52nd Legislative Day 5/25/2011

AM0061	Motion	143
AM0062	Motion	143
AM0063	Motion	143
AM0064	Motion	143
AM0065	Motion	143
AM0066	Motion	143
AM0067	Motion	143
AM0068	Motion	143
HB0078	Recalled	19
HB0078	Third Reading	20
HB0078	Vote Intention	24
HB0147	Recalled	12
HB0147	Third Reading	13
HB0224	Recalled	14
HB0224	Third Reading	15
HB0242	Third Reading	17
HB0263	Recalled	26
HB0263	Third Reading	28
HB0295	Third Reading	28
HB0363	Recalled	30
HB0466	Third Reading	32
HB0653	Recalled	33
HB0653	Third Reading	34
HB0806	Recalled	40
HB0806	Third Reading	40
HB1079	Second Reading	4
HB1220	Second Reading	138
HB1226	Second Reading	138
HB1233	Recalled	131
HB1233	Third Reading	132
HB1241	Third Reading	42
HB1253	Second Reading	5
HB1258	Second Reading	138
HB1355	Second Reading	139
HB1490	Second Reading	7
HB1530	Second Reading	11
HB1576	Third Reading	128
HB2023	Recalled	45
HB2023	Third Reading	46
HB2193	Recalled	48
HB2193	Third Reading	49

52nd Legislative I	Day	5/25/2011
HB2249	Recalled	50
HB2249	Third Reading	51
HB2313	Recalled	52
HB2313	Third Reading	53
HB2555	Third Reading	54
HB2804	Recalled	55
HB2804	Third Reading	56
HB2860	Recalled	57
HB2860	Third Reading	65
HB2934	Second Reading	140
HB2987	Third Reading	81
HB3022	Recalled	97
HB3022	Third Reading	98
HB3027	Recalled	99
HB3027	Third Reading	100
HB3034	Recalled	116
HB3034	Third Reading	117
HB3184	Recalled	119
HB3184	Third Reading	119
HB3237	Recalled	122
HB3237	Third Reading	123
HB3384	Recalled	124
HB3384	Third Reading	125
HB3390	Second Reading	139
HB3440	Third Reading	127
HB3635	Second Reading	140
SR0220	Adopted	134
SR0244	Adopted	135
SJR0030	Adopted	136
SJR0035	Motion	142
Consta to Order Co	nator Cahoonhora	1
Senate to Order-Senator Schoenberg Prayer-Hafiz Feroze Khan		1
Pledge of Allegiance		1
Journal-Postponed		1
Committee Reports		± 1
-	lage/Reconvenes	141
Senate Stands at Ease/Reconvenes		141
Committee Reports Senate Stands in Recess/Reconvenes		145
Committee Reports		145
Messages from the	House	145
messages IIOm che	36DUII	145

5/25/2011

Adjournment 146

52nd Legislative Day

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senate will come to order. Regular Session of the 97th General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks? Will our guests in the galleries please rise? The invocation today will be given by Hafiz Feroze Khan with Masjid Al-Huda in Hanover Park.

HAFIZ FEROZE KHAN:

(Prayer by Hafiz Feroze Khan)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please remain standing for the Pledge of Allegiance. Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Jacobs)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Madam Secretary, Reading and Approval of the Journal.

SECRETARY ROCK:

Senate Journal of Tuesday, May 24th, 2011.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Mr. President, I move to postpone the reading and approval of the Journal just read by the Secretary, pending arrival of the printed transcript.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Hunter moves to postpone the reading of the Journals, pending the arrival of the printed transcript. There being no objection, so ordered. Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ROCK:

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Senator Delgado, Chairperson of the Committee on Public Health, reports House Bill 1095 Do Pass, as Amended, and Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 3027 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Wilhelmi, Chairperson of the Committee on Judiciary, reports House Bill 1226 Do Pass and Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1044 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Hunter, Chairperson of the Committee on Human Services, reports House Bill 3635 Do Pass, as Amended.

Senator Meeks, Chairperson of the Committee on Education, reports Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1197 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Sandoval, Chairperson of the Committee on Transportation, reports House Bill 1220 Do Pass; Senate Resolutions 220 and 244 Be Adopted; and Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 147 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Noland, Chairperson of the Committee on Criminal Law, reports House Bills 1258 and 3390 Do Pass, as Amended; Senate Amendment 4 to House Bill 263, Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1253 and Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 2193, all recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Garrett, Chairperson of the Committee on Commerce, reports Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3034 and Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3414 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Martinez, Chairperson of the Committee on Licensed Activities, reports Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1490 and Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2023 recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Hutchinson, Chairperson of the Committee on Revenue, reports House Bill 1355 Do Pass; Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 212, Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 363 and

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2313, all recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Harmon, Chairperson of the Committee on Executive, reports House Bill 267 and 2934 Do Pass; House Bill 3039 Do Pass, as Amended; Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1293, Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 1530, Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2860, Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3184 and Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 3384, all recommended Do Adopt; Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 152, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1357, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1553, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1708, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1708, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1761, Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1821, and Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1972, all recommended Do Adopt.

Senator Holmes, Chairperson of the Committee on State Government and Veterans Affairs, reports Senate Joint Resolution 30 Be Adopted, as Amended; Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2095 and Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 3188 recommended Do Adopt; Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 170, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1240, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1352, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1602, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1637, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1637, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1804 and Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2042, all recommended Do Adopt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Supplemental Calendar No. 1 has been printed and is being

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

distributed. We'll proceed momentarily. We will proceed now to the printed Calendar, page 61 of your printed Calendar, House Bills 2nd Reading. At the top of the page, House Bill 186. Leader Radogno. Leader Radogno. Out of the record. House Bill 230. Senator Koehler. 230. Senator Koehler. Out of the record. House Bill 1079. Senator Christine Johnson. She wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the bill. SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 1079.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 2, offered by Senator Christine Johnson.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Christine Johnson, on Floor Amendment No. 2. SENATOR C. JOHNSON:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman {sic} and Members of the Senate. When we passed this bill out of committee originally, I had said that CMS had some -- expressed some concerns with the bill and we resolve those concerns with this amendment. Amendment No. 2 of House Bill 1079 simply changes the dollar value for the listing of equipment that State universities must provide to CMS from two thousand dollars to one thousand dollars. There's no opposition and it passed the committee unanimously.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Maloney.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

SENATOR MALONEY:

Yeah, I -- just to the bill, Mr. President. I rise in support of the bill...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

To the -- to the amendment.

SENATOR MALONEY:

To the amendment. Senator Johnson took the committee's consideration -- took the committee's recommendation into consideration and came back with a bill that passed unanimously out of Higher Education Committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Thank you. Is there any further discussion? Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Madam Secretary? SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. House Bill 1163. Senator Jacobs. 1163. Out of the record. House Bill 1215. Senator Crotty. Senator Crotty. Out of the record. House Bill 1237. Senator Noland. Senator Noland. Out of the record. House Bill 1253. Senator Martinez. Senator Martinez. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 1253.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration, Madam Secretary?

SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 1, offered by Senator Martinez.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Martinez, on Floor Amendment 1.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Floor Amendment No. 1 deletes everything and becomes the bill. And I'll be -- I'll be happy to discuss it on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Kotowski. There being no further discussion, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 2, offered by Senator Martinez.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Martinez, on Floor Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. This amendment just makes a -- a single technical change and I'll be happy to discuss it on 3rd Reading also.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it, and the amendment is

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Madam Secretary?

SECRETARY ROCK:

No -- no further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. With leave of the Body, we will return to House Bill 1293. House Bill 1444. Senator Wilhelmi. Out of the record. House Bill 1490. Senator Martinez. She wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 1490.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration, Madam Secretary?

SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 2, offered by Senator Martinez.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Martinez, on Floor Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This is a -- a very long and negotiated process that is taking place between the Department of -- Department of Professional Regulations {sic} (Regulation) and UFC. And I'll be happy to discuss the whole entire bill on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Opposed, Nay. Opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. The Floor amendment is adopted. All -- are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Madam Secretary?

SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. Senator Kotowski, for what purpose do you seek recognition, sir?

SENATOR KOTOWSKI:

Point of personal -- point of personal privilege, please, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Want to reboot that?

SENATOR KOTOWSKI:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your point. Take it a little slower.

SENATOR KOTOWSKI:

Please let me, in their {sic} persistent -- way, state my point. So, it is my great honor -- I have a Page for the Day today and I'd like to ask him to stand. He's joining me. His name is Lucca Bonaventura. He's ten years old. He goes to Science & Arts Academy in Des Plaines. He's in fourth grade. He is a -- he likes to play chess. He's a big Urlacher fan, which I found out. Sorry to say, Senator Maloney, he's a Cub fan, so - yes, yes - so there is a lot of wisdom in this young man. He plays the saxophone and the recorder. He's joined today by his mother, Deanna - she's right there - and his father, Geno. They're wonderful people. Could you please,

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

please, give -- give my good friend here, Lucca, and his family a great Springfield welcome?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Will our guests in the gallery please rise? Welcome to the Illinois Senate. Lucca, I can see the similarities between Brian Urlacher and Senator Kotowski. Senator Millner, for what purpose do you seek recognition, sir?

SENATOR MILLNER:

Thank you, Mr. President. A point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your point.

SENATOR MILLNER:

I would like to welcome and introduce my Page for a Day, Tyler Nass, who's in the eighth grade at Cary Junior High, and he's a football player, wrestler, baseball player, et cetera just loves sports. He's also a very smart, smart young man. He's actually Senator Dan Duffy's constituent. And his grandparents, I'd like to introduce as well and welcome, Paulette and Don Neri from Barrington. Welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Will our guests in the gallery please rise? Welcome to the Illinois Senate. Senator Rezin, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR REZIN:

Thank you. For point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your point.

SENATOR REZIN:

I have two guests today. The first one I would like to

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

introduce is another one of my children, my oldest son, Nate, who is visiting today. He's a recent graduate of University of Illinois, last week, in finance. He's also a member of the - and I have to remember - Alpha Sigma Phi fraternity and he's the treasurer for the fraternity. So I'd like to offer him a warm Springfield welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Thank you. Nate, welcome to the Illinois Senate. We see the succession chain already. You have another introduction, Senator?

SENATOR REZIN:

I do. Thank you, again. On this side of me, I have a young man, who is twelve years old, Adam Claggett, who is from Waltham Grade School. He enjoys golf, tennis, track, language arts and science. Adam is -- since he's been nine years old, has conducted two food drives each year - one for Easter, one for Thanksgiving -- excuse me, he started at the age of eight. Every year, he raises about five thousand pounds of food for the food pantries every year. So, again, I'd like to offer him a warm Springfield welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Adam, welcome to the Illinois Senate and thanks for all your volunteer work. Senator Dillard, for what purpose do you seek recognition, sir?

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you. The same happy privilege, for a point of introduction, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

State your point.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you. I have with me Sydney Albert, who is my Page for a Day. Sydney went to the same grade school that I went to when I was a little -- a little child, so I told her there is living proof that she'll learn to read and write there.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

...younger or when you were a little child?

SENATOR DILLARD:

Yeah, but Sydney's a friend of my family's. Her mom knows my wife, Stephanie, and she knows my daughters, and it's great to have her and her father, Jeff, who's a prominent attorney in Chicago now. They live in Hinsdale. And I'd like to have a warm Illinois Senate welcome for them as well. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Let's give Senator Dillard's guests a warm Senate welcome. Thank you. We will continue to proceed on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading. House Bill 1530. Senator Delgado. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 1530.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 3, offered by Senator Delgado.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Delgado, on Floor Amendment No. 3.

SENATOR DELGADO:

52nd Legislative Day

SECRETARY ROCK:

5/25/2011

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Amendment No. 3 - Senate Amendment No. 3 makes two changes to the underlying bill. First, it removes the mental parity requirements from the current mandates regarding the treatment of autism spectrum disorders and habilitative services for children. Second, the amendment clarifies that the new mental health parity requirements do not apply to individual health insurance plans. And I would ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Madam Secretary?

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. House Bill 1698. Senator Mulroe. Out of the record. House Bill 3372. Senator Koehler. Out of the record. We'll now proceed -- page 57 in your printed Calendar, bottom of the page, House Bills 3rd Reading. House Bill 78. Senator Frerichs. Senator Frerichs. Out of the record. House Bill 132. Senator Steans. Out of the record. House Bill 147. Senator Hutchinson. She wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the bill. With leave of the -- Senator Hutchinson seeks leave of the Body to return Senate {sic} Bill 147 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate {sic} Bill 147. Madam Secretary, are there any further -- are there any Floor

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 1, offered by Senator Hutchinson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Hutchinson, on -- with Floor Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Floor Amendment No. 1 really just makes sure that the drug test that's called to in the underlying bill conforms to federal standards.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. Opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 147. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 147.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 147 allows an employer to require a school bus driver to submit to drug and alcohol testing if the employer reasonably

52nd Legislative Day

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

5/25/2011

suspects that a driver is under the influence of drugs or alcohol. If the driver refuses to take the test or tests positive, the employer sends the results to the Secretary of State and the Secretary must suspend the bus driver's permit for three years. Thank you and I would ask for your support.

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Hutchinson, do you wish to close? Question is, shall House Bill 147 pass. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting's open. All in -- vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 56 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 147, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 212. Senator Hutchinson. Out of the record. House Bill 219. President Cullerton. Out of the record. House Bill 224. Senator Steans. She wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary -- Senator Steans seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 224 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 224. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor -- please read the bill. I -- I'm sorry, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 3, offered by Senator Steans.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Steans, on Floor Amendment No. 3. SENATOR STEANS:

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Yes. Floor Amendment 3 deletes all and becomes the bill. I'll explain it on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. Opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Madam Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading is House Bill 224. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 224.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 224 helps put us into compliance with the new federal accountable care legislation, regarding external review process for the insurance industry. We removed utilization review and benefit determination from this bill to help get insurance industry more comfortable with this. We're changing the definition of "adverse determination" to include the denial, reduction, or termination of benefits based on preexisting condition. The amendment also provides an adverse determination

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

includes a recission of coverage determination. We're providing that requests for external independent reviews shall be made in writing to the Director of Department of Insurance, instead of the health carrier, and making some other changes to the Section involving exhaustion of internal appeals process. This is -- the federal government has set criteria for an external review process; that if states don't implement and meet those criteria by July, we could, in fact, then have to be subject to going and using the federal external review process. This puts in -- us in compliance so we can keep that here in the State. I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of the legislation. I -- I must caution the Members that I think there's still a number of issues that need to be dealt with. This isn't quite perfect, certainly not. But I -- I think for the good of the State of Illinois and -- and the cause, I -- I stand in support of this Senator's legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Is there any further discussion? Senator Steans, do you wish to close? Question is, shall House Bill 224 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

224, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 242. Senator Koehler. He wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the bill. SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 242.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 242 requires that a county board commence demolition proceedings in sixty days when responding to a request from a township. And this comes because there are some townships that make requests of county boards and they don't take any action and so this will help to alleviate that problem.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Koehler, do you wish to close? The question is, shall House Bill 242 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 56 -- 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, 1 voting Present. House Bill 242, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senator Jones, for what purpose do you seek recognition, sir?

Personal privilege, Mr. President.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your point.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Want to welcome a group from Chicago, the Roseland Safety NETS. Would you all please stand? These are a group of individuals from my district - matter of fact about a block away from our district. If Senator Rickey Hendon was here, he would say, these are my babies. Well, these are my babies from Chicago. They're down here advocating against human service cuts. Through the House budget, they was wiped out, but through the Senate budget, they was restored. And we want to make sure they get every dime that they are owed. They're here under the leadership of Roger Jones. So please join me in giving them a warm Senate welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Guests in the gallery please be acknowledged. Welcome to the Illinois Senate. Thank you very much for joining us today. Senator Brady, for what purpose do you seeking recognition, sir? SENATOR BRADY:

Thank you, Mr. President. A point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your point.

SENATOR BRADY:

I -- I would like to introduce to the Body, Micah Harvey, who is a junior high student in Clinton, Illinois. He's a member of the band and he plays football, youth group, and enjoys mission trips. He's here visiting us because he likes public service. He, himself, wants to be a police officer someday. Micah, would you please stand?

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Welcome to the Illinois Senate. Let's give Senator Brady's guest a warm greeting. Thank you for joining us. We -- with leave of the Body, we will return to House Bill 78. Senator Frerichs wishes to proceed. Senator Frerichs seeks leave of the Body to return Senate -- House Bill 78 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 78. Madam Secretary, are there -- please read the bill. Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 2, offered by Senator Frerichs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Frerichs.

SENATOR FRERICHS:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Today is a good day for votes. House Bill 78 prohibits a student or employee who has been suspended, expelled, or is dismissed from school from entering or remaining in a safe school zone when such prohibition is a condition of the suspension, expulsion, or dismissal for a period not to exceed the term of expulsion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Murphy. Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Frerichs, do you wish to close? The -- the question is, shall House Bill -- shall -- shall Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 78 pass. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. Amendment is adopted. Are there any further

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 3, offered by Senator Frerichs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Frerichs.

SENATOR FRERICHS:

Thank you much. Floor Amendment No. 3 ensures the safe school zone does not apply to actions protected by the First Amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. Opinion of -- opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 78. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 78.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Frerichs.

SENATOR FRERICHS:

I got a little ahead of myself in explaining the bill previously. Be happy to answer any questions of the Body.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing -- I'm sorry, Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield, please? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Indicates he'll yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Frerichs, this -- this bill has been a little bit of a moving target through the process, not unlike a lot of them. I wonder if you could just take a moment here and walk me through exactly what changes are now going to be made to current law with the bill, as amended, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Frerichs.

SENATOR FRERICHS:

Sure. You're right. This has been a moving target. This was a bill that was brought to me and Representative Jakobsson by a school resource officer in Champaign, who had some problems with students gathering just off -- outside of schools about to start fights. He was looking for some sort of way to disperse them. It has been amended, because there were some people who thought that this bill might limit the ability to picket near a school zone, and then once that amendment was put on, some other people came to us and said, "Well, if you're going to create a special exemption for that, you should also have a special exemption for people who want to exercise their First Amendment rights as well. It shouldn't apply to them."

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. So, the bill, as I understood from your description of Amendment 2, would extend -- if someone's been suspended or expelled, it extends the -- the boundaries within which they can't come to the sidewalk adjacent to the school. Is that right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Frerichs.

SENATOR FRERICHS:

That -- that is correct. On Section number 2 -- amendment -- or, Amendment No. 2, we had a problem with penalties -- or, proportional penalties, that we had to remove part of the original bill so that someone who was convicted, could be convicted of another crime, wouldn't get a lesser penalty because of where it occurred.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. And then, in your description of Amendment 3, I heard you -- say something about that the provisions of it don't apply to people exercising their First Amendment rights, maybe is what you said. Is -- is that -- first I want to ask if that's a -- if that's an accurate characterization of -- of what was in Amendment 3? Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Frerichs.

SENATOR FRERICHS:

Yes, I believe that's an accurate characterization. This

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

stemmed from a previous court case regarding free speech outside of abortion clinics. That was something that was prohibited, so this was something we wanted to be -- we wanted to pass and make sure we were in compliance with federal courts and wouldn't be subject to a lawsuit.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

In the instance where you have someone who has been subject to a suspension or an expulsion, if that individual also happens to be picketing, what -- what's the resolution there, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Frerichs.

SENATOR FRERICHS:

In that case, I would have to tell you, I am not sure. I believe, if -- if they were subject to expulsion, that that would limit their free speech rights around the school. But I would probably want to consult with one of our staff before...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there -- is there any further discussion? Is there further discussion? Senator Frerichs, do you wish to close? Senator Frerichs.

SENATOR FRERICHS:

Would just ask a favorable vote, as was given in COGFA today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

The question is, shall House Bill 78 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 78, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senator Murphy, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR MURPHY:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your point.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Like to introduce my Page for today, Michael Frankiewicz. Michael's a freshman at Hersey High School. He's involved with the Congressional Debate and Math Teams. And he's one of my kind of guys. He wants to be an investment banker when he grows up. So he's, you know, obviously smarter than your average bear. He's joined today by his father, Chuck, who's on the Democrat side. And if you would all give Michael a warm Senate welcome, it'd be much appreciated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Welcome to the Illinois Senate, Michael. If our guests in the gallery could please rise. Senator Meeks, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR MEEKS:

Mr. President, how you doing today?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

I couldn't be better. Thank God.

SENATOR MEEKS:

You're such a wonderful gentleman. I assume that my speaker light was on, because on the last bill, I pushed green,

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

but since my speaker light is on, I must have pushed speaker. So, just record me as a vote on the last bill and then no harm, no foul. Record me as an Aye on the...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

The record will so reflect, on House Bill 78, Senator Meeks wishes to be recorded as voting Aye. Senator John Jones, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR J. JONES:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your point.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Mr. President and Members of the Body, today I have two young men here today that's paging for me, Daniel Flood and Wade Xanders. They've been escorted to Springfield today by Daniel's father, who is Jack Flood, the Clerk of the Fifth District Appellate Court. And if we could give them a warm welcome to Springfield today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Will our guests please rise? Welcome to the Illinois Senate. Glad to see you. Thanks for joining us. President Pro Tem Harmon, for what purpose do you seek recognition, sir? SENATOR HARMON:

For purposes of an introduction, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please make your introduction, sir.

SENATOR HARMON:

I'm told that we have some guests in the gallery from St. Paul School in Melrose Park, in my district. I'd like you all

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

to join me in welcoming them to the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Welcome to our guests. Please rise. Thank you for joining us in the Illinois Senate today. Senator Wilhelmi, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR WILHELMI:

A point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

State your point.

SENATOR WILHELMI:

Thank you. Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I have a special guest with me here today. His name is Scott Paddock. A number of you have already met Mr. Paddock. He is the new President of the Chicagoland Speedway and Route 66 Raceway in Joliet, the only NASCAR track in the State of Illinois and one of the best tourist attractions we've got going here in the Land of Lincoln. He's also a former executive with -- with Gatorade. He played basketball for Digger Phelps at Notre Dame. And we've become fast friends here in the last twenty-four hours. So please give a warm welcome to our guest, Scott Paddock, from the Chicagoland Speedway.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Welcome to the Illinois Senate, Mr. Paddock. We will continue on the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. House Bill 263. Senator Millner. Senator Millner seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 263 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 263. Madam Secretary, are there any further -- are there any Floor amendments approved for

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 4, offered by Senator Millner.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Millner, on Floor Amendment No. 4.

SENATOR MILLNER:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amends the Sex Offender Registration Act and the Child Murderer and Violent Offender Against Youth (Registration) Act. It's called Andrea's Law. And what the amendment does, first, it -- it splits first degree murderers into either the Sex Offender Registration Act or the Murderer and Violent Offender Against Youth Act. It renames the Child Murderer and Violent Offender Act -- Against Youth Act as the Murderer and Violent Offender Against Youth Act. And under this Act, the murder of an adult carries a registration period of ten years after release; murder of a person under eighteen years of age and by an adult remains, as under current law, lifetime registration. We passed this in this Body now two times already and I just ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will -- will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. Amendment is adopted. Madam Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

263. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 263.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Millner.

SENATOR MILLNER:

As I stated earlier, plus the fact that this amends the Sex Offender Registration Act and the Child Murderer and Violent Offender Against Youth (Registration) Act and it's -- will be known as Andrea's Law. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Millner. Seeing none, Senator Millner, do you wish to close? The question is, shall House Bill 263 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 263, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 295. Senator Maloney. Madam Secretary, please read the bill. SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 295.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Maloney.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

SENATOR MALONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Bill 290 provide -- 295 provides that a sex offender or sexual predator must register with the public safety or security director at any school in Illinois that he is -- he or she is either employed or attends. This is an initiative of the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police. The rationale for this is that at many of our community colleges and universities now, virtually all of them have some sort of child care services. They also host -- a very large number of community events. This would not involve any additional fees. It would not involve any additional fingerprinting. The individual would simply go to the security officer within that school and fill out a form. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Yes, Mr. President, and just for a point to the bill. This bill received strong support in the committee and I commend the sponsor for his work on it. I do want the Senate to note that it was strongly opposed by the child molesters who entered a slip against the bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Maloney, do you really wish to close? The question is, shall House Bill 295 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 295, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. President Pro Tem Harmon, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR HARMON:

For purposes of an introduction, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your point.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I am joined by two special guests here today, two Pages for the Day, from -- from my district, Matthew and Anna Testore, who came down with their mom and their little brother, who are over at the State Museum. But Matthew is a seventh grader at Percy Julian Middle School and Anna is a fifth grader at Beye School. They are here today because of their family's support for Hephzibah, one of the marquee children's support groups in Oak Park. I'd like you all to join me in giving them a warm welcome to the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Let's welcome our guests from Oak Park to the Illinois Senate. Thank you for coming today. We will now go to House Bills 3rd Reading. House Bill 363. President Pro Tem Harmon wishes to -- seek leave of the Body to return House Bill 363 to the Order of 2nd Reading. There being no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 363. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Floor Amendment 1, offered by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

President Pro Tem Harmon, Floor Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. The amendment becomes the bill. I would move for its adoption. Once the bill's back on 3rd Reading, I'd like to hold it there for today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. Amendment is adopted. On the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill -- are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 2, offered by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. This Amendment No. -- do we have Amendment No. 2 or Amendment No. 3?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

2 and 3, sir.

SENATOR HARMON:

Let's -- let's keep 'em rolling. I'll move for the adoption of No. 2 and discuss it on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. Amendment is adopted. Are there any further

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Floor amendments approved for consideration, Madam Secretary? SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 3, offered by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Harmon, Floor Amendment No. 3.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 3.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. Opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, we'll proceed to House Bill 466. House Bill 466. Senator Kotowski. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 466.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Kotowski.

SENATOR KOTOWSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: House Bill 466 provides additional flexibility for the sale and compromise and deferral of past due debt, as well as the sale of certified as

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

uncollectible under current law. This builds on legislation that we passed last year to give us more flexibility to get more money for outstanding debt in this State. There were some issues with the -- the law that was passed. State universities have requested this exemption in order to give them flexibility in working out payment plans with students with debts owing to the university. Secondly, IDOT has requested an exemption in order to make sure that they can enter into deferred payment plans with cities and towns for road construction, also with uninsured motorists who damage highway property. And it also contains exemption for debts owing to the Department of Employment Security and Department of Healthcare and Family Services. And this is done to avoid violating federal law from the sale, compromise or deferral of those past due debts. This change was passed out of the House unanimously. Be more than happy to answer any questions, if there are any.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Kotowski, do you wish to close? The question is, shall House Bill 466 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 466, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate -- House Bill 653. Senator Althoff seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 653 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of House Bill 653, Madam Secretary, are there any Floor

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 2, offered by Senator Althoff.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Althoff, on Floor Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you, Mr. President. Floor Amendment No. 2 mirrors Committee Amendment No. 1, but adds additional language which provides that disqualifying convictions are defined by the DCFS standards for background checks and it adds an immediate effective date and requires that the Department begin registry checks within ninety {sic} (sixty) days of the effective date of the Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. Opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 653. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 653.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Althoff.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. House Bill 653 is simply Paul's Law. Many of you may recall the numerous news and media reports about the tragic and unfortunate incident that occurred at one of our State's group homes for disabled children and adults managed by Graywood Foundation. Graywood, in fact, manages several facilities in central Illinois. And while there were ongoing, numerous rumblings about the abuse and neglect of their charges, none of them were treated substantially or timely enough to have avoided the tragic outcome that occurred to Paul McCann for taking a cookie. Paul was a sensitive, inquisitive forty-two-year-old beloved son and beloved brother, mother, Lois McCann, and his sister, Kathy Slovick, had planned on attending today's Session, but due to the -- volatile weather up north, they are choosing to remain at home and are listening to the debate online. Paul was beaten to death by an employee of this facility, an employee who was entrusted with his care and was not the first to die at the hands of these employees. While I won't go into the details and allegations of these abuses, know that they were horrific and heart-wrenching and know that, as a State, nothing was done, because at that time our laws were permissive and did not require any action to be taken. With great thanks to Representative Greg Harris, in the House, and his diligent, careful work with the Department of Human Services and in conjunction with the Department of Healthcare and Family Services, the Department of Public Health, the Department of Child {sic} (Children) and Family Services, as well as the Department on Aging, this legislation will ensure that what happened to Paul McCann and his family will not happen

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

to any other family here in the State of Illinois. House Bill 653, Paul's Law, amends the Department of Human Services CILA Licensing Act to do three things: It requires the Department to initiate funding and licensing review and revocation of licenses in case of disproportionate claims of egregious abuse, neglect, or exploitation or in the apparent unnatural death of individual served by an agency. It requires registry checks of employees at the time of hire and again every year during their employment, requiring termination if an employee's name has been placed on a registry with disqualifying convictions substantiated cases of abuse and neglect. And it requires the Department of Human Services to make available to individuals and guardians upon enrollment, a document listening -- listing telephone numbers and other contact information to report cases of abuse, neglect, and exploitation. I'm proud to have played a role in the creation of this legislation, albeit a small role, and I commend Paul's family and Representative Harris for their proactive response and creation of Paul's Law. This bill has been a collaborative effort by many advocacy organizations, State departments, and even, yes, AFSCME. On behalf of Paul and his family, I thank each and every one of you for your time and support. And, Mr. President, I know of absolutely no opposition to this legislation. I am only aware of the need to unanimously approve its passage, as was done in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Senator Delgado. SENATOR DELGADO:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: I rise in strong support of the lady's legislation. As a member of the Human

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Services Committee, I had to sit in as the Chairperson, as Senator Hunter, the Chairperson, had to be in another committee. And it was ironic that it would touch me. But Paul's mother, who was here, the family, and -- and the -- the gut-wrenching testimony that we endured that morning, we shared the pain. This is clear. We want to commend all of the agencies that were mentioned in coming together to show how government can work and can bring justice to families that are -- in egregious cases, and let mother come on stage and -- and be part of the creation to protect in the -- in the memory of Paul, to make sure that we all have green lights up there, because, as I said to her, "I don't imagine how you feel; I know how you feel." So it's very, very difficult to have to deal with this day in and day out, but this one here, this one -- this one took the cake and now we can at least make it taste a little well, this cake, for the family that Paul has left, with his mom who continues to have to live this day and day. Senator Althoff, I commend you and your courage and -- and to continue to find the -- the support for this bill. And we have it here today. So, please, in the name of this young man and the family who continues to struggle, trying to find answers to unanswerable questions and pounding their fists in grief, let's all give 'em green lights today, gentlemen and ladies.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Wilhelmi. SENATOR WILHELMI:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: I want to echo my -- my good friend and colleague's comments, Senator Delgado. I'm sure all of us are feeling the same way, that it's -- it's

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

tragic and unfortunate that we have to move a piece of legislation like this, but the fact is, this is critically important, so necessary. I want to commend Senator Althoff and Representative Harris and all the men and women who worked on this important legislation. We got to make sure this never, ever happens again. And by this piece of legislation, the mechanism provided in the bill, we will make sure that our loved ones, our loved ones in all of our districts, will never be treated like Paul was treated, will never be given that kind of disrespect to the point where his life was taken - an unbelievable tragedy, something that we, through this piece of legislation, will avoid for future families, constituents, and make sure that our CILAs are safe. So I want to commend Senator Althoff, Representative Harris, and I, obviously, urge all of us to put a green vote on this bill and do the right thing for our families and for folks who live in CILAs. We need to protect them. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I obviously rise in support of the bill, but want to tell a little story. Last night, a number of us had dinner with Senator Althoff - and sometimes around here people get really cynical about the way things happen - and I remember Pam got up and she said, "I got to leave you all, 'cause I got to go home and I got to compose myself and I got to figure out what I'm going to say today, 'cause I got this bill up called Paul's Law." And, you know, we take our job seriously, but I want the public to know that when these

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

tragedies like Paul's death arise, this General Assembly takes our job seriously. And just wanted to convey that here's Senator Althoff, she's on the Floor today, and I want Paul's family, who she said is watching, to know that their friend, Senator Althoff, last night excused herself early from dinner to go back to her apartment in Springfield, read the file once again, go through the testimony that Senator Delgado said was brought forward by the courageous family. But I just want to commend Senator Althoff for bringing this. And I want the public to understand, you know, it's a rough and tumble world here in the General Assembly, but there are people like Senator Althoff and I think almost all of us that really care deeply about the people of this State, and Senator Althoff took this duty of bringing this bill in Paul's memory very seriously. And sometimes I think in the hustle and bustle of what we do around here, the human side of those of us who serve in the General Assembly gets lost. But in the case of Senator Althoff and Senator Delgado and many of us, it's here. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Althoff, do you wish to close? ...Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

I would just like to note that Representative Harris is also on the Floor here to watch all the green lights. So I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Thank you. The question is, shall House Bill 653 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 59 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 653, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 806. Senator Rezin. Senator Rezin seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 806 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 806. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 2, offered by Senator Rezin.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Rezin. Senator, do you wish to withdraw the amendment and proceed with the underlying bill? Senator Rezin. SENATOR REZIN:

Yes. I would like to withdraw the amendment and proceed with the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

The amendment has been withdrawn. Madam -- the -- the amendment has been withdrawn. 3rd Reading. On the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 806. Senator Rezin. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 806.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Rezin.

SENATOR REZIN:

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 806 amends the Environmental Protection Act. It sets forth additional requirements for persons who apply sewage sludge to agricultural lands in Illinois. Provides that these requirements are in addition to any other requirements that were imposed by the IEPA. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Rezin, do you wish to close? The question is, shall House Bill 806 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 806, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Tony Bateman from IIS Video -- seeks permission to videotape today's proceedings. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Senator Annazette Collins, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR A. COLLINS:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your point.

SENATOR A. COLLINS:

I would like to welcome Westinghouse High School from my district. They -- they're in the gallery today. Would they rise? They also know Senator Hunter and they also know Senator Harmon and they want to wish a shout-out to them as well. We want to thank you all for coming today.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Will our guests in the gallery please rise? Let's give -our friends from Westinghouse a warm Senate greeting. House
Bill 1151. Senator Haine. Senator Haine. Out of the record.
House Bill 1197. Senator Lightford. Out of the record. House
Bill 1233. Senator Emil Jones. Senator Jones. Out of the
record. House Bill 1241. Senator Martinez. She wishes to
proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 1241.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. -- Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 1241 provides that a police officer who has probable cause to arrest a suspect when he or she believes is driving under the influence of drugs and alcohol -- or alcohol must request that the driver undergo a chemical test. However, under this bill, the driver may still choose to refuse to take the test. And this is -- we're trying to close -- close a loophole in the existing law when it comes to -- in -- in a case of a major accident. This comes after a family came to us with -- with a story about their child. Two kids that were killed and the officer did not ask the individual driving, which was an off-duty police officer, to -- to conduct a chemical test. And so this is just closing a loophole. I've worked the State -- I've worked with the State -- State Police and the Secretary of

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

State on this and -- and this is the -- the loophole that they need to close. And I -- happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Senator Righter. SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield, please?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Indicates that she'll yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Senator Martinez, I appreciate the -- the issue that you're trying to remedy by this, which is an -- an officer's failure to request someone do a test in this -- in -- in such a circumstance. But let me ask you: Another circumstance where an officer might not request that a test be administered is one where, to the officer, it is clear that the individual is inebriated to the -- or intoxicated to the extent where they couldn't possibly perform the test. I mean, what about in a situation like that? Do you still believe -- I mean, this would require that officer to still ask that individual, you know, "Will you please take the test?"

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Senator Righter. No, this is if the officer believes that he has probable cause. Sometimes when there is a DUI -- if there is say, for instance, an accident and there is a person who was maybe under the influence of -- of drugs, as opposed to alcohol, a breathalyzer exam is not going to cover that. So, that's where I think this comes in. It's really up

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

to the officer to make sure that these kind of tests are -- are -- are there, ready for him, in case there is a case like that one.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

The bill says that if the officer determines there's probable cause to believe the person's intoxicated, the officer shall request that individual take the -- the test. Correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Yes. And this is -- I worked this with the State Police and they are -- they helped with the language on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Okay, that's the situation I'm describing, is where the individual is clearly intoxicated. There's no issue of probable cause; the person can barely walk. In that instance where the officer sees that individual, clearly has probable cause and knows the individual can't possibly get one step down the road when it comes to taking the sobriety test, your -- this bill would still require them to at least ask the individual to try and complete that. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Yes.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Righter. Thank you. Are there any further -- is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Martinez, do you wish to close? Senator Martinez. The question is, shall House Bill 1241 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 56 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 1241, having received the required constitutional majority, is Senator Jacobs. hereby declared passed. House Bill 1368. 1368. Out of the record. House Bill 1576. Senator Koehler. Senator Koehler. Out of the record. House Bill 1600. Leader Trotter. Out of the record. House Bill 1663. Senator Dillard. Out of the record. House Bill 1717. President Pro Tem Harmon. Out of the record. House Bill 1719. Senator Raoul. Raoul. Out of the record. House Bill 1723. Senator Sullivan. Out of the record. House Bill 1883. Senator Hutchinson. Out of the record. House Bill 1957. Leader Trotter. Out of the record. José Moré with the Chicago News Cooperative requests permission to seek -- to take still photos of the -proceedings. Seeing no objection, permission is granted. House Bill 2023. President Pro Tem Harmon. Senator Harmon, 2023. Madam Secretary, please read the bill. Senator Harmon seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 2023 to the Order of 2nd Seeing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 2023. Madam Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Floor Amendment 1, offered by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Harmon, on Floor Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The amendment retains the underlying bill but adds to it the language from Senate Bill 2062, which passed the Senate unanimously. I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Madam Secretary?

SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 2023. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 2023.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

President Pro Tem Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. The underlying bill is an initiative of the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation and provides for a modernization of the Real Estate

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

License Act of 2000. It passed the House unanimously, 103 to nothing. The language I've amended is also relating to Financial and Professional Regulation. It relates to the regulation of computer forensic services and, again, is identical to the -- the language of Senate Bill 2062, which passed the Senate. I'm hoping the House will have more interest in taking up the original bill on a concurrence motion. I ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Harmon, do you wish to close? The question is, shall House Bill 2023 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 2023, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senator Hutchinson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your point.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

I would like to take this opportunity to invite all to the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus and the Illinois Legislative Latino Caucus end-of-Session, we hope, barbecue. It is tonight. It'll be soul food, music, Mexican food. All invited. And it's tonight at the Illinois Black Caucus House, which is at 614

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

South College Street, which is a half block south of old Boone's Saloon, and everybody is invited. I like to also call this the annual Salsa Soul Fest. It's sure to be a good time. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Thank you very much for extending that invitation. Continuing on the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading, House Bill 2089. Senator McCann. Senator McCann. Out of the record. House Bill 2095. Senator Noland. Out of the record. House Bill 2193. Senator Haine. Senator Haine. Senator Haine seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 2193 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 2193. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 2, offered by Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Haine, on Floor Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This Floor amendment was the initiative of the Chemical Industry Council and the Illinois Retail Merchants Association. The underlying bill, the gist of the bill is to do something about those who possess caustic and noxious substances for the purposes of severely injuring others. It grew out of a -- an -- acid attacks on two Chicago women in late 2010. Terrible attacks, terrible permanent damage to them. And this was an initiative of the now distinguished City Clerk of Chicago. And this -- but this takes care of the problems that were seen by

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

the Retail Merchants and the Chemical Industry Council.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Senator Haine, do you wish to close? Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Would ask -- I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Question is, shall House Bill 2193 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed -- all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading, House Bill 2193. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 2193.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you. As I indicated before, the gist of the bill is to prevent criminals, those with a criminal intent, from possessing those substances which could be used in these terrible attacks. That's simply what it is. The -- IRMA and the Chemical Industry Council wanted to exempt those who possess

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

them for noncriminal purposes and to go after those who are buying them for the purposes of doing great harm to others.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Haine, do you wish to close? The question is, shall House Bill 2193 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 2193, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2249. Senator Haine. 2249. Senator Haine seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 2249 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 2249. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 2, offered by Senator Haine.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Haine, on Floor Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Floor Amendment -- Floor Amendment No. 2 actually becomes the bill. It includes the underlying gist of the bill, which is to allow self-management training programs according to the National Standards for Diabetes Self-Management Education Programs. This is an initiative of Blue Cross Blue Shield. What the amendment does is makes explicitly clear that this is

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

not a mandate; that this is something that's included in what is already offered.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Haine, do you wish to close? The question is, shall House Bill 2249 pass. I'm sorry. There being no further discussion, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it, and Floor Amendment No. 2 has passed. Madam Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading, House Bill 2249. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 2249.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Haine. Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Mr. President. My explanation a few moments ago will be -- certainly suffice for an explanation for the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Haine, do you wish to close this time? The question is, shall House Bill 2249 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 2249, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senator Kotowski, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR KOTOWSKI:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your point.

SENATOR KOTOWSKI:

I would just like to make the announcement that it's three hundred and sixty days to Toi Hutchinson's birthday. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Thanks for sharing. House Bill 2313. Senator Sullivan. Leader Sullivan, 2313? Senator Sullivan seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 2313 to the Order of 2nd Readings. There being no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 2313. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 1, offered by Senator Sullivan.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Leader Sullivan, on Floor Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. The amendment makes three changes to the bill. It makes the adoption of the rules -- changes it from "shall" to "may". The second thing it does is it ensures that agricultural interests

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

are represented on the Illinois Finance Authority Board by at least two members. And -- and the third thing it does is it allows the Illinois Facilities Fund {sic} to convert funds to capital so that they can further leverage these funds. I'd be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Madam Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. On the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading, House Bill 2313. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 2313.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Leader Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. The -the original bill amends the Illinois Finance (Authority) Act by
-- by providing that fire -- that the fire truck revolving loan
program shall include -- provide loans for the purchase of brush
trucks by fire departments. It limits the amount of money that
can be used per truck. It also talks about the interest rate.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

In addition to the amendment that we just adopted, that's incorporated into the bill. I'd be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Sullivan, do you wish to close? The question is, shall House Bill 2313 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 2313, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2555. Senator Wilhelmi. He wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 2555.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Wilhelmi.

SENATOR WILHELMI:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Bill 2555 allows Will, Lake, DuPage and Kane counties the ability to charge an administrative tow fee for vehicles that they tow. Bill also states that the tow fee does not have to be collected by the towing company and that the towing company is not responsible for paying the tow fee to the county in the case of abandoned vehicles. I know of no opposition and I ask for your support.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Wilhelmi, do you wish to close? The question is, shall House Bill 2555 pass. All 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? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 56 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 2555, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2804. Senator John Jones. He wishes to proceed and he seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 2804 to the Order of 2nd Reading. There being no objection, leave is granted. On the Order now of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 2804. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 1, offered by Senator John Jones.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator John Jones, with Floor Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill -- Floor Amendment No. 1 to -- to Senate {sic} Bill 2804 adds to the underlying bill and I would ask for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. On the Order now -- House Bills 3rd Reading, House Bill 2804. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 2804.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator John Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 2804, with Senate Amendment No. -- Floor Amendment No. 1 adopted to it -- actually we ran into a little problem in -- around over the State and -when deer season's in and we was processing the deer meat; people would bring a deer in to be processed and then decide that they didn't want it or couldn't afford to pay for the -for the processing and the processor was left sitting there with the meat and -- and couldn't do anything with it. So, working with the Department of Natural Resources, we was able to come up with a -- with a solution for this. And -- and what the bill does is allow any meat processor that wishes to take advantage of the bill would be required to become an active member of the Illinois Sportsmen Against Hunger, which is -- is set up by the Department of Natural Resources. Meat processors are required to keep written records of all deer received for a period of two years, details of what records must be kept are specified in the bill, and any meat shipped by a meat processor must be tagged or

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

labeled. And I'd be more than happy to answer any questions. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator John Jones, do you wish to close? The question is, shall House Bill 2804 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 2804, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2860. Senator Forby. Senator Forby seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 2860 to the Order of 2nd Reading. There being no objection, leave is granted. On the Order now of House Bill 2nd Reading, House Bill 2860. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 1, offered by Senator Forby.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby, on Floor Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR FORBY:

Thank you. Floor Amendment No. 1, all it does is opt -- opt Cook County out.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Will the sponsor yield, please, Mr. President?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

He indicates that he'll yield. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Forby, why?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

The reason why is, Chicago says they to want opt out and I
-- probably couldn't get the bill through committee without them
-- doing this -- amendment. So it made them happy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

So I understand, Senator Forby, in order to get the bill called in committee, you needed to make the City of Chicago happy. Is that fair?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

Yes, that's fair. That's -- I couldn't get enough votes till we done an amendment on 'em, make 'em happy. So it opts 'em out. I don't see why they'd want to be opt out on this, but to get this bill done -- it's a good bill. I've experienced this myself. I ride a motorcycle, so I have been there before. And I have been at red lights where it wouldn't change.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Any discussion? Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: This bill was

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

originally in Transportation. It came out on an Agreed Bill List. I'm not crazy about Chicago being excluded, but I do believe it's a good bill. It's a good A.B.A.T.E. bill. They're very supportive of it and I would encourage an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Kotowski.

SENATOR KOTOWSKI:

Sponsor yield for a question, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

He indicates he'll yield on the amendment.

SENATOR KOTOWSKI:

Yes, Senator Forby, could -- could you please define for me what's considered to be a reasonable amount of time?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

I'll -- I'll give you what I done -- experienced firsthand. I pulled up to this red light in Herrin, Illinois - I know exactly where I was at - I sat there, the lights came by, the cars on the other -- up -- north and south, went north to south, then they'd stop. The lights stopped and they'd made a left turn, then it started again and then the north and south traffic started again. So they didn't give the east and west nothing. So I waited and it done it one more time and so I sat there. And why I knew there was an issue, on the opposite intersection, a car pulled up; when that car pulled up, the lights changed right away. So I knew there was an issue. You know, I've heard about motorcycles and heard about people talking about this.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

But I sat there and experienced it. But when the car on the other -- other side right across would pull up, then the lights changed. That's what this bill's all about.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Kotowski.

SENATOR KOTOWSKI:

It just -- did the -- did the amendment that you included in the bill, did it -- did it address the concerns of the Illinois State Police?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

No. I mean, I don't have nothing here on the Illinois State Police. Why -- the reason they -- they said -- they told me that we know there was a trouble but we just don't have a reason what to do with it yet. But they said they'd like to look into it. But so this here will give 'em time to look into it and -- and protect the motorcycles that they go on.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Bivins.

SENATOR BIVINS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, have experienced the same problem in my own hometown. It does create a -- a problem for riders when they're at stoplights and traffic backs up and you sit through three cycles of lights. It does put the onus on the -- the biker to be -- proceed with caution, just as they would at a yield sign or an unmarked intersection. So I do support the bill.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? President Pro Tem Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you. Senator Forby, this bill was in the Executive Committee earlier today and -- and Senator Trotter did a very able job of presenting it on your behalf. There were a fair number of concerns raised in the committee and I just want to ask for some clarification on a few of those points. The amendment that was in the Executive Committee today - the underlying bill had gone to a -- to the Transportation Committee - but the amendment today exempt -- exempted the City of Chicago from -- from this provision, but not the entire County of Cook. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby. ...Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you. I -- I understand that was an accommodation to the City. Suburban Cook County is similarly situated in terms of density and -- and traffic. Is there a reason that you did not exempt suburban Cook County from -- from the bill?

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

Nobody contacted me on that, nobody had an issue, so I didn't -- I didn't say -- I mean, I didn't do anything. I just looked at the people who's contacted me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

And one -- one last question and -- and it may make sense for me to come back to this on the bill, but much of this discussion is about the -- the -- the sensitivity of the sensors that aren't triggered by a motorcycle. But at the same time, much of the discussion is about the interaction of the motorcycles and the -- the automobiles at the intersection. I'm -- I'm trying to reconcile that. It would seem to me that sensors would only not work if there were no other automobiles present. If an automobile pulls up next to them -- to the motorcycle, wouldn't that trigger the sensor and wouldn't that obviate the problem?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

I think the big issue on motorcycles or bicycles is the size and the weight, and the cars weigh more, they're a lot longer, so the sensor works that. And I think, you know, you can be -- maybe just right in a parking lot {sic}, maybe the weight or the size, where a car would do that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm going -- I'm going to try that one more time, Senator, 'cause I -- I -- I understand the notion if a motorcycle is sitting alone at a red light and there's no traffic on either cross street, that might not trigger the sensor. But it also doesn't pose the sort of safety risk to the motorcyclist that sitting at a light where cars are coming. I don't understand how the light -- the sensor wouldn't be triggered by the other automobiles at that intersection if -- and -- and the motorcycle could proceed through the intersection once the automobile sitting next to it triggered the change in the light.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

Well, one thing that might be, if it's just a single lane highway, the car behind the motorcycle, he wouldn't be able to signal, where the car -- if the motorcycle's there, he wouldn't be able to signal. You know, if it's a two-lane where a car and a motorcycle could be together, that would probably signal the light. But there's a lot of intersections where it's only two lane.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you. Thank you. I appreciate your patience, Senator. You weren't in the committee and -- and so it's not fair for me to ask you some of these questions out of context.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Much of the conversation was about a motorcycle in the left turn lane being able to move over and turn right on red if the signal weren't working. It -- it seems to me - and, again, I'm looking at this from the fairly narrow perspective of suburban Cook County, which is much more like the City of Chicago in terms of its density and its -- its roadway patterns than perhaps some -- some downstate intersections. But I would certainly ask if you'd consider an amendment to exempt all of Cook County. I raised that question in committee. I know it's not fair to put you on the spot since you weren't in the committee, but I'd ask if you would consider that amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Raoul. Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

I -- I just have one question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

He indicates he'll yield. Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

Does a motorcyclist have to have a helmet when he goes through this red light?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

No, I don't think the motorcycles have to have it, 'cause the motorcycle to me is a lot heavier. Now if you had Maloney on his bicycle, now you might have to have a helmet.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion?

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

He indicates he'll yield. Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator, I was just wondering if -- if it'd be possible to get downstate and the suburbs exempted out of Cook County, period. Is that something you could do for us?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

I'm not going to comment on that 'cause I need some votes upstate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Madam Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 2860. Madam Secretary please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 2860.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

Like you said in the 2nd, this is an A.B.A.T.E. meeting {sic} and I just ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Senator Harmon. SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just a -- a quick recap to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

...bill.

SENATOR HARMON:

I appreciate the sponsor's work on this and I understand the problem as it's been described. I think that, in committee today and on the Floor, there have been concerns raised about the -- the definition of the term "reasonable" and how that would be implicated. I would also caution Members from the suburbs and the exurbs that are not exempt from this bill that I think it does pose a -- a traffic safety issue in our part of the world. And I think that you'll see many Members from the suburbs and others who are concerned with traffic safety voting No on the bill. And I just ask for your consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any further discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield, please?
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Indicates that he'll yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Forby, the information that we received in the Executive Committee was that the most recent crash statistics indicate that there were about three hundred accidents involving motorcycles hit from the rear end, but there wasn't any indication what percentage of those three hundred were actually caused while a motorcycle was sitting stopped at a red light. Do you know anything about breaking out those numbers and how many were actually caused while -- or actually occurred while the motorcycle was sitting, waiting on a red light to turn? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

No, I don't have the numbers, but I do know a couple years ago that a motorcycle was sitting at a red light, a car run into him. So, I don't have your numbers, but I do know it happens.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Now, I know, Senator Forby, that you are a motorcyclist, and as someone who is, you can attest personally to the importance of the campaign - and that's what I'm going to call it - that we see on signs and bumper stickers and other places that has the phrase "Start Seeing Motorcycles". I know you've seen that. Tell me what that's about.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Well, as a motorcycle rider, I -- I want to say this to every motorcycle rider, if you don't ride on defense all the time, even when you're sitting still, looking behind you and looking all over, a lot of times the cars just don't see you, because you're not as big as a automobile. But I -- I -- riding a bicycle or a motorcycle, I suggest you ride on defense every minute. If you take your defense off, I think that's one of the problems you have with motorcycles.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. And, you know, Senator Forby, I'm not a motorcyclist, but what you say to me right there makes eminent sense. So let me ask the next question, which is, don't you think it places that hard-to-see motorcyclist in a greater degree of jeopardy if you change the law and allow that motorcyclist to drive out into the middle of an intersection, whereby the vehicles coming from other directions have a green light, whereby those -- those -- those motorists don't have any reason to believe that a motorcycle or any other vehicle is going to be in their way, because they have the green light? Don't you think that further jeopardizes people who are riding on motorcycles?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

Well, you know, that's not any different than pulling out of your driveway, cars going north and south. You got to yield the right-of-way. So that's why the motorcyclists, at an

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

intersection, you yield the right-of-way before you pull out in front of somebody. If you pull out of your driveway and there's a road in front of your house, you yield to the driveway {sic}, so I don't see much difference in that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Well, the difference, Senator Forby, I would suggest, is there are not now stoplights at the end of people's driveways that they have to wait on before they can go out into the road. Whereas here, you have a system in place and it's a stoplight system, and drivers coming from directions wherein they have the green light, you know as well as I do, assume they have the right-of-way. In fact, they do have the right-of-way. Right now, the only thing in Illinois law that allows someone to proceed with a red light is they can turn right on red if the conditions are safe. So, there is a difference between those two scenarios. I'm going to ask the question again. Do you not think it places the motorcyclist in greater jeopardy to roll out in the middle of an intersection when the cars coming from the other directions have a green light?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

Only issue that -- what you're saying, if we don't get a yield -- we don't move, that motorcycle sits there. Does he just set there till the State cop comes and say, "No, you can move", or what -- what do you do? I mean, that's the issue. I mean, that's what this bill's about, is sitting there and moving

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

your motorcycle out of the way and not getting a ticket.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Well, first, Senator Forby, a State Police officer or any other officer is not going to give a motorcyclist a ticket for sitting at a red light. But let's -- let's talk about your suggestion about the issue of, well, what's he going to do? That's a fair question. As I mentioned just a moment ago, current law already allows a motorcyclist or any other vehicle, unless there's a specific prohibition, to come up to a red light, after stopping and looking both ways, to make a right if it's safe to do so. Why can't the motorcyclist just turn right? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

Well, I guess that could be right, too, but what if the motorcycle wants to turn left or go straight? I mean, what's the difference? So you're going -- you're going to make a guy riding a motorcycle -- you're going to penalty {sic} him? 'Cause he's got a license, he buys a license, he's paid taxes on it. What the heck? What's the difference between a car and a motorcycle? They ought to have the same rights as a car, a truck, a pickup truck. All I'm asking is the same.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Now, Senator Forby, be careful. I can sling the red meat as well as you can. That's not what we're doing here. Okay?

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

And first of all, I agree that they have the same rights. But we're -- your bill doesn't allow a car or a truck to proceed out in the middle of an intersection when there's a red light, does That's not what we're talking about. Now, in answer to your question, is -- is that what we're going to make the motorcyclist do, make a right? That's what I'm suggesting and I'm curious about your response to that. Make the motorcyclist go another two or three blocks around. That's exactly right. I understand that that's an issue and inconvenience. But it's not nearly so much as an inconvenience as if they get hit by a vehicle coming through because they've gone out in the middle of the intersection. And it's not nearly so much an inconvenience for the person who ran into that motorcycle or had to swerve to avoid that motorcycle and hit something or someone else. What is the dramatic inconvenience about turning a right on a red, Senator Forby?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

What about a one-way street where you can't turn right? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

You know, Senator Forby, you got me. I don't know what you do in that situation, but what I'm asking you is, is that -- I don't know what the percentage of intersections where you have a red light and there's a one-way street going left, but I bet it's pretty doggone small compared to all the others. So what I'm asking you again is, is turning right on red not a

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

satisfactory answer to this issue for you?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

To the bill if I might, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

To the bill.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

You know, Ladies and Gentlemen, I -- I am always, if not almost always, a supporter of the positions of the grassroots group that has brought this bill to Senator Forby and us here in the Senate. But let's think about what we are doing here. There is an -- there is an easy remedy, except for the infrequent occasions when a motorcyclist comes to a red light and the red light won't work and he is stopped at a one-way street going left. Okay, so those are the circumstances that all need to line up in order for this not to work. In every other circumstance, the motorcyclist can go right on red, down a block or two, make a left, and then come back around the way they want to go. That's all they have to do. But think about the price of the remedy that this bill suggests. And I -- we heard in -- in the -- in testimony in the Executive Committee, a witness say, "Hey, no one cares more about motorcyclists than we do." Well, and I would respectfully suggest that most of us care about our constituents who are on motorcycles as much as

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

those people do, but those people are going to be at greater risk. No one in this Chamber disagrees with the suggestion that motorcycles are harder to see than -- full-sized vehicles are. Of course they are and that's why we all agree with the slogan about "Start Seeing Motorcycles". Aren't they going to be harder to see when the -- the motorist is driving with a green light, who is worried about what their kids are saying in the back or the radio won't quite get the signal they want or a hundred other things, 'cause they're not really concerned about the intersection in front of them because they have a green That places that motorcyclist at grave danger, not to mention the motorist -- the other motorists around, the motorist who hits the motorcyclist, the motorist who swerves to miss the motorcyclist and hits another vehicle or hits a light pole or does something else. You know, I'm all for convenience and I'm all for accommodating people who are on motorcycles. This puts them in greater danger. It puts other motorists in greater danger when there is an easy remedy already at hand. I urge a No vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I was in Executive Committee. I did carry this bill for Senator Forby, who was not there. So I did hear the questions that were given and -- and also I heard the answers. The main problem here is - and I mentioned in committee - is that too many of us, especially those of you and I myself

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

included, drive four-wheeled vehicles, don't have a clue about motorcyclists. You still have a mindset that we're in the 1960s, the wild and crazy bunch of guys who jump on a bike and some of us too young to have any sense and the rest of us too old to even remember what sense was are on a motorcycle and out there having fun. We are having fun, but we're very responsible individuals having fun. You say make a right on a -- on a street, well -- and you can do that instead of taking this illegal ride across as if we're not paying attention to the car. We're not listening to no kids in the back, 'cause there is no backseat. We're not texting, because we have both our hands on the handlebars. We know what's going on all the time, because we know what y'all are doing in your cars, you know, because you are listening to kids, eating potato chips, talking on the cell phone and doing all that craziness. So why should I have to make a right and go two blocks down, then turn around at the next intersection, just to get across the street at the 7-I might be just -- I might be running out of gas, trying to get to the gas station across the street, and you're making me drive a -- two extra blocks. But you know what is also legal? It's legal to make a U-turn. Go on down - what? twenty-five feet? What is the Vehicle Code? Maybe then -- and make a U-turn. Is that not more dangerous than just going across the street after you stood there for two/three minutes, knowing this light isn't working? You know if a car is coming. No. Let's -- let's be sensible here. The gentlemen that had spoke -- I know one was a lieutenant with the Illinois State Police. He talked about and we asked him, "How many streets have these sensors? How bad is this?" He couldn't answer.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

he had another quy, I guess from the highway department, said "There's thousands of these streets out there and, no, the technology is not up to speed to actually gauge when someone is sitting there, besides a car." He had no details. You want details, how many people got hit from the back. Well, the highway department -- the highway department man didn't have those details. So you expect us to come here today and give them to you. Let me tell you, when you're sitting there on that corner, and we may be at fault here, because when we're sitting and you're sitting too long, you take your hands off the handlebars, essentially took your hand off the brake, so now you don't have a brake light. But the sucker behind you doesn't see that you've been sitting there and he runs into the back of you. So, I mean, so it's -- it's a lot of things, but bottom line is I know if I see a car coming up behind me, coming too fast, I turn the corner. You get off, 'cause you know how people speed to the corner and you're standing there on your bike. You're not going to sit there because you're in a hurry and they're going to run over me. This is a sensible bill addressing a situation that eleven other states have already addressed. We're not coming up with nothing radical here. We're not on -on any crusade. This is something that is happening, not only in the State of Illinois; it's happening around this country and I'm sure there'll be the number thirteen and number fourteen state will be doing this in the near future. And I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Millner.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

SENATOR MILLNER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I don't know what I'm going -if what I'm going to say now is going to confuse everybody or, you know, bring everybody together on the issue. But I, too, love riding motorcycles and I remember many times, even on a Sunday morning, I'll be coming up to an intersection and the light just won't change. Now, in regards to Senator Righter's comment about whether or not you can make the right-hand turn. Well, in our area, sometimes you'll have three lanes heading in one direction and two left-turn lanes. I'll be in the left-turn It's early in the morning or late at night, doesn't change. Well, you really can't make a right-hand turn cutting off -- it's really dangerous to just make a right-hand turn and it's called improper lane usage. The other side of the coin is this, as a police officer, I don't know of any police officer who would write a ticket to a motorcyclist who would sit there, wait for the thing to change, it doesn't change because it's not -- the sensor's not hit and the motorcyclists go through it. You might get stopped by the police officer. You tell the police officer, "Officer, the sensor didn't change." I don't know of one police officer who would write the ticket. So, the other side of this coin, too, though, is that we'll have people who possibly could abuse it - I'm kind of yin yang on this thing - who says, "Hey, it's now legal for me to run through the red light, because the law says I can." So here we go. The light doesn't change, because the sensor doesn't pick it Typically and usually, it's not really violating the law by going through the red light if it's safe to do so, I don't believe, whereas a police officer would write you a ticket. I

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

just don't think he would. So -- I mean, do what you will. I don't know if that clarified or screwed -- screwed you up, but those are my brief comments. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Thank you, Senator Millner. Is there any further discussion? Senator Bivins.

SENATOR BIVINS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, ride a motorcycle. ride probably one of the heaviest motorcycles made weight-wise, and one block from my house, I sat through three cycles of lights. And to address Senator Righter's concern, I did turn right eventually, but the problem is, I go one block, I turn down another road, that's a one-way street, and then I have to drive another mile to come back and another mile again to get back to where I was. If I go the other way, I drive six blocks and then I'm on a four-lane highway that's extremely busy. It's a major highway and it's -- it puts me even in more peril. I --I think motorcyclists today - the ones that I know, the ones I ride with, and I've ridden with hundreds of them -- it -- in various groups, as I'm sure the other motorcyclists have - are very responsible, are very -- probably the most defenseorientated people that I know, constantly looking out for cars. And in the rural area where I live, it's -- it is a lot different than the city and the suburbs. We have a lot of single-lane highways. We have a lot of areas that -- two lane -- or two-way stop signs, where you're always looking out for cars coming and going each way. That's the duty of a motorcyclist. So, as you come to that light, and if you sit through three cycles of light -- lights, then you're going to be

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

looking very cautiously if you can get out in that intersection or not. So I encourage a -- a Yes vote on this bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Cultra.

SENATOR CULTRA:

Thank you, Senator -- President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

To the bill.

SENATOR CULTRA:

I've been riding motorcycles since I was fifteen years old and to address Senator Righter's response that, you know, riding a motorcycle and sitting at a stop sign, wanting to enter a busy highway when you have traffic going both ways, would be no different than if you were sitting at a red light where it wouldn't change. You look both ways after a number of cycles and the light doesn't change and you proceed, just like you would at any other stop sign with traffic going by. So, I think this is a sensible bill. I've had this problem many times myself and I'd ask for an Aye -- Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby, will you yield to Senator Jacobs? Want a minute to think about it?

SENATOR JACOBS:

Senator, can you tell me if this bill passed through the

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

House? If it did, do you have any idea what the -- what the vote was?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

No, I couldn't be there today. Senator Trotter run this bill for me today, so I wasn't in the committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator...

SENATOR FORBY:

Oh, it...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

I -- 104 to nothing in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

And we like to operate here in the Senate in order to save time and to make things easier and so we don't have fights on the Floor. We like -- we like to have committees and people get to air out all their opinions. They get to say, "You got to change your bill." Have you ever been involved in that process, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

When I was in the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

I noted that Senator Trotter cast a Yes vote, but to my amazement, I noticed that Senator Righter also cast a Yea vote. Could you explain to me what might have happened between fifteen minutes ago and now to change his mind?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Forby.

SENATOR FORBY:

They tell me that was for the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Righter, your name was used in debate. Wish to speak for a second time? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Just -- just to clarify for Senator Jacobs, who I know is reading his analysis carefully, the vote in Executive Committee was simply on the amendment, not on the substance of the bill. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Thank you. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Forby, do you wish to close? Senator... The question is, shall House Bill 2860 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 43 voting Aye, 12 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. House Bill 2860, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. We will continue on House Bills 3rd Reading. House Bill 2976. Senator Wilhelmi. Out of the

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

record. House Bill 2987. Senator Hutchinson. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 2987.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 2987 creates the Project Labor Agreements Act. provides that a State department, agency, authority, board, or instrumentality that is under control of the Governor shall include a project labor agreement on a public works project, including federally funded projects, when the Body determines that a PLA advances the interests of the State in terms of cost, efficiency, quality, safety, timeliness, skill, labor stability, or diversity in projects. Additionally, the bill requires State entities that have PLAs in connection with a public works project to prepare a quarterly report for the Department of Labor that includes workforce participation by minorities and females as defined by the Business Enterprise for Minorities, Females, and Persons with Disabilities. The Department of Labor shall then provide an annual report of these findings to the General Assembly and Governor. I'd like to be very clear in the fact that we operate underneath an executive order that encourages project labor agreements right now. I am not seeking to do anything that we don't already do in the State of Illinois. And I'm happy to ask for any -- answer any questions.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

She indicates that she'll yield. Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Senator Hutchinson, you know how much I hate this bill. That becomes my standard -- I hate this bill. One of the arguments in committee that you brought forward was that you felt the bill was a cost-saving measure. Can you tell me how much money Illinois is projected to save with this bill?

Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

I believe that it is - and thank you for that - I believe that the reason they use the term "cost saving" is because this is a way to make sure that projects come in under budget and on time by relaxing work rules when there's a whole lot of confusion or when there's multiple unions working on one project. So the idea is that whatever you can do to increase standards of safety and efficiency and productivity would be a good thing and a cost savings. One of the things that came up in committee also is that this increases the amount of construction costs on projects and that goes to some of the philosophical arguments against project labor agreements. But the thing that I think we said quite clearly in -- in committee

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

as well is that every study that says it does, there's another study that says it doesn't. And most reasonable people say you really cannot -- you really cannot quantify that. We -- it -- it -- there's so many variables on there as to whether or not this actually raises the cost of doing business. So, the -- the idea of describing it as something that is cost saving, it just goes to, I think, the efficiency that project labor agreements attempt to do when pulling together a number of different factions on a job.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Althoff, on your favorite bill.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

On my favorite bill. Going just beyond that: We have a bidding system. So we have several contractors who'll bid on a project. If one of those contractors is a merit shop, is not a union shop, and they are the low bidder, they get the job. If they choose not to sign the PLA, what happens?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

My understanding is that it would go to the next bidder. Because the fact that there is a project labor agreement on there, it's something that goes through a process. And that's the other thing that's important to understand about this bill. This bill -- the -- the way that we determine whether or not a project is project labor worthy goes through a particular process through the Department of Labor. This bill does not change the process that determines whether or not something would be worthy of a project labor agreement. In fact, IDOT

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

lists about a thousand jobs a year. And over the last six years, only about two hundred and seventeen of those jobs over about six thousand of 'em were made project labor jobs. So this doesn't change the process that we go through already. It doesn't mandate that every project is going to be a project labor agreement. It just codifies our executive order that encourages that we look at projects, and when it's -- when it's beneficial to the State, that that's something we put a project labor agreement on. To your point, if someone knows -- you know that before you bid, so if you choose to bid on that, the assumption is that you're going to agree to a project labor agreement. If not, then it's going to go to the next bidder.

Senator Althoff.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

I -- I understand that that's the position. I think my point was trying to make that there are many companies in the State of Illinois who are really struggling to make ends meet and by taking their ability away to be able to be competitive when they go forward and require them to sign a PLA, limits the number of bidders that what would -- we have on these projects. And I don't think that, in our current economic climate, that's a smart decision. Also, in conclusion, merit shop contractors typically pay into their employees' IRA, their personal retirement accounts. Under a PLA agreement, the contractor is also forced to pay into the retirement fund of the union. The nonunion worker, then, does not benefit unless he joins the union and waits until that benefit is vested. Correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Okay. This is probably one of the biggest points of contention on this thing. Yes, everyone is required to -- to pay into the -- the fringe benefit program, which includes the pensions. This pension system is not unlike any other pension system that we already have. If a worker doesn't vest, the worker doesn't get the pension. Most PLAs are put on projects that last anywhere from several months to several years. like any other worker, if you are on the project long enough to vest, then you get the pension benefit, whether or not you're a union worker or not. You could be a nonunion worker that stays on a project - like what we anticipate possibly the Illiana being; that's going to be a multi-year project to be built out you can be a nonunion worker, end up on a multi-year project that has a PLA on it, and get a very nice pension deal that you would not have otherwise gotten in the merit shop. I actually think that that argument goes both ways. Additionally, there's some merit shops and I -- honestly, in an environment like this, they have a very difficult time offering comprehensive benefits for their employees. If you end up on a project that has a PLA agreement on it, once you hit that threshold, you are eligible for health benefits in a way that you wouldn't whether you're a nonunion worker or not. So there are benefits to do -- there are -- there are benefits and ways to look at this that are not necessarily a thing to say that this only benefits union folks. Any worker who doesn't vest - i.e., I lose my next election, I don't get a -- I don't get a pension benefit either. bill does not discriminate against nonunion workers and it

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

doesn't preclude merit shops from bidding on any project. That's been found when the constitutionality of project labor agreements was first tested in the courts.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Althoff. SENATOR ALTHOFF:

I -- I think my point on that, Senator Hutchinson, was not that it was necessarily bad for the -- employee who stays on that long-term project, but it's bad for the employer who's now paying into a pension system where his employee may not receive that benefit and continuing to pay in the employee's personal IRA. It's double the cost. It's got to cost the -- the employer more money. And -- and, again, if this is such a wonderful idea, can you cite for me how many other states have passed legislation that requires the PLA agreement?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Actually, there's only one other state that's passed it as a statute. But I will notice -- I will make for the record, in particular, that all fifty states use some form of PL agreements on a number of different projects. It's been used in a number of different states. Nobody else besides one other state has done it or codified it in statute. And, again, let me reiterate. I'm not asking to do anything that we don't do right now, that we -- we are operating under an executive order at the State level. And in 2009, there was an executive order issued by President Obama encouraging project labor agreements on federally funded projects. So, I understand your point and I

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

think that's one of those things that proponents and opponents will have to agree to disagree on.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Althoff.

SENATOR ALTHOFF:

Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate your indulgence. Just to set the record straight: Actually, there are five states that prohibit PLAs from being used - Arizona, Idaho, Missouri, Montana, Utah - and, additionally, three states limit the use of PLAs by the executive order. To the bill: I really think everybody should consider very seriously how they're going to vote on this legislation. I would urge a No vote. We have been talking for the past three years about how important it is in the State of Illinois for jobs - jobs, jobs, jobs. On the campaign trails, here in this Chamber, we are continually talking about the importance of creating an environment that is going to promote the creation of jobs. This PLA legislation does not do that. I would urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Like to speak to the bill, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

To the bill.

SENATOR McCARTER:

You know, I'm -- I'm wondering here who's -- who's taking up for the -- the workers in this State. You got nonunion workers who are going to be forced to pay union benefits. You

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

got nonunion contractors who are going to be run out of business. Not only are we not a right-to-work State, we're a forced-to-join-the-union State. Someone needs to step up and defend the eighty -- eighty-four percent of the workers who don't benefit from this. You're -- you're increasing the job costs by anywhere from twelve to eighteen percent. We need to -- we need to decide what -- what value do you want in this State in the middle of a recession and a budget crisis. You want eight and a half miles of road or ten miles of road? You want four new schools or you want five new schools? That's the difference. You want to give the rest of the workforce an opportunity to work? Passage of this bill will put an end to open, fair and competitive bidding on public work projects. a time when we're fighting to get our budget under control and having to make hard decisions, cutting services constituents, why would we purposely raise the cost of building roads and schools and take away opportunities for our families to go back to work? I encourage a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Yes, to the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

To the bill.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

In twenty-one years prior to my coming to the Senate, I was the Executive Director of the Peoria Area Labor Management Council. I'm very familiar with project labor agreements. This is a relaxation of work rules for contractors. This helps give

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

contractors predictability so that work can be done on time and This is a big, big step for the industry. And I --I would say that the cooperation that I have seen between unions and -- and contractors, at least in the Peoria area, has been very good, because here you have the -- the professionalism of a -- of a union contractor in which both the contractor and the -the unions in the -- in the -- I'll name some of the -- examples of -- of -- NECA-IBEW, where they train and -- and help to give apprenticeship status to a young person coming out of either community college or high school that wants to become electrician and they invest that time and money. This is a free education for our young people to get into to get a -- to get a skill to be able to have a lifetime job. Project labor agreements are really the way we do business right now in the State of Illinois. And this really just codifies what is already taking place. I think this is a good bill, because it helps both the worker and the company, the contractor that's trying to do the work. This is the right thing to do. Please support it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Cultra.

SENATOR CULTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

To the bill.

SENATOR CULTRA:

Another black eye for Illinois' business climate. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce recently graded Illinois as one of the worst states in the country when it comes to regulation and this House

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Bill 28 -- 2927 {sic} only makes things worse. Only one state in the whole country has PLA agreements. That's New Jersey. And only two others allow for PLAs by executive order. PLAs are unfriendly to taxpayers by driving up costs of construction products, by limiting bidders, forcing contractors to follow outmoded and inefficient work rules. PLAs are unnecessarily {sic} and they drive up costs on every project. PLAs -- promote -- proponents argue that PLAs promote labor cooperation in construction. Well, just last year, there was a twenty-one-day strike that -- in the Chicago-area expressways and streets which forced the Illinois Tollway to suspend major projects, and that was under PLA agreement. You look at PLAs, they require nonunion companies to pay their workers' health and welfare benefits to a union trust fund, even though these companies have their own benefit plans. These companies have to pay benefits twice, once to the union plan and once to the company plans. Eighty-four percent of the workers in this country are nonunion. This limits their ability to work on public work projects. I would ask for a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Raoul.

SENATOR RAOUL:

To the bill, Mr. President. I...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

To the bill.

SENATOR RAOUL:

I rise in support of -- of Senator Hutchinson's bill. PLAs have been used in other states to encourage diversity where there have been traditional obstacles to minorities entering the

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

trades and public work projects. I'm encouraged that this bill has additional language requiring a quarterly report. I'm cautiously optimistic about that, 'cause this State, notwithstanding that we've had a diverse Legislature vote on capital bills that fund the public works projects throughout the State, we haven't seen the same diversity in the workforce on those public work projects. So while I'm encouraged by the fact that we will have quarterly reporting, I call upon the Governor and this Legislature to hold a hammer up to make sure that those numbers go up in that quarterly report.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Garrett, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

...the bill.

SENATOR GARRETT:

I've had the opportunity to host a couple hearings on the situation Illinois is in regarding jobs. And I have nothing against the unions. I have nothing against the direction that this State has taken, really, with the tax increase. But that doesn't mean I have to agree with it and I don't think that people outside of -- of this State Capitol, if -- when they find out about this, they're going to say, "Why are we doing this?" "Why" -- "what is the need to add additional layers and make it more expensive for business to operate in our State?" So, I -- I'm concerned that we continue to go in this direction and I'm concerned that we continue to think it's okay to go in this

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

direction because we have to keep everybody happy. We should be doing everything we can to ensure that the job climate is as friendly and welcoming as possible. And, unfortunately, I can't vote for this bill. I admire the sponsor very much. I understand where she's coming from. But I think this is going backwards when it comes to providing more job opportunities in Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Senator McCann.

SENATOR McCANN:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

To the bill.

SENATOR McCANN:

I am a general contractor. I have never been signatory to any union, but I have utilized many union forces. I enjoy a wonderful relationship with union and nonunion subcontractors alike. One of the issues at hand with this bill is that it actually, up until this point -- I come -- I come from a family of strong union background and the thing that was so wonderful about that history is there are many of my family members who chose to go into the union, join a union. The problem with this bill is, is that low bidders are thrown out if they will not become signatory to unions, thereby we take the choice away from the employee to join the union and put it in the hand of the employer. The employer then becomes the driving force and not every person out there wants to be in the union. As a matter of fact, only sixty percent -- approximately speaking, approximately sixty percent of the construction forces in

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Illinois are -- are not union. Approximately eighty-seven percent of -- of the workforce nationwide is not union. People make a choice. This takes the choice away from the employee and it becomes a mandate on the employer and by the employer. That is not free market economics. That's not what our country was founded upon. It is not what allowed this country and this State to become so great and it will -- it will not allow us to flourish. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Final speaker is Senator Sandack. Senator Sandack.

SENATOR SANDACK:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

She indicates that she'll yield.

SENATOR SANDACK:

Senator, a merit shop or nonunion shop that wins a bid, when they want to hire personnel on the job, would they necessarily need go through the union hall or could they hire their own people?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Right. I -- I don't believe that you have to hire union. You can hire your own people. But once there's a project labor agreement on there, yes, you are operating under rules that are published before you bid on the project. But you could bring your own people.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Senator Sandack.

SENATOR SANDACK:

My understanding, Senator, is that you can bring your own people if they are accepted and come through the union hall on the instance involved in the public works program, meaning that they would not automatically be hired, but they need the -- the blessing of the union hall. Is that your understanding as well? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

No, that's not my understanding. But I -- I do think that people can bring in their own members and you can sign up to be -- on the list. I do not think that you have to have -- that you have to have -- you hire from that specific job if you have your own folks.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Sandack.

SENATOR SANDACK:

...bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

...bill.

SENATOR SANDACK:

I rise in opposition to the bill. I -- I, too, respect very much the sponsor. I understand what she's doing. I have great respect for her and admiration. I think her answer is incorrect. I think nonunion shops, or merit shops, need necessarily hire their own people through the union hall in the event a -- a PLA is utilized on a public works job. I think, to a previous speaker's point, that is not a good competitive

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

environment. I think it sends the wrong message and I think invariably this entire realm is a step backwards for growth, for jobs, for opportunity, and for building business in the State. I respectfully urge a No vote. Thank you, Mr. President. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

We've had a very extensive debate on this issue. Senator Hutchinson, do you wish to close? ...Hutchinson. SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

I appreciate all the comments. There are a number of people in this Chamber who I respect so greatly and I think that, at the end of the day, the -- the major disagreements about project labor agreements are largely philosophical. you -- if you completely disagree with the fact that we are not a right-to-work State, that we have union rules in this State, then -- then PLAs are not going to be something you philosophically agree with, and I understand and respect that. I would take notice, though, and actually I would disagree strongly with the -- with all the people who stood up and said this automatically raises costs on construction. We can't -there's so many variables in this and it even came out in committee; for every study you show that does, there's a study that shows that it doesn't. As a matter of fact, we've had widespread praise and use by Fortune 500 companies, many of whom are not union - Walmart, Toyota, Boeing. Toyota, for example, reports that its PLAs promote the highest standards of safety, efficiency, and productivity, and could not have been more pleased with the results. This is something that we -- this is how we do business today, right now as we stand in the General Assembly today. I would also disagree strongly with the fact

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

that PLAs put anybody out of business. Two hundred and seventeen jobs over six years that have had -- that have been made project labor worthy projects. And there are specific guidelines to determine how a project is made project labor worthy. This bill does not change any of those things. And I would also add that, yes, we want to increase a wonderful environment to attract and retain business and I know that we have to balance that with the needs of the working people in this State. And there are a lot of different folks who don't think that they need to give better benefits and there are a lot of people who don't want to work to make sure that people have an opportunity to get into apprenticeship programs. folks out there who do not care that the unemployment rate is -is very high amongst women and poor and minorities. Project labor agreements, when they get put on a job, is a win-win for everybody if you choose to look at it that way. I understand that there are philosophical differences as to this notion as a whole, but this is a good bill. This does not raise costs, on the fact that we already do things at prevailing wage right now. It gives people an opportunity to have pensions and benefits that they would not otherwise have in a lot of different cases. And I would urge serious consideration of an Aye vote. you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

The question is, shall House Bill 2987 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 33 voting Aye, 26 voting Nay, none

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

voting Present. House Bill 2987, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3022. Leader Lightford. Senator Lightford seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3022 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order now of 2nd Reading is House Bill 3022. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 3, offered by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Lightford, on Floor Amendment No. 3.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Floor Amendment No. 3 changes the wording from "shall" to "may". I'd be happy to answer questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing -- Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

To the bill. I just wanted...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

To the amendment.

SENATOR McCARTER:

To the amendment, my -- my apologies. Only just want to say thank you to Senator Lightford for listening to my concern regarding the State Board's obligation to address failing schools. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion?

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. Opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Madam Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. On the Order now of 3rd Reading, House Bill 3022. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 3022.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

...you -- thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The bill, as amended, is the legislation that the State Board of Education sends over yearly to correct duplicative changes in the statute. As Senator McCarter indicated, there was some concerns as it relates to the State Board's obligations and the amendment does make that adjustment. I'd be happy to answer questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Lightford, do you wish to close? The question is, shall House Bill 3022 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 3022, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3027. Senator Steans seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3027 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order now of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 3027. Madam Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 1, offered by Senator Steans.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Steans, on Floor Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR STEANS:

Yes, this amendment deletes all, becomes the bill. I'll explain it on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing -- Senator McCarter. Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. Opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. Amendment is adopted. Madam Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 3, offered by Senator Steans.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Steans, on Floor Amendment No. 3.

SENATOR STEANS:

Floor Amendment 3 is a technical amendment and I'll explain it in -- in entirety on 3rd Reading.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Madam Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. On the Order now of 3rd Reading, House Bill 3027. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 3027.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 3027 is a bill that ensures that if a school is providing sexual health education and is taught in a public school, that it must be medically accurate and age-appropriate. This bill is not a mandate. It's just if a school is providing sexual health education, it must provide so in a -- in those ways. This bill incorporates recommended amendments from Senator Sullivan that clarify and makes sure that it's totally clear that this is only applying to classes taught in grades six through twelve. It also reinforces the teaching of abstinence by requiring that sex education classes emphasize that abstinence from sexual

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

intercourse is a responsible and positive decision. And the final amendment - we made at Senator Sullivan's suggestion - was that it does not include any references to the Illinois Human Rights Act. This bill will help reduce unwanted pregnancies, STIs and HIV/AIDS among our youth. I very much urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Thank you. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield for a couple questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

She indicates that she'll yield.

SENATOR PANKAU:

This is the sex education bill and, as you noted, there are a number of amendments to it. Couple things, Senator. You stated in committee that it would be up to the school board what curriculum would be used for the sex education programs under your bill. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

The -- the school districts, yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

I think I specifically asked you if it would be the school administration or it would be the school board, and I believe

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

you answered me, the school board would make that decision.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

The school boards and administrations generally make the curriculums in concert. So, yes, it's the school districts and that would include the school boards.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

Okay, then I guess I must ask again: Ultimately, who makes the decision, a vote of the school board or the school administration?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

I am trying to be clear that generally those decisions are made in concert with the administration, but the ultimate decision lies with the school board, yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

You also stated in committee that abstinence-only or abstinence education programs could still be taught in schools. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

If it's in concert with an overall curriculum that meets

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

these criterias {sic} only; that make it medically accurate and age-appropriate - those are the criterias. The Illinois State Board of Education will be putting curriculum online, made available for school districts to be choosing from available curriculum.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

So if the school board, in a vote with the -- with the advice of the school administrator, the superintendent or principal or whatever it is, says that they wish to teach abstinence-only education and they take an official vote on that, does your legislation overrule them?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

It has to be comprehensive, medically accurate, and ageappropriate. It has to meet the criteria of this if the school is a public school and it's teaching sex education. That's what this bill is doing. So it has to meet those criteria.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

I understand the outlines of the program, but who ultimately is the decision maker? If the school board of a particular school by an official vote says we want to teach abstinence only, then does your legislation overrule that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Steans.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

SENATOR STEANS:

Well, the -- the -- within this legislation, they're going to be making the determination about what overall curriculum are medically accurate and age-appropriate and the Illinois State Board of Education will be putting those things online. So they're going to be determining whether that kind of a curriculum would or not -- would or would not be medically accurate and age-appropriate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

To the bill -- to the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

To the bill.

SENATOR PANKAU:

Usually when we pass bills in here, it's because there's a problem and something needs to be fixed. Right now, the schools that want to teach sex education are, in fact, doing that and they're doing it in the manner that their school board and their community want to do it in. I see no reason why we shouldn't just leave that alone, why we need to add more rules, more definitions, more, more and more. I urge a No vote on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

To -- to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

To the bill.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

I just want to take this opportunity to say that I really support this legislation. I -- I believe that in our schools, some of the old -- old information on the books has to be updated and I think this bill makes that happen. It's going to make sure that all the information that's being taught in the sex education classes are accurate information and mostly updated. But I think also, it helps us, as families, as moms, you know, that if we -- some -- there's moms that uncomfortable talking about sex education to their children and right now it's -- you know, I'm happy to see that the schools are beginning to talk more about it, because, you know, we want to teach our kids abstinence, but I think that the reality is, is that that's not what's happening in our schools today. So I think any added help that these sex class educations {sic} can provide for our children, as far as medically accurate information, and making sure that someone is talking about this to our young men and women from grades six up to twelve, I think it's important. So I stand in real support of this -- of this bill and I hope that everyone else does too.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

To the -- to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

To the bill.

SENATOR McCARTER:

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

First of all, Senator, I just want to say thank you for listening to some of the concerns, and as well, other Senators on your side who worked with you to -- to amend it to make it more palatable. I just -- I just want to clarify a few things. I don't -- I don't long to stand up and talk about fruit and contraceptives in the same sentence, but I was referring to the University of Maryland's documents verbatim, and I found it interesting that the sponsor of the bill was quoting from the same university's data. So when -- we didn't know why -- you know, where that came from, and -- and I have to admit it was an embarrassing moment for myself, 'cause we had two -- we had kids in the -- in the gallery. But, you know, if it's -- if it's tough to talk about it on the Floor, how tough is it to talk about with a -- you know, a child? And another thing, I have --I understand, Senator Martinez, and I -- I know you care about your community and the situation in your community, but the truth is, your community is not just like my community. that's why I think it's important that the people that you elect to your school board be responsible to determine what curriculum is taught, just like it's -- I'm responsible for electing a school board to take care of the kids in my neighborhoods. So I understand your concern. I know you're -- I -- I know you -you -- you mean the right thing here -- to do the right thing, but I think we just need to leave this control very much in the -- in the hands of the people that we elect to school boards. Despite some of the changes that have been made and my appreciation for that, I still urge a No vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion?

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Senator Cultra.

SENATOR CULTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill: Basically, this just comes down to, who do you want to have control over the curriculum that's in your school? Right now, the school boards can choose a curriculum. They can teach any kind of curriculum on sex ed that they want. If they want to teach abstinence, that can be done. But what this bill will do, it'll say if -- if you want to teach sex education, you have to go by these certain guidelines. And it takes the choice away from our school districts. And it might be appropriate in your area, but it might not be appropriate in other areas. So I would ask for a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Duffy.

SENATOR DUFFY:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

...bill.

SENATOR DUFFY:

The fact is that public policy affects and changes people's lives. The laws that we make here will impact people, and in this case, our most precious and impressionable young children. Illinois has taught and continues to teach abstinence in our schools. California, since 1992, has taught what you are proposing here. They teach comprehensive sexual education in their schools. According to the Center for Research on Adolescent Health and Development at the Public Health Institute in Oakland, California, California has a fifty percent higher

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

pregnancy rate than Illinois does right now - fifty percent higher pregnancy rate. And one in four Californians between the ages of fifteen to twenty-four have a sexually transmitted infection. Why do you want to duplicate a failed policy? Our practice in Illinois of teaching abstinence surely always needs to be improved, but when we look at other states like California that currently teach a comprehensive sexual education program, the facts show that abstinence actually works better than a comprehensive program. As a state, we do not -- we do not want to knowingly implement laws that history shows will impact our children in a negative way. Public policy does change our lives. This policy will do just the opposite of what we want. It will actually increase pregnancies, increase the number of STDs in our young adults, and starting with sixth graders, build sexual -- build a sexual education foundation in each individual based on confusing, damaging principles rather than teaching the facts about the beauty and miracle of life. Every child and every body is different. Not all sixth graders mature in the same level or come from the same backgrounds. The innocence of childhood only lasts for an instant, and now when children should be educated about the miracle of life, you want to graphically teach and show sixth graders, some who will be writing letters to Santa Claus, about graphic sexual practices, STD and AIDS. There is a time and place for everything. is not the time for our schools to be teaching graphic, comprehensive sexual education. It has not worked in California and it will not work in Illinois. I encourage a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Holmes.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

SENATOR HOLMES:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

...bill.

SENATOR HOLMES:

Yeah, I -- I mean, we're back -- we're back to this discussion again on the Floor and I've heard some of the arguments that -- that some people have raised and some of the excuses for not supporting this legislation. I would call them rather flimsy excuses. Let's -- let's replay some of them. This is a little too far reaching and sex ed should be taught at home, not in school. Interesting, and a little disingenuous. I may go so far as to say it's almost hypocritical again, because we're saying that our schools, whose purpose it is to educate our youth, should not be teaching medically accurate and ageappropriate sex ed, even though the goal of the school is to educate our kids. It's okay to teach 'em math and English and science. Those are the skills we know will prepare our kids for By the way, if those same children contract a a future. sexually transmitted disease, they may not have a future. Their jeopardy because an unintended future's also in serious pregnancy in a sixteen-year-old girl is not real conducive to a good college career as they move forward. So it's too far reaching to teach our kids issues that may save their lives? Where do we stand? Is it too far reaching to teach our kids about drinking and driving? We don't have an issue with that. That's not too far reaching. How about texting and driving? We're good with that. We think we should be teaching our kids that. And do we think that a parent should be teaching their

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

kids this at home? Absolutely. But we also think it should be taught in the schools, because what does it do? It reinforces the lessons our kids are learning at home. In fantasyland, where I think a good number of you are living, we're thinking that our kids are going to listen to us just because we've taught it. We think that they're not texting and driving. think they're not drinking before they're twenty-one and we think they obey their curfew, because we, as parents, have gone out there and told our kids that's what they should do. So I'm really confused. Education's a priority, but we're not going to teach medically accurate, age-appropriate sex ed just because we're a little squeamish on the topic. And to hear the discussion over there, I think it's also very interesting that in certain parts of the State, this isn't necessary. It may be necessary in -- Senator Martinez, it seems to be necessary in your neighborhood. But guess what? Down in southern Illinois, those kids are not having sex because their parents said they shouldn't. I think that's a really interesting point. So all I want to say to you all is, we teach our kids on issues that they're going to be confronted with as they grow up. And guess what? If you think your kids in their teenage years are not going to be confronted with sex, wake up.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

To the bill.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Thank you. First of all, I just want to -- Senator Steans indicated that we had worked together on some language that either had been removed or some language that was added to the I appreciate your cooperation with addressing some of those concerns. We wanted to make sure that -- that it -- that the -- that abstinence was certainly emphasized in the language and that we included some language that says that abstinence is a responsible and positive decision and is the only protection that's a hundred percent effective against unwanted pregnancy. So I appreciate her efforts to put that back in. There was also another area in the -- in the -- in the law that -- in the language as originally drafted that really wasn't clear as to where comprehensive sex education would be taught and so we clarified that, that it would only be in grades six through twelve. And of course, as she mentioned, didn't feel like it was necessary to have the reference to the Human Rights Act in there, so that was removed. I just also want to say that -make sure that everybody understands that -- that the -- the schools themselves make the decision whether they want to offer sex education, so it's local control; number two, that the schools decide on the curriculum. They're going to have an array of curriculum that they can choose from. If they can't find a curriculum that they like, they obviously, again, do not have to offer it in their school. Also, that the curriculum -if a school decides to offer it, that the curriculum is going to be available to a parent or a guardian. They can preview it. They can look at it. They can make that decision whether they want their child to be -- to participate in that. And if they

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

don't want their child to be -- to participate, they can -- that child does not have to. The parent or guardian can make that decision. I think it's important to keep in mind that -- what we are trying to accomplish here and -- and I -- and that is that if you -- if you believe that our schools should teach comprehensive sex education, that it should be age-appropriate and that the curriculum emphasize abstinence and contraception with the goal to prevent unwanted pregnancy and STDs, then I would certainly urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

There was extensive debate on this bill. There are no speakers -- no additional speakers seeking recognition. Senator Steans, do you wish to close? Senator Steans.

SENATOR STEANS:

Thank you very much for the lively debate, everyone. I think Senator Sullivan did a terrific job wrapping up exactly what this bill does. There's been some suggestion that perhaps this isn't needed; that there's not a problem. Well, I'd like to give you the facts that suggest very much why this bill is needed. Nearly half of Illinois high school students have engaged in sexual intercourse at least once, but nearly forty percent of the teenagers did not use a condom during their last sexual encounter and only about a quarter used hormonal birth control. This is the reality. That's the facts. This is statewide. Over one-third of our -- of the new chlamydia and gonorrhea cases in Illinois in 2009 affected teenagers, a third of teenagers between fifteen and nineteen. Clearly, they're not getting all the information to make wise decisions they need. So there is clearly a problem. All of the best medical groups

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

suggest that we need to, in fact, provide comprehensive, developmentally appropriate and evidence-based sex education programs to make better -- help our youth make better decisions. The American Academy of Pediatrics encourages schools to begin sexuality education in the fifth or sixth grade as a component of comprehensive sex health education. The American Medical urges schools to implement comprehensive, Association developmentally appropriate sex education programs, so forth and That is why every single public health -- the Illinois Medical Society, all the organizations here in Illinois are supporting this bill. It's clearly the right information to be providing our kids. Additionally, our residents in this State believe we should be providing this education. Seventy-three percent of voters polled say they would be worried if they found out comprehensive sexual health education was not required in Illinois public schools. not even requiring it. This is just saying if we're doing it, it has to be comprehensive. A majority of voters think children and teens are not learning enough about sex education in public schools today. Sixty-four percent of voters polled say they would oppose teaching abstinence-only sex education. This is clearly a needed bill that's got the support of all of our medical experts, as well as the residents of this State. I very strongly urge an Aye vote. I also do this as a mother of three I want to make sure my kids have the information they appropriate, safe, healthy decisions for to make themselves. Please vote Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Thank you. The question is, shall House Bill 3027 pass.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, take the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 28 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. House Bill 3027, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your point.

SENATOR McCARTER:

Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to introduce Mayor Ricky Gottman from Vandalia. He's here today with his newly elected alderman, Neil Clark; his brother, B. John Clark; and Andy Lester. Give them a warm welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Will our guests from Vandalia please rise? Welcome to the Illinois Senate. Senator Haine, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR HAINE:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your point.

SENATOR HAINE:

After that stimulating debate, and in fact, the whole afternoon of stimulating debates, from motorcycles to sex education, I want to call the attention of the Chamber to two events which occurred today in history. In 700 A.D., the father

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

of English history, the Venerable Bede, a saint in the Anglican and Catholic calendars, died at a Benedictine monastery - the first person who organized a formal history of England, including the early stages of the common law. Secondly, I want to call attention of the Body to the fact that in 1926 on today's date, Miles Davis, the great American musician and composer, was born three blocks from where I live in the City of Alton, Illinois. And he is a great American and we should remember him tonight with a toast, as well as to the Venerable Bede. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Thank you, Senator Haine. Senator Murphy, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR MURPHY:

A point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your point.

SENATOR MURPHY:

I'd like to ask of Senator Haine what any of that has to do with William the Bastard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Murphy, have you concluded your remarks? If you were any more overexposed, Senator Murphy, you'd be a Kardashian. Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Purpose of an announcement, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your announcement.

SENATOR HUNTER:

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Immediately following caucus -- Session today, the Green Caucus will meet in Room 112 -- 122B today. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Thank you. The Green Caucus, 122B, immediately following the conclusion of our business here today. We will now continue on the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. House Bill 3034. Senator Wilhelmi. Madam Secretary, please read the bill. Senator Wilhelmi seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3034 to the Order of 2nd Reading. There being no objection, leave is granted. Now to the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 3034. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 1, offered by Senator Wilhelmi.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Wilhelmi, on Floor Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR WILHELMI:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The amendment tightens the licensing requirements under the Home Repair and Remodeling Act and gives teeth to those...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Excuse me. Could we...

SENATOR WILHELMI:

...requirements.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Excuse me, Senator. Could we hold the sidebar discussions down, especially in this row over here - the girlfriends? Thank you. Senator Wilhelmi, do you wish to proceed?

SENATOR WILHELMI:

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Yes. And I -- I'd be happy to discuss this further on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Thank you. Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Madam Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 3034. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 3034.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Wilhelmi.

SENATOR WILHELMI:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 3034 adds a new Section to the Home Repair and Remodeling Act that sets forth restrictions on contractors offering repairs following a catastrophe, which is defined as a natural occurrence, including but not limited to flood, drought, earthquake, tornado, windstorm, or hailstorm, which damages or destroys more than one residence. Specifically, the bill provides that a contractor offering home repair or remodeling services shall not advertise or promise to pay or rebate any portion of any insurance

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

deductible as an inducement to a sale; second, shall not accept any form of compensation in exchange for allowing an out-of-area contractor to use its business name or license; and, finally, shall include its Illinois State roofing contractor license name and number on all contracts, bids, and advertisements involving roofing work. We're trying to have -- have a bill that will ensure that storm chasers don't come -- come into our neighborhoods in the State of Illinois. We want to keep those storm chasers out of Illinois. I'd be happy to answer any questions and I ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Senator Pankau.

SENATOR PANKAU:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

...bill.

SENATOR PANKAU:

This is commonly known as the storm chaser bill. The sponsor has done a lot of work to put on a lot of additional things that will actually work and will actually make it better. And given that it appears that outside things have gotten very dark and stormy in fact, I urge an Aye vote on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Wilhelmi, do you wish to close? The question is, shall House Bill 3034 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

58 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 3034, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3036. President Pro Tem Harmon. 3036. Out of the record. House Bill 3038. Senator Harmon. Out of the record. House Bill 3184. Senator Harmon seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3184 to the Order of 2nd Reading. There being no objection, leave is granted. Now on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 3184. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 1, offered by Senator Harmon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd move for the adoption of Floor Amendment No. 1. It becomes the bill and I'd like to address it on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. On the Order now of 3rd Reading, House Bill 3184. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

House Bill 3184.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. As amended, House Bill 3184 is an initiative of Cook County Clerk David Orr and the County Clerks' Association. It cleans up the language with respect to marriage licenses to make sure that they would apply on parity with licenses for civil unions. It also gives authority to the county boards; the ability to set the license fee at an amount not to exceed seventy-five dollars and to control the fees for notary public recordation fees and the assumed name certificate filing fees. I'm not aware of any opposition. I ask for your Aye votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill, if I might.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

To the bill.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, just as a point of information, this bill authorizes the issuance of licenses for civil unions. It also allows for an increase in the fees to be charged for both marriage and civil union licenses. Right now, I believe, there are different caps in place depending on the size of the county. This bill would

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

raise that cap to seventy-five dollars if the county board chooses to implement that. And it can implement it anywhere between what the current level is up to seventy-five dollars, for those of you who -- who are wary of fee increases and other issues. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? President Pro Tem Harmon, do you wish to close? The question is, shall House Bill 3184 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 38 voting Aye, 17 voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 3184, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senator Hutchinson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please state your point.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

The hour is getting late and there was a surprise birthday party in a particular office of one of our constitutional officers and I just wanted to announce to the Senate that today is Dan Rutherford, our Treasurer's birthday. And since I said I was Chair of the "May Babies Caucus", it's my job to introduce everybody's birthday in May. So, happy birthday, Dan. We all wish you well. Thanks.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Thank you very much. House Bill 3188. Senator Frerichs. Out of the record. House Bill 3237. Senator Koehler. Senator Koehler seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3237 to the Order of 2nd Reading. There being no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of House -- on 2nd Reading, House Bill 3237. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 1, offered by Senator Koehler.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Koehler, on Floor Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Floor Amendment No. 1 removes all the opponents at this point. It's an agreed-upon bill. It does four things. It first states that a contractor or subcontractor must certify monthly payroll only during the months that work would be done -- that work on the project has occurred. The amendment also changes the penalty for payroll violations from a Class 4 felony to a Class A misdemeanor. And increases from three to seven days the number of days a contractor or subcontractor has to produce records for inspection. Finally, this amendment provides that anyone convicted or found guilty of violating Sections 5 or 6 of the Act is subject to disbarment for four years with no right to a hearing. As I said, this makes the bill agreed-upon and be happy to discuss it further on 3rd.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Cultra.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

SENATOR CULTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

To the bill.

SENATOR CULTRA:

I want to thank the sponsor for the amendment. This bill originally would -- was a -- a felony charge for paperwork violation, which would -- was -- would -- was terrible, and he's amended it so that now these paperwork violations are now a -- a Class A misdemeanor, and in some cases, that'll be an increased penalty from Class B. So, I just wanted to make the Body aware of that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any further discussion? Senator Koehler, do you wish to close? Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

...we adopted the amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

You're -- seeing no further discussion, all those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. On the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 3237. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 3237.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

I pretty much explained the bill when I explained the amendment. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Koehler, do you wish to close? The question is, shall House Bill 3237 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 36 voting Aye, 19 voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 3237, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3276. Senator Lauzen. Out of the record. House Bill 3285. Senator Jacqueline Collins. Out of the record. House Bill 3308. Senator Lauzen. Out of the record. House Bill 3329. Senator Muñoz. Leader Muñoz. Out of the record. House Bill 3371. Senator Wilhelmi. Out of the record. House Bill 3384. Senator Dillard. Senator Dillard seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3384 to the Order of 2nd Reading. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order now of 2nd Reading is House Bill 3384. Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 2, offered by Senator Dillard.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Senator Dillard, on Floor Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. This is really a technical amendment and just clarifies that when someone presents for recycling containers that are usually used for bringing soft drinks to grocery stores or retail outlets that they can continue to be paid in cash, if that's what they so desire. I'd move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. Amendment is adopted. Madam Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. On the Order now of 3rd Reading, House Bill 3384. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 3384.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. As I alluded, this bill deals with the recycling of these canisters that quart bottles of soft drinks are delivered to our local grocery stores

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

and retail outlets. And there has become, as the price of plastic has gone up, an incredible black market and recycling market for these containers. Each is worth at least two dollars apiece. And, for example, just one soft drink or beverage company that we have statistics for - just to show you the enormity of the amount of money we're talking about - Dr Pepper: Dr Pepper's about four to five percent of the soft drink market in the metropolitan Chicago area. Dr Pepper every year, has just four or five percent of the market, spends two million dollars a year on these recyclable containers that bring the drinks to our grocery stores. They lose about half of that, either to theft as they get piled up in the back of Jewel's, Osco's, Dominick's, Walgreens, wherever. People come and they -- they take these and they take them to the recycle center. And what this bill does is it says that for the recycler, if somebody is presenting more than five of these kinds of cases to 'em, they need to get the name and the address of who's bringing them. It is a way to -- to not stop a -- a young child from bringing one they find in the street to a recycler, but it's going to stop the black market of these things. And why do you want to stop that? You want stop it to hold down the price of soft drinks, which we, I just might throw in, recently started to tax in the State of Illinois. So if you're worried about what is being charged, we want to keep the prices down at our retail stores for soft drinks, you want to vote Aye. But this is brought to us by the soft drink association and I'd be happy to answer any questions. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Dillard, do you wish to close? The question is,

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

shall House Bill 3384 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, 1 voting Present. House Bill 3384, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3414. Leader Sullivan. John Sullivan. 3414. Out of the record. House Bill 3440. Senator Emil Jones. He wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 3440.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Emil Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Should be an amendment to the bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator, the committee amendment has already been adopted.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Please proceed.

SENATOR E. JONES:

House Bill 3440 retains the underlying bill and it removes all requirements that the schools must allow service dogs to accompany students with disabilities. The amendment instead requires that a -- reasonable accommodations must be sought for

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

these students. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Jones, seeing none, do you wish to close?

SENATOR E. JONES:

I just ask for a Aye vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Question is, shall House Bill 3440 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 55 voting Aye, 2 voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 3440, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3450. Senator Muñoz. Leader Muñoz. Out of the record. House Bill 3636. Senator Mulroe. Out of the record. With leave of the Body, we will return to the top of page 59 of your printed Calendar. House Bill -- House Bill 1576. Senator Koehler, do you wish to proceed? He wishes to proceed. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 1576.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Bill 1576 promotes the hiring practices that increases the

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

diversity of the workforce. The goal of this bill is to establish minimum testing standards in areas of mental aptitude, physical abilities to make sure that we're hiring qualified people as firefighters to protect our community. Beyond a local unit of government, they may customize their hiring process to meet the unique standards of the community. Additionally, statewide testing option includes language that encourages the Office of State Fire Marshal's Joint Labor and Management Committee to establish a program that markets firefighter occupation to unrepresented groups. I want to, in particular, thank the parties that negotiated this as a -- an agreed-upon bill, particularly the Municipal League and the Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois. I think it's a good bill and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Koehler -- I'm sorry. Senator Frerichs, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

SENATOR FRERICHS:

For question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

He indicates that he'll yield. Senator Frerichs.

SENATOR FRERICHS:

Senator Koehler, Amendment No. 3 allows the appointing authority to pass over the highest ranked person and appoint either any person who has a ranking in the top five percent of the register of eligibles or any who is among the top five highest ranked person on the list of eligibles if the number of people who have a ranking in the top five percent of the

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

register of eligibles is less than five people. For the purpose of legislative intent, does that mean any appointing authority may appoint from only the top five candidates or five percent of the total number of candidates on the list, whichever is greater, or may they appoint a candidate that's five places or five percent below the last person appointed?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

Yes, thank you for your question. Yes, the amendment allows -- only allows a local appointing authority to appoint from the top five percent of the total number of candidates on the list or the top five candidates as they appear on the list, whichever is greater.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Frerichs.

SENATOR FRERICHS:

Senator Koehler, the amendment allows the appointing authority to pass over the top person on the final eligibility list. What are the circumstances that would allow the appointing authority pass over the top person on the eligibility list?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Koehler.

SENATOR KOEHLER:

...Senator. The bill allows the appointing authority to pass over the highest ranked person if they can demonstrate that the candidate fails to meet the minimum standards for the position or if the appointing authority can demonstrate that an alternate

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

candidate would better serve the needs of the department. The intent is that the local appointing authority would promote the highest ranking person on the list unless they can provide a legitimate reason for passing over the candidate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Koehler, do you wish to close? The question is, shall House Bill 1576 pass. All those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 50 voting Aye, 4 voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 1576, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we will turn to page 58 on your printed Calendar, House Bills 2nd Reading. Bill -- House Bills 3rd Reading. House Bill 1233. Senator Emil Jones seeks leave of the Body to return to House Bill 1233. Seeing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order now of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 1233. Madam Secretary, have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

Floor Amendment 1, offered by Emil Jones.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Emil Jones, on Floor Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Yeah, Amendment No. 1 provides that a landlord is not responsible for changing the locks when it's four units or less and the landlord occupies one of the units in the building.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. Opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it. Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for -- are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration, Madam Secretary?

SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. On the Order now of House Bills 3rd Reading, House Bill 1233. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 1233.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Emil Jones, on House Bill 1233.

SENATOR E. JONES:

House Bill 1233 provides that a landlord is responsible for changing the locks of a rental unit that has been vacated prior to a new tenant moving in. The landlord will be held liable for any theft or damages from a theft that occurs as a result of the landlord's failure to change the locks. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Cultra, for what purpose do you seek recognition? SENATOR CULTRA:

Thank you. Would the sponsor yield?

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR CULTRA:

So this applies only to Cook County?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Emil Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

No, this is statewide.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Cultra.

SENATOR CULTRA:

So this is new legislation requiring anyone that has rental units above four to put new locks on every time the -- that -- that the apartment or the rental is changed?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Emil Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Cultra. Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I put my light on late. Thank you for recognizing me. I guess, Senator, if we might, I want to follow up on Senator Cultra's question. Our analysis indicates that -- that Amendment 1 made this applicable only to Cook County. Can we clarify? Are we talking about statewide or just Cook County?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Senator Emil Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Yes, that was my mistake, Senator Righter. Yes, it only applies to Cook County under Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Is there anything to this bill that applies to anywhere outside of Cook County?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Emil Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Murphy. Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Emil Jones, do you wish to close? The question is, shall House Bill 1233 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 56 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. House Bill 1233, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. We will now proceed to the Order of Supplemental Calendar No. 1, Secretary's Desk, Resolution. It's already been printed and distributed. Senate Resolution 220. Senator Hutchinson. Senator Hutchinson. Madam Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ROCK:

Senate Resolution 220, offered by Senator Hutchinson.

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Resolution 220 encourages further -- is in -- to encourage furthering the effort to create a comprehensive pavement preservation and maintenance plan in Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Hutchinson, do you wish to close? Senator Hutchinson.

SENATOR HUTCHINSON:

I would just ask for your support. This is a way for us to actually get a nice return on our investment in an -- in an infrastructure. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

The question is, shall Senate Resolution 220 pass. All those in favor will -- will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. Opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Senate Resolution 244. Senator Silverstein. Madam Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ROCK:

Senate Resolution 244, offered by Senator Silverstein.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. This renames a portion of Milwaukee Avenue from Albion to Gross Pointe Road the Seweryn Memorial Road.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution No. 30. Senator Martinez. Senator Martinez, do you wish to proceed? She does. Madam Secretary, please read the resolution.

SECRETARY ROCK:

Senate Joint Resolution 30, offered by Senator Martinez.

The Committee on State Government and Veterans Affairs adopted

Committee Amendments 1 and 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Joint Resolution 30, as amended, directs the State Housing Task Force to establish a Foreclosure Working Group. The Foreclosure Working Group will monitor the impact of foreclosure activity in Illinois communities and will develop recommendations for housing education and foreclosure prevention programs. The Working Group will submit its findings as an addendum to the Annual Comprehensive Housing Plan submitted by the State Housing Task Force to the Governor and General Assembly. And we were able to work out, through the amendments, some concerns that IBA had and -- and this is -- the proponents are the IHDA and the Spanish Coalition for Housing and the Metropolitan Planning Council, just to deal with some of the issues that are going on with foreclosures today. And I'll be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator McCarter.

SENATOR McCARTER:

To the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

To the resolution.

SENATOR McCARTER:

To the resolution, my apology. I just want to say that Senator Martinez listened to the objections of the Bankers Association and responded in -- with -- with everything that they had asked for. We're not creating a new task force. This is now a work group within an existing task force. And all of my concerns were addressed. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Is there any further discussion? Is there any further discussion? Senator Martinez, do you wish to close? Senator Martinez.

SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Thank you. And I just want to thank Senator Johnson, who gave me the idea about creating this -- to stop creating task forces but have people working from within. And I want to thank the other side of the aisle that I was able to take a few of the suggestions and make it a better bill and I want to just thank all. And I'll be happy -- and I ask for an Aye vote on this bill {sic}.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

As this resolution requires the expenditure of State funds, a roll call vote will be required. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

who wish? Madam Secretary, please take the record. On that question, there are 56 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. House Joint Resolution -- Senate Joint Resolution 30, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared adopted. The Order of Supplemental Calendar No. 1. Supplemental Calendar No. 1, House Bills 2nd Reading. House Bill 267. Senator Wilhelmi. Out of the record. House Bill 1095. Senator Althoff. Out of the record. Senator -- 1220. Senator Sandack. 1220. Senator Sandack. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 1220.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. House Bill 1226. Senator Wilhelmi. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 1226.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. House Bill 1258. Senator Noland. 1258. Out of the record. Senator Noland? With leave of the Body, we'll proceed to House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 1258. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

House Bill 1258.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. House Bill 1355. Senator Garrett. 1355. Senator Garrett. Senator Garrett. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 1355.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. House Bill... With leave of the Body, we'll return to House Bill 2934. House Bill 3039. Senator Lightford. Leader Lightford. Out of the record. House Bill 3390. Senator Mulroe. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 3390.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration,

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Madam Secretary?

SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. House Bill 3635. Majority Leader Clayborne.

3635. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 3635.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

Are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY ROCK:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SCHOENBERG)

3rd Reading. José Moré from the Chicago News Cooperative requests permission to take still photos of the proceedings. Seeing no objection, permission is granted. Senator Crotty in the Chair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Now on House Bill 2934. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY ROCK:

House Bill 2934.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Senator Schoenberg. Oh, 3rd Reading. The Committee of

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

{sic} (on) Assignments will be meeting in the President's Anteroom. If everyone would please go to the... Committee on Assignment members, please come to the President's Anteroom. And the Senate will stand at recess. We will be standing at ease. (at ease) Committee on Assignments, please go to the President's Anteroom. Please -- please join Senator Lightford. (at ease) Senate will come to order. Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ROCK:

Senator Clayborne, Chairman of the Committee on Assignments, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to the Executive Committee - Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 267, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 342, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 342, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 343, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 343, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 344, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 344, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 345, Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 345, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 171, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 175, Motion to Concur on House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 541, Motion to Concur on House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1035, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1234, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1364, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1386, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1578, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1607, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1740, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1741; refer to the Insurance Committee - Committee Amendment 2 to House Bill 1577 and

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

Committee Amendment 3 to House Bill 1577; refer to the State Government and Veterans Affairs Committee - Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 178, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 90, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 153, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 840, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1270, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1321, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1584, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1623, Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2064 and Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2064 and Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 2106; and Be Approved for Consideration - Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 1095 and Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 1197.

Signed by Senator James F. Clayborne, Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Ladies and Gentlemen, the following committees will be meeting to take up Floor amendments: Tonight, the Executive Committee will meet in Room 212 at 6:35. Senator Steans, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR STEANS:

Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I move to waive all posting requirements so that SJR 35 can be heard in the Senate Committee on Human Services on Thursday, May 26, at 8:45 a.m.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

President Steans moves to waive all -- Senator Steans moves to waive all posting requirements so that Senate Joint Resolution 35 can be heard in Senate Committee on Human Services

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

on Thursday, May 26, at 8:45 a.m. All in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the motion is adopted. Senator Muñoz, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Purpose of announcement, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

State your announcement.

SENATOR MUÑOZ:

Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of -- Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I move to waive all posting requirements so that the Appointment Messages 61, 68 can be heard in the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments - sorry about that, Madam President - Messages 61 through 68 can be heard in the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments on Monday, May 30th, at 9:01 a.m.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Senator Muñoz moves to waive all posting requirements so that -- so that Appointment Messages 61 through 68 can be heard in the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments on Monday, May 30th, at 9:01 a.m. All in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the motion is adopted. Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Madam President. Inquiry of the Chair, if I might, first.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

State your inquiry.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Madam President, I -- I don't know if you've had an

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

opportunity to review the most recent report issued by the Committee on Assignments, but if you haven't, I can tell you that probably ninety to ninety-five percent of the workload that was kicked out by the Assignments on -- or, the Committee on Assignments has been assigned to two committees, the Executive Committee and the Committee on State Government and Veterans Affairs. Do you know how many Members of the Senate serve on both of those committees?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

If I'm not mistaken, I think two.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Do you know who they are?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

You're one of them.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Who's the other?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Would it be me?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Yeah, I'm glad that you're willing to share the workload with me, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

I look forward to spending more time with you, too, Senator.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Thank you. The feeling is very mutual. Thank you. Second matter, if I might, Madam President. The Senate Republicans would request a caucus in Leader Radogno's Office immediately upon adjournment. We anticipate to take an hour,

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

which is the time you need for the posting notice anyway. So we'll see you in committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR CROTTY)

Senate Republicans -- thank you. That's always in order. Absolutely, Senator. After today's committee meeting, we will be coming back for Floor action. So the Senate will stand in recess to the call of the Chair. After committee meetings, the Senate will reconvene to receive committee reports and further Floor action. The Senate stands at recess.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Senate will come to order. Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

SECRETARY ROCK:

Senator Delgado, Chairperson of the Committee on Public Health, reports House Bill 143 Do Pass, as Amended.

Senator Harmon, Chairperson of the Committee on Executive, reports Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 263, Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 342, Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 343, Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 344 and Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 345 recommended Do Adopt.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

Madam Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY ROCK:

A Message from the House by Mr. Mahoney, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the

52nd Legislative Day

5/25/2011

passage of a bill of the following title, to wit.

Senate Bill 1794.

Together with the following amendment which is attached, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Amendment 2.

We have received like Messages on Senate Bill 1798, with House Amendment 2; Senate Bill 1824, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 1669 {sic} (1996), with House Amendment 3; Senate Bill 2082, with House Amendments 1 and 3; Senate Bill 2236, with House Amendment 1; Senate Bill 2268, with House Amendment 2. They all passed the House, as amended, May 25th, 2011. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

A Message from the House by Mr. Mahoney, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has passed a bill of the following title, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Bill 306.

It passed the House, May 25th, 2011. Mark Mahoney, Clerk of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR MUÑOZ)

There being no further business to come before the Senate, the Senate stands adjourned until the hour of 12 p.m. on the 26th day of May, 2011. The Senate stands adjourned.