"I see this change in the this change in the 26-24 vote as follow party for Rodney Pippin in favor of the bill. Sen. Thor Anderson, himself, voted in favor of the bill.

Teague story dealing with secondary collective
Stiffening opposition causes Senate to shelf teacher bargaining bill

By KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau
INDIANAPOLIS—Stiffening opposition in the Indiana Senate to collective bargaining bills prompted the shelving of a primary and secondary teacher bargaining proposal sponsored by Sen. Thomas Teague, D-Anderson.

After seeing the difficulty, Sen. Robert Kovach, D-Mishawaka, had trouble Tuesday getting a narrow 26-24 vote in favor of faculty collective bargaining, Teague decided to not bring SB 386 up for third reading.

"It would only pass if I used every ounce of influence I have," stated Teague, Senate Majority Floor Leader. He added that disagreement between the American Federation of Teachers and the Indiana State Teachers' Association on whether or not to support the bill aided in his decision to dump the proposal.

"Teachers already have Public Law 217 (giving them collective bargaining rights)," said Teague. However, he plans to support legislation giving more money for education, as well as any possible due process legislation that may come up yet this session.

SB 386 would have expanded the criteria teachers could use in bargaining to include more than the present limit to wage-related issues. "As long as Indiana has a law prohibiting teacher strikes, I think we should bargain in good faith," said Teague.

Reminded that PL 217 did not always succeed in preventing strikes, Teague commented, "If the teachers weren't frustrated...I think it would reduce the incidence of teacher strikes."

The fourth collective bargaining bill introduced in the Senate this session, SB 386 did not draw the support that other collective bargaining legislation has up until this point. Teague attributes this to many senators wanting to project a "balanced, middle-of-the-road image" to their constituents before the fall elections.
By KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau

INDIANAPOLIS—I am not sure my mother would approve, but Tuesday night I stayed up until midnight with nearly 50 men in their chamber—the Indiana Senate chamber, that is.

In an effort to catch up with a glutted agenda, the Senate held a marathon session, Tuesday, starting at 10 a.m. and running until 11:45 p.m. A lunch recess was granted, but dinner consisted of cold cuts spread out on a coffee table in the hallway surrounding the Senate. Try calling down a bill when your mouth is full of a ham and cheese on rye!

It is one of the combined advantages and disadvantages of the Senate that the debates are both longer and more in-depth than those in the House of Representatives, a factor which contributes heavily to the delay in getting through each day’s slate of bills. Over 400 bills were introduced in the Senate for the 1978 session, leaving a large number to be considered even when many never make it out of committee.

The Senate is usually a quiet place compared to the House, its members sitting relaxed in their high-backed red leather chairs, while Senate President Robert Orr keeps things orderly. Lt. Gov. Orr’s position is not as powerful as that of House Speaker Kermit Burrous, R-Peru, however, especially because the Senate is controlled by the Democrats while Orr is a Republican.

Tuesday’s session proved that those who pass the laws are as human as the citizens, even if they’re not as well-dressed.Senators hurl register at decisions until their votes are counted, Orr declares the bill and sponsors. The session continues day and night!
INDIANAPOLIS—A proposed renters' tax deduction of up to $40 was changed to a tax credit to insure receipt of the tax break by those who need it most during a meeting Wednesday of the Indiana Senate Finance Committee.

Claiming, "A credit is a better way to go," Sen. Michael Gery, D-Lafayette, proposed the amendment to make House Bill 1245 more closely resemble Gery's Senate Bill 50, which would grant a tax deduction of up to $40.

Both HB 1245 and SB 50 propose a tax break to renters of 2 percent of one month's rent or $40, whichever is lower. Costs for the new credit would be between $12 million and $13 million, to be paid from the state's Property Tax Replacement Fund.

Gery pointed out during the committee meeting that a deduction rather than a credit would only mean about 60 percent of those eligible, leaving out those who need the credit the most, such as the elderly. Many persons in low-income tax brackets do not even file a return, said Gery, thereby cheating themselves of a potential savings.
Tenant legislation passes, 7-3

INDIANAPOLIS—Landlord-tenant legislation moved one step closer to passage Thursday as the Indiana House Judiciary Committee passed Senate Bill 171, 7-3.

The bill, sponsored in the Senate by Sen. Patrick Carroll, D-Bloomington, was amended to include provisions similar to those in House Bill 1012. Sponsored by Sen. John Thomas, R-Brazil, HB 1012 did not receive a hearing by the committee before the House deadline.

Earlier this week, several representatives of Indiana organizations testified in favor of SB 171, including representatives of the Indiana League of Women Voters, the Indiana Catholic Conference and the Bloomington City Council.

Piper to introduce resolution

INDIANAPOLIS—Sen. Rodney Piper, D-Muncie, plans to introduce a resolution in the Indiana Senate today or Monday giving the Senate the right to confirm some of the governor's appointments to government positions.

Patterned after the federal government's practice of advice and consent, the proposal is designed to keep an Indiana governor from making political appointments of persons who may not be qualified for a particular job.

"The party in power wouldn't want it," said Piper. "It would affect their appointments." The advice and consent pattern is presently in effect in 35 state governments.

Piper introduced a similar resolution last year which faltered halfway through its approval by the legislature. Although he is not sure how the resolution will fair this year, he stated, "Eventually it will come."
Senate schedules $1.2 million for pay raises, improvements

By KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau

INDIANAPOLIS—A possible state budget appropriation giving Ball State $1.2 million for salary increases and improvements in the academic program passed the Indiana Senate Monday on second reading.


Of Ball State's $1,224,562 share, $1,064,562 would provide an additional 3 percent for salary increases and $160,000 would be recommended for use in cooperative instruction programs, career and life planning services and improvements to instructional resources.

The $10.3 million total appropriation raises the amount of funds given to state universities to the level recommended last year by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education, which made no new recommendations this year when it was discovered that the state's unexpected surplus would allow additional funding for certain projects.

(Continued on page 3)

The appropriations do not equal what was asked for by Ball State itself, however, pointed out Thomas Kinghorn, assistant vice president for finance. The commission collects requests from the state universities and then submits a master list of requests to the state legislature each session.

Although the bill has not yet reached final passage, its adoption would "provide much-needed improvements in the salary plan," said Kinghorn. A 5.6 percent salary increase granted in last year's budget would be increased to 8.6 percent to be used for salary increases in the 1979-80 school year.

The 8.6 percent increase would be used for "across-the-board salary increase, promotion and any other adjustments that need to be made in salaries next year," according to Kinghorn, who explained that the increase could apply to all university personnel.

(Continued from page 1)
Senate passes contribution bill

By KATHY BARKS
DN Legislative Bureau
INDIANAPOLIS — A bill doubling the amount one may deduct from his state income tax for contributions to public and private colleges and universities passed the Indiana Senate Monday on second reading, after being amended to include contributions to elementary and secondary schools as well.

The deduction would be raised from the present limit of $50 to $100 on individual returns and from $100 to $200 on joint returns. In addition, the bill would raise the limit to $1,000 for corporations who contribute to higher education institutions within the state.

House Bill 1210 was sponsored by Sens. Merton Stanley, D-Kokomo, and John Mutz, R-Indianapolis.

Sen. Joan Gubbins, R-Indianapolis, sponsored an amendment to the bill to include deductions for contributions to state public and private primary and secondary schools in the bill. The amendment narrowly passed by a vote of 24-23.

Stanley expects opposition to the bill because of Gubbins' amendment, which he opposes. "There is an alternative to (kindergarten through twelfth grade) ... but no alternative to a college education," he stated.

In other business, the Senate passed on second reading a bill proposing an appropriation of $50 million to local governments for use in highway maintenance and repair.

Senate Republicans attempted to amend the bill to give $45 million to the state highway department and only $15 million to local government highway departments, but the amendment failed by a partisan vote of 20-28.

It is expected that the bill will face further changes after Senate passage when it is taken into conference committee and compared to the version presently in the House.
III. STATEMENT OF THE HONORS PROJECT

This honors project is a collection of the Daily News articles I did while serving as a legislative reporter at the Indiana General Assembly in January and February, 1972.

The role of the press as an adversary to government had until then been only a theoretical standard, but reporting on the legislature gave me the chance to practice the ethics and responsibilities which had been impressed upon me during my four years as an undergraduate at Ball State University.

The project consisted primarily of covering the legislature, in particular the Senate, for the Daily News readership. Using the techniques I had learned in journalism, I wrote articles on pending legislation and other topics of interest occurring at the Statehouse.

Skills such as writing under deadline and formulating my own story topics were used extensively, as well as editing and interviewing techniques. The experience in Indianapolis also passed on the lesson that a healthy amount of skepticism is an asset when dealing with government officials.
IV. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

I won my opportunity to report on the state legislature after applying for the position by letter fall quarter. With only three applicants for the three available openings, the selection was an easy one for the faculty members and Daily News editor choosing the legislative bureau staff. Barb, Charlene and I began making plans to live in Indianapolis January and February.

We were fortunate in having each others' experience to draw on as problems arose. Unfamiliar with the Statehouse and with those involved in it, I relied heavily at first on our shared knowledge of the state government. Jim Fraze, one of our 1977 predecessors, gave us background on bills and on the personalities of the men and women elected to the House and Senate. Located as we were in the Hoosier State Press Shack, we were also able to draw on the vast experience of the reporters who had covered the state legislature for several years or more, and their assistance was always freely given. The rapport among the journalists developed basically along professional lines, and they were among the quickest to accept us as full-fledged reporters once we had proved ourselves. There was very little "tagging along" and our staff quickly
learned to stand on its own two feet.

I attribute much of our success to breaking the work down into definite "beats," giving us a chance to get to know the legislators through regular contact and giving them the chance to become accustomed to us as well. I enjoyed covering the Senate, not only because of its smaller membership, but also because of its spectrum of personalities. The Senate debates issues for a longer period of time and is much more independent of its chairman than the House, factors giving it a flavor of power and depth. With more time for the individual characteristics of each senator to appear, I soon learned to listen for those I knew would make interesting comments rather than long-winded orations.

Familiarity, however, soon bred its own problems. Although I had gained enough insight by the end of the session to judge the senators by a more objective criterion, at the beginning it was hard to see past the masks they wore and judge what they were really trying to accomplish. I also found it hard to follow up on an idea if I considered the senator involved ineffective.

This problem marked my coverage of Sen. Rodney Piper, D-Lucie. Several other reporters and senators concurred with my opinion, but I really had no excuse to avoid him other than finding him distasteful. Because of our Lucie readership I should have made a special effort to get more of Piper's ideas into print,
if only to show the public how worthless they were, but I objected to Piper's condescending and chauvinistic behavior toward me. The experience taught me the value of keeping my personal feelings from coloring my reporting, and I believe I could now be more objective if placed in a similar situation.

Lured at first by both the surroundings and the people with whom I had to deal, I soon found that even elected officials are "just people." This bit of knowledge played a large part in my increased self-confidence and gave me the aggressiveness I needed to track down information and approach senators for their comments. I soon found that many legislators were less familiar with some of the bills than I was, and this too helped make them more human. They did have limits on both their patience and their time, however, and I quickly learned that no one had much tolerance for uninformed or insignificant questions.

Being female worked both for and against me, but the negative aspects tended to fade once I was accepted as a "bona fide" journalist. As I mentioned in the introduction, personal appearance had a large impact among Statehouse employees. Although I took pains to dress attractively, however, I found acting like a professional with a job to do worked far more to my benefit than simply being female. If anything, being female initially worked against me, as evidenced by the kind yet condescending treatment I received until
proving I was there for a purpose.

News judgment had to be exercised continually in the course of each day's reporting due to the large volume of possible story topics. Although the Daily News would call us about mid-afternoon to tell us how much space would be available, we were always having to toss ideas out the window because only so much legislation could be covered. It seemed important to us to treat each bill as fully as possible, but our breadth of facts often proved to be the managing editor's nightmare. We usually had to settle for selecting stories on the basis of diminishing relevance to our readers, leaving much interesting legislation uncovered.

The hours we worked each day often extended until 7 p.m. or later, and a large factor was the time it took to read each day's copy over the telephone. Jim Brown usually did an accurate job receiving our stories but the average 20 to 30 minutes spent reading each story soon became tiresome. It was the best solution we could work out if the news was to be kept timely, however, and it gave Jim a chance to ask questions before the articles were put into print, cutting down on possible inaccuracies.

The legislative staff tried to collaborate with on-campus Daily News reporters to make some of the legislation more relevant to the Ball State and Muncie communities, but this proved difficult to coordinate.

Thomas Kinghorn, Ball State assistant vice president
for finance, was a good source of information while he was lobbying at the Statehouse, especially when we needed to know the administration's stand on pending legislation. Through Sington, daily feedback from the Daily News and our own news judgment, we were able to keep a line on what would best be of interest to our readers.
V. EVALUATION

The basic value I gained from this experience was the chance to try my hand at government reporting while meeting daily deadlines. I had not done any serious reporting since my internship at The Joden News during the previous summer and found, to my pleasure, that my writing skills had improved fall quarter.

Although I never felt as though I was lacking in the basic mechanical skills necessary to write a news story, I was a bit rusty at first. A journalism style class taken Fall quarter helped me make my stories less dry and enabled me to approach my writing from a different angle. I have a basic preference for writing features over straight news, and the style class aided me in combining the two. It seemed doubly important to make the legislative articles readable to both Ball State students and Muncie citizens, especially because most readers find the legislature boring or hard to understand.

With this in mind, I tried to keep my leads light and relate the legislation to Daily News readers. This was easier to do than on other newspapers because the DN audience is fairly homogeneous and easily targeted.
Even so, my technique was a little stiff in the articles I wrote the first few weeks. In an effort to make my leads interesting, I made them wordy and cumber- some. Finally went to a style that used the basic news lead (who, what, when, where, why and how) as a skeleton and then fleshed it out with a few words describing the atmosphere surrounding the passage of a particular bill. There was never any lack of interesting color to add to our stories, but I had to control myself or the facts got buried in sketches of senators or an especially lively Senate session.

Disadvantages aside, I think the lighter thread running through most of my stories aided rather than hindered them, especially once I learned to control the amount of description in each article. Although the device is fairly obvious in my first dozen articles, I felt much more comfortable with it after writing several non-news stories. The interview with Randy Norland took me several painstaking hours to complete, but it also gave me an opportunity to try out different descriptive devices. Once used, they were easier to refer to again in my subsequent news articles. I still had to exercise care in keeping my leads newsworthy and not merely "cute," however.

My landlord-tenant story written Jan. 17 was about the closest I got to writing a "cute" lead on a news story. I was able to justify it for this particular story because it lent itself so well to the Ball State
community. Many similar leads got thrown out, however, because they were inappropriate for the subject being covered.

The problem that came as I gained experience with the legislative process was explaining the technical language of the bills to our readers. Although the gist of the bill could be explained in layman's language, quoting specifics of the bill often resulted in barely paraphrased passages taken directly from the bill itself. Once I had a good working knowledge of how a bill was written, I found it much easier to explain what the legal-sounding phrases meant in common terminology.

Even if the Indianapolis staff used only straight news reporting devices, there were still complaints that our stories were too long. The general consensus among those of us at the legislative bureau that each topic should be treated as fully as possible to aid reader comprehension caused the managing editor to despair of ever fitting in the 30-50 inches of copy we called in each day. The problem was heightened by the traditionally smaller winter quarter issues, but the editors did do their best to make maximum use of each day's material.

Because of the editors' fair treatment of our stories, I tried to make my articles more concise as February drew on. Where I had previously both quoted and paraphrased a source, I now tried to condense my notes more succinctly, cutting out unnecessary repetition.
I tried to keep my stories from losing sparkle because of this leaner style, but I did not always succeed, as my renters' tax article shows. Much of what would be said at a meeting or during a debate would not make sense merely as a direct quote, but the lack of space did not allow using both the direct quote and a paraphrase of what was said. In such cases, I was forced to merely paraphrase, taking out much of the personal element of the story.

This difficulty became even more evident when I wrote on state expenditures. I found it extremely difficult to keep the monetary figures from becoming merely dry lists of numerals, and an added problem was the highly technical language of most of the appropriation bills. This hindered my attempts to make the legislation meaningful to students, although the budget bills usually were the most important of the legislative session. I improved with practice, but I do not feel the last story I wrote on possible appropriations, dealing with salary increases and academic program improvements, was much better than my first, dealing with the College of Business.

Writing under deadline placed a premium on using my time to best advantage as well as writing a story right in the first draft. With little time for revision, facts had to be accurate and copy had to be quickly but unerringly edited. We edited our own and each others' copy in Indianapolis, but only a minimum of editing was
subsequently done at Ball State. There were times when I would be forced to dictate the last several paragraphs of a story out of my head, and my only chance to check what I had written or said came when Jim Brown would read his version of our stories over the telephone before sending it through the typesetting machine.

...an amazingly-small number of mistakes resulted with this system, but errors did occur with headlines written by the copy desk. The headlines improved as we made our stories easier to understand and as the copy editors gained experience with the legislative process, but it was frustrating to realize mistakes were being made over which we had no control. Other reporters at the legislature experienced similar problems, however, so we felt fortunate to be working with a staff which had the capacity to learn quickly from their mistakes.

Daily deadline pressures also prevented us from going into as much in-depth reportage as we would have liked, but we did try to deal with important topics from as many angles as possible. This included talking to a bill's sponsors as well as to its opponents, finding out how it would specifically affect our readership area and taking notes on the legislative debates. With the many different sides to an issue, it was important to ferret out as many of the significant ones as possible. This entailed some quick work, even during a usual eight to ten hour work day. I think my articles reflect this concern for thoroughness, either individually or
as a series on a specific topic.

I would liked to have written more feature stories, especially on the legislators and staff milling together at the Statehouse each day. By only two attempts came with the Woodland interview and my article on the Senate's first near-midnight session. Because they took a proportionately longer time to research and write, I found little time to work on features, but I passed up an excellent opportunity for myself in the process. I think one of the reasons my reporting became more routine toward the end of the six weeks was because of the all-news rut into which I'd fallen, giving my writing no chance to revitalize itself.

At the end of our legislative stint, I was content with my reporting as a whole. Although some of it remained dry despite my best efforts to improve it, there were articles in which the reader could sense the excitement and controversy that are the trademarks of state government. Ball State students and Muncie residents were informed on a daily basis of the progress of legislation affecting them, helping them to better participate in their state government.
VI. SUMMARY

If there were one thing that helped me get my recently-acquired police/general assignment reporting position with a northern Indiana newspaper, it was probably the experience I gained writing at the state legislature. Not only did my writing improve, but I gained a much-needed dose of self-confidence and experience working with government officials and bureaucracy. More than a mere simulation of the working conditions on a non-campus newspaper, the legislative bureau gave me practical knowledge which could prove invaluable after graduation.