63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Speaker Turner: "Members are asked to be at their seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Pastor of Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

"Let us pray. Most gracious Crawford: omnipotent God You are, who art the giver and the sustainer of our lives, we invoke Your blessings and presence upon this august assembly. We pray Your strength and Your blessings upon the Leader of this House as well as upon all of its Members. May they, during these tough and most Father, lean not toward their own difficult times, understanding, but Father, I pray they would ask for Your direction, that they ask for Your wisdom to direct their paths. I pray that You would grant them the grace to be bold, to be courageous as well as to be wise. I pray, Father, that their decisions bring a calm to the many fears and the many uncertainties that many in this wonderful state are feeling. I pray, Father, today that their willingness to compromise will restore the face and the confidence that the people have in this august assembly, and may it bring healing and peace across this great land and amongst Your great people. This we pray in Your Son's name, Amen."

Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands,

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

- one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Turner: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Bradley, Franks and Jones are excused today."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Pritchard and Tracy are excused on the Republican side of the aisle today."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 present, a quorum is established. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 1816, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. First Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Zalewski: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Sir."
- Zalewski: "I brought down reinforcements for the long week ahead. I have Henry Zalewski with me. He's prepared to do the work of the people. So, he's glad to be here in Springfield."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome. Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Sir."
- Bost: "Well, I'm blessed today. You know, last week I had my son with me. I've got my youngest daughter and her husband...

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Kaitlin and her husband, Chad and Tinley and Lilly and Sydney and Wiley are all with me today along with my... along with their grandmother or Yaya as they like to call her, Tracy. And if you could welcome them to the floor today."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Representative Fine."

Fine: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Ma'am."

Fine: "Thank you. I'd like to welcome to the floor today my whole family, my two sons, Jeremy and Jacob and my husband, Michael."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Representative Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Sir."

Unes: "I, too, would like to welcome my entire family to the House Floor with me today, my wife, Natalie, my daughters, Megan and Michelle and my sons, Nathan and Nicholas."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Members, we will begin on page 3 of the Calendar with Senate Bills on Third Reading beginning with Senate Bill 105, Representative Phelps. Out of the record. Senate Bill 628, Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 628, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 628 represents an important step in the efforts of the Members of the House of Representatives to identify and establish a permanent source of funding to improve the regulations of hospitals and ensure high

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

This Bill established a long overdue quality care. licensing fee of \$55 per bed. The proceeds of which will be dedicated to funding essentially the regulations of these facilities and to monitor the quality of care. The Hospital Association reports that the hospitals support this legislation. These proceeds will be deposited into a new hospital licensing fund which will be allocated for the administration of the licensure program and patients' safety and quality initiatives for hospitals including, without limitations, the implementation of the Adverse Care Event Reporting Act which was passed back in 2005. Thirty dollars of these fees will be supported... will go to support and implement the Adverse Health Care Event reporting and the remaining \$25 will be used to implement the rational and the progressive complaint investigation process. The fee will generate an estimated \$2 million. I know of no opposition to the Bill and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Osmond: "Representative, just so we can make this clear, I do support this Bill. The Hospital Association is in support of this Bill, is that not correct?"

Flowers: "You are correct, Representative Osmond. They are..."

Osmond: "And basically, this is a fee per bed and that money will be accumulated into a fund that is separate from other funds. And could you just tell one more time how this fund will be spent?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Flowers: "Thirty dollars of the fee will support the implementation of a Bill that was passed back in 2005 named the Adverse Health Care Event Reporting Law. And the remaining \$25 will be used to implement the complaints in the investigation progress as a result that people may have of their experience in the hospitals."

Osmond: "So, basically, this is for more security and making sure that the proper procedures are in place."

Flowers: "Absolutely, Representative. This is patient protection as well as hospital protection."

Osmond: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sacia: "Representative Flowers, I was trying to read through quickly and I see that there was some related legislation of yours, I think it was House Bill 3148. At that time, it made reference to beds in nursing homes as well. Does this affect beds in nursing homes in any way?"

Flowers: "Representative, I am glad you asked. The Bill clarifies the long-term acute care hospitals and psychiatric and rehabilitation hospitals may opt out of having an emergency department. These facilities must still comply with federal emergency care requirements and provide public notice of their status. Any facility that does not exercise this option cannot call itself a hospital."

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Sacia: "Thank you, Representative. Regretfully, I heard most of what you said, but is it fair to say that nursing homes are exempted?"

Flowers: "You're correct."

Sacia: "Okay. Thank you very much. But we are still creating a fee, correct?"

Flowers: "Absolutely."

Sacia: "Okay."

Flowers: "A fee to protect the hospitals and a fee to investigate the complaints of the hospital. There are some events that has occurred in the hospitals that never should've happened. And it's one thing to have the investigation and to have it sit on the shelf; it's another thing for that information to be talked about and shared, so whatever that event was it will never happen again."

Sacia: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Kosel: "I am reading the actual legislation here and I'm having difficulty finding any language in here that prevents this fund from being swept. Is that language in here and have I just missed it?"

Flowers: "Representative, there's laws and rules in place in regards to the sweep of funds, so this Bill does not address that issue."

Kosel: "The laws that we seem to have seem to be the laws that say you can sweep any fund that's out there..."

Flowers: "I think there's..."

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Kosel: "...and so that's what my concern is."

Flowers: "I think..."

Kosel: "If you're going to do something with these good intentions, there is no language in here that prevents sweeps."

Flowers: "Representative, I don't… once again, this Bill has nothing to do with fund sweeps and I cannot… I don't have that information in front of me now, but there is some protection in regards to being able to sweep the funds."

Kosel: "Thank you very much. To the Bill. So, here we have another fee and another fund that someone will look at and decide that they can sweep and use for their own purposes. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Harris, D.: "Representative, in looking at this Bill, I under...

I think I understand your intent. You want to make sure that if an incident happens at a hospital that that incident is properly investigated. You exclude from payment of this fee, I believe, rehabilitation hospitals and psychiatric hospitals. Is that correct?"

Flowers: "That is correct."

Harris, D.: "Couldn't there very well be and as a matter of fact, potentially, even to a greater extent be some sort of adverse incident at a psychiatric hospital or a rehabilitation hospital with a caregiver who... who violates a patient in a psychiatric hospital or a rehabilitation hospital?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Flowers: "Representative, these hospitals, they're under a different Act; and so, therefore, it's not applicable."

Harris, D.: "They may be under a different Act, but they don't have to pay the fee, correct?"

Flowers: "That is correct."

Harris, D.: "Okay. And..."

Flowers: "They still have to comply with federal emergency care requirement and give public notice as their status."

Harris, D.: "Well, but they're not... they don't have to comply with the Federal Emergency Medical Treatment Act and Labor Act, otherwise known as EMTALA, unless they opt out of being a psychiatric hospital, rehabilitation hospital or long-term acute care hospital."

Flowers: "You're correct."

Harris, D.: "So, they have to change their status. Regarding the fee, the fee is \$55 per bed?"

Flowers: "You're correct."

Harris, D.: "So, that's a fee of \$55 per bed on every hospital in the State of Illinois that... unless they are one of these three categories of hospitals, correct?"

Flowers: "I'm sorry. I..."

Harris, D.: "That is \$55 per bed for every hospital in the State of Illinois..."

Flowers: "And there..."

Harris, D.: "...correct?"

Flowers: "You are correct and there are no objections from any of the hospitals in the State of Illinois in regards to this fee."

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Harris, D.: "Right. So, this is in addition to the assessment that they're already paying."

Flowers: "There is no opposition to this legislation."

Harris, D.: "No, I'm sure there isn't from the Hospital Association, but this is in addition to the assessment that they're already paying."

Flowers: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "Okay. So, \$55. Is that \$55 per year, per month or how often is that \$55 assessed?"

Flowers: "It's \$55 per year."

Harris, D.: "Fifty-five dollars per year. So, as an example, I sit on the board of a major hospital in suburban Cook County that... it's a 600-bed hospital. Now, at any given time only 75 percent, perhaps 80 percent, of those beds, if they're lucky, are filled. So, there are 20 to 25 percent or more of the beds that are not filled, but nonetheless, they're still paying the \$55 fee. As I did a quick multiplication for a 625-bed hospital which is a big hospital that's roughly \$34 thousand a year. They could probably sustain a \$34 thousand a year hit, but it's \$34 thousand a year in addition to the assessment that they're already paying. I have a concern about that, and Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill, if I may. I do understand what the Lady is trying to do, but I would come back and say she's excluding three types of hospitals where it is quite possible where there might be a patient who is harmed in a rehabilitation hospital or a psychiatric hospital that that incident needs to be looked at very closely. And even though the Hospital Association is not opposed to this

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Bill, it is an additional cost in every hospital in the State of Illinois and for that reason I'm not going to support the Bill. And I urge you to look very closely at it. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Moffitt: "Representative, how much is this projected to generate per year?"

Flowers: "According to... I'll get that information for you shortly, Representative."

Moffitt: "Okay. I would appreciate that. Secondly, the Hospital Association, are they actually a proponent or are they simply neutral?"

Flowers: "There's no opposition to the Bill. It is my understanding, Representative, that this fee is expected to... is expected to bring in \$2 million. It's projected to bring in about \$3 million."

Moffitt: "Three million annually?"

Flowers: "That's correct."

Moffitt: "And you said the hospitals are neutral or are they a proponent?"

Flowers: "They are a proponent of this legislation."

Moffitt: "And back to the prior question about... from another Legislator about sweeping. That is certainly a concern. Are you looking at doing a trailer Bill to prohibit sweeping this fund?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Flowers: "In regards to the fund sweep, Representative, I think and I'm not sure, I'll be more than happy to work with you on a trailer Bill."

Moffitt: "I would just be a lot more comfortable if the language was already in there. The grim sweeper hits pretty hard there at the... as the budget goes together so."

Flowers: "I'm sorry?"

Moffitt: "I say the grim sweeper is always grabbing funds, so I'd feel more comfortable if it had language prohibiting it. Thank you for your response."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "Now, Representative, who's going to pay this fee?"

Flowers: "The hospitals are going to pay the fee."

Kay: "The hospital is going to pay the fee?"

Flowers: "That is correct."

Kay: "So, Medicaid pays that fee then?"

Flowers: "Pardon me."

Kay: "I'm sorry. Speaker, I can't hear."

Speaker Turner: "Members, Ladies and Gentlemen, I know we have many guests in the chamber today, but can we please keep the noise level down. It is becoming increasingly difficult to hear the debate. Thank you."

Kay: "Let me go back on that, Representative. Who pays the fee that you're advocating here in this piece of legislation?"

Flowers: "The hospital will pay the fee."

Kay: "Okay. And so, in many cases, the hospital fee will come
from Medicaid or Medicare?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Flowers: "It will come from the hospitals."

Kay: "Well, who pays the hospital? That's my... that's where I'm
trying to..."

Flowers: "Well, it could be the insurance company, private pay, Medicare, Medicaid."

Kay: "So, the patient actually could pay then. Is that correct,
 if it's an insurance policy?"

Flowers: "This is... patients do pay their insurance premiums."

Kay: "I understand that. I'm just trying to get clear in my mind where the payment is coming from because then I want to find out how much we're talking about, but..."

Flowers: "The most important..."

Kay: "...if an insurance company pays the claims and I buy the insurance, then I'm paying for the claim. I'm paying the \$55 for this fund you'd like to create. Is that correct?"

Flowers: "Can you repeat that, please?"

Kay: "Yeah. Well, if I have an insurance policy that I've purchased then that \$55 really is being paid by my insurance company based on the premiums that I pay."

Flowers: "Well, you know, Representative, I'm going to be quite honest with you. We passed The Ratio Act in regards to insurance and we said that the insurance company had to spend at least 80 percent of what they bring in, in regards to patient care. Now, if you want to say that's a part of it, that is the law. That is the law today. That has nothing to do with this Bill, this legislation, but since you brought up the subject matter about the insurance paying for it, that is what they're supposed to do."

Kay: "Yeah. Okay."

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Flowers: "Eighty percent of their premiums is supposed to go for patient care."

Kay: "Okay. So, we have a scenario where the hospital could pay, Medicare could pay, an individual could pay through a policy or a corporation could pay through a group policy. I get that now. So, let me ask this question. How many incidents do we have per 100 thousand people that we need to look into in the State of Illinois?"

Flowers: "Well, I'll tell you this much, Representative. If it's one of your loved ones, it's one too many because too many medical errors. A report that was put out not too long ago that says 99 thousand people die a year in hospitals because of medical errors, because of incidents that never should've happened. And what has happened is instead of the hospitals sharing what the problem was that caused the death of that patient they have quietly put it on the shelf for fear of being sued."

Kay: "Okay. Let me..."

Flowers: "This legislation would allow them to discuss and disseminate that information and not worry about being sued. This is about patient safety."

Kay: "Sure. I... sure, sure, sure."

Flowers: "This is to make sure that we learn from our errors..."

Kay: "Sure."

Flowers: "...and not cause the death of so many patients in the State of Illinois."

Kay: "How many... how many incidents per 1 thousand of cases that are not addressed do you think we're dealing with here because everyone is concerned about one case, but how many

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

cases out of a thousand do you think we're dealing with here?"

Flowers: "Well, you know, this is something that I discovered long time ago, Representative, back in 2005 when I passed the Patient Adverse Reporting Law, dead people cannot speak. And as a result, I told you once before that the hospitals were not reporting the medical errors; so therefore, I'm not at liberty to give you the right answer to your question because I don't know how many people have died. We do know about the high profile people who may have died because of the medical errors. One of the board members of the <u>Sun-Times</u> newspaper was one. So, how many more since then, how many more before then, I have no idea."

Kay: "Yeah."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay, can you please bring your remarks to a close?"

Kay: "Well, I will. One more question and then I think I will close. I think Representative Harris asked you how much money this would take in, in the aggregate, and I didn't hear that number. Can you repeat that for me, please?"

Flowers: "Maybe 3 million."

Kay: "And that's based on the number of beds, the number of
incidents?"

Flowers: "It is based on the number of beds that we have."

Kay: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This is just a, I guess, another attempt to gen up money and the truth of the matter is, that it's either going to come from some other pocket beside ours. I mean,

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

the individual will pay, the corporation will pay. In some cases, Medicare is going to pay. And I, frankly, don't see... considering we don't know the nature and extent of the problem, I don't see the need nor necessity to be doing this. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers to close."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill creates the State Treasurer... the Hospital Licensing Fund. The purpose of this fund is to provide funding for the administration of the licensure program and patient safety and quality initiative for hospitals including the implementation of the Illinois Health Care Event Reporting Law which passed in 2005. This law that passed in 2005 has never had the requisite funds to be implemented. The Illinois Hospital Association believe that this fee is necessary to prevent never should've happened events within the hospital facility. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. There is no opposition to Senate Bill 628, no opposition. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 628 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourself. Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunkin. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 41 voting 'yes', 69 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Representative Flowers. The Bill fails. Mr. Clerk."

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2013: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 for Senate Bill 1307, Floor Amendment #2 for Senate Bill 1912 and Floor Amendment #3 for Senate Bill 2371."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Harris, D.: "A question of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "Please state your inquiry."
- Harris, D.: "I noticed that we have three pages of Senate Bills on Third Reading. And I also noticed in our Calendar that the Third Reading deadline was last Friday. So, I'm assuming it's safe to say that every one of these Bills has had its deadline extended. And I notice the Clerk shaking his head."
- Speaker Turner: "Yes, Sir. That's correct."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you very much. It maybe would've been nice to have worked a little harder and gotten all these done ahead of time, but I guess we'll do them now. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Turner: "Senate Bill 1044, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1044, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill makes several changes in the Civil Practice Act relative to collecting judgments and the changes that were made benefit

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

not only creditors, but also save the debtors' money as well in terms of interest, court cost, et cetera. I would ask your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall...

Representative Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Lang: "Yes."

Reis: "Representative, I noticed there was quite a bit of opposition to this in committee and we just want to make sure that some people know what's actually in this Bill and you carefully really didn't say what was in the Bill."

Lang: "Well, Mr. Reis, just so you know, the opposition was taken care of by the Amendment."

Reis: "Opposition in votes or opposition in... from associations?"

Lang: "Well, there was some concern about an area of the Bill called Revival of Judgment and the Amendment changed it in the way that the committee asked me to."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang to close."

Lang: "Appreciate your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1044 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 97 voting 'yes', 13 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1044, having received the

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1456, Representative Moffitt. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1456, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1456 is now an agreed Bill. The language that was in Amendment 1 language that was from the Associated Firefighters. When it left committee, they... we said we work out with them language, so that's agreed. Amendment #2, the Municipal League had opposed. Amendment 2 was tabled. That removed the opposition and we have a letter from the Municipal League indicating that they have removed their opposition. So, if you heard from them, I'll be happy to read this letter that was dated May 23. It says they no longer have a position on this Bill. They removed their opposition with tabling Amendment #2. This is an initiative of the Illinois Association of Fire Protection Districts. The language does not apply to municipal departments only the fire districts and it would be a very small percentage of them. In districts that have 12 or more full-time employees, the members... they must appoint individuals on to a board of fire commissioners which deal with labor issues. And with the changes that we made then, no opposition. This brings clarity to who... what the qualifications are to serve on this board of fire commissions. The language was vague in the past and this takes it down into a political... no more than two from one Party. Chairman Rita Mayfield has the

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

information on that and knows that the opposition's been removed. Be happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you. To the Bill. I chair Police & Fire Public Safety Committee and Representative Moffitt is correct. All opposition has been removed from this Bill. I did speak with Joe Schatteman from the Illinois Municipal League and he did confirm that with the tabling of the Amendment all opposition is removed. The initial underlying Bill is the language from the Associated Firefighters. This is a good Bill. We liked it in committee as originally presented. And I'm recommending an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt to close."

Moffitt: "Thank you. Now that we've worked out to where it's an agreed Bill, I would ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1456 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 110 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1456, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1458, Representative Phelps. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1458, a Bill for an Act concerning utilities. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an initiative of ICC. All it does is

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

simplifies the process to give an alternative resolution to the process of pipeline safety violations. It's an agreed Bill with the Illinois Energy Association. It passed the Senate 54 to 0 and I ask for its 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1458 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1458, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1493, Representative Sullivan. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1568, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1568, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1568 would amend the Illinois Wage Payment and Collection Act. It will allow the Department of Labor to establish an administrative procedure and adjudicate claims of any amount under the Wage Payment and Collection Act. Currently, it's limited to \$3 thousand and then the Attorney General would have to... would have to have an informal review of that. That's proved ineffective. The Attorney General is in favor of this Bill, I understand, as well as the Department of Labor. I know of no opposition."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

Kay: "Will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield?"

Kay: "Jay, one question on your Bill here that I didn't ask in committee, but I know that there's an administrative procedure you want to set up here to get things rolling, so to speak, to a settlement. Does this preclude any of the parties from going to a court of law if they're unhappy with the settlement process?"

Hoffman: "No, it does not."

Kay: "Good. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "I just ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1568 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1568, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1639, Representative Zalewski. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1655, Representative Sims. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1655, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1655, as amended by House Amendment #1, amends the Real Estate License Act to make several clarifying and cleanup changes. It's a... it's an initiative of the Illinois Association of Realtors. It passed the

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Senate 48 to 0. I know of no opposition and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1655 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', O voting 'no' and O voting 'present', Senate Bill 1655, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1718, Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1718, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1718 is a clarification of happy hour prohibitions. It's a law that's being applied and it's a clarification pursuant to some recommendations of some parties. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1718 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Tryon. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 74 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1718, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1791, Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1791, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1791 contains language agreed upon between the Illinois Student Assistance Commission and the Golden Apple Foundation. The Bill clarifies expectation for the administration of the Golden Apple Scholars of Illinois and it stipulates the various administrative functions provided for the cleanup language. And I know of no opposition to the Bill and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1791 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1791, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1842, Representative Beiser. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1843, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, can you please move Senate Bill 1843 back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1843, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman."

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

- Hoffman: "Yes. This is a cleanup Amendment. This is an initiative of the Illinois Probation and Court Services Association. It's a technical Amendment. The additional language clarifies that a transfer case originating in another state under the Interstate Compact for Juveniles probation fees may not be imposed if permitted by the Interstate Commission for Juveniles. May only be imposed if permitted by the Interstate Commission for Juveniles."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1843. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1844, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk... Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1844, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Yes. This is also an initiative of the Illinois Probation and Court Services Association. It amends the Juvenile Court Act by providing that a person who is 18 years of age or older will have a petition of delinquency filed against them may get confined in a detention center with adults rather than a juvenile detention center facility for 30 days or less. In making this determination, the court shall consider the following facts: the age of the person, previous delinquent or criminal history, previous history of abuse or neglect and any mental history

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

and any educational history. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, what's the standard right now? What are the juvenile courts doing now?"

"Under the current law, if a court finds that a minor is quilty of being a delinquent minor the court then sets a date for a sentencing hearing and may also impose some presentencing requirements where appropriate. presentencing requirements for these minors includes, but not limited to, placing them on probation conditional discharge, requiring them to undergo substance abuse assessment, place them on electric home confinement or placing them in a detention center for 30 days or less. Currently, the detention of a minor must take place in a juvenile detention home and the minor must be at least 10 years of age. This... there is nothing in the current law dealing with those juveniles that have reached 18 years of age who have a petition of delinquency filed against them."

Reboletti: "And so, this would set out the standards for the courts to follow then?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "I ask for a favorable Roll Call. I know of no opposition."

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1844 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Gabel, Rosenthal, Schmitz, Verschoore. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 100 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1844, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1872, Representative Zalewski. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1884, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1884, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill is the extension of advance deposit wagering. As you know, this sunsetted on December 31 and created a real mess. It took all spring to negotiate this. This Bill is the product of those negotiations. Aside from continuing ADW, it has an additional sunset date of January 31, 2014 and has distributions of the funds just as the previous ADW Bill did. I would ask your support."

Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Harris, D.: "Representative, there is a second part of this Bill, is there not?"

Lang: "I didn't hear your question, Sir."

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

- Harris, D.: "There is a second part of this Bill, is there not?"
- Lang: "Well, why don't you... I'm not sure what you mean, Sir."
- Harris, D.: "Doesn't this Bill also make a transfer from a...

 from the gaming fund for the... that was supposed to be
 reserved for the Horse Racing Equity Fund and Chicago State
 University. Is that not part of this Bill?"
- Lang: "Well, as I said, it deals with transfers and disbursements, yes."
- Harris, D.: "Well, let's look at the... Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. Let's look at the transfers and disbursements in detail if I can for a moment. When the tenth license was issued the Horse Racing Equity Fund and Chicago State University were supposed to receive a fee from the proceeds of that ten license... that tenth license. And because the Comptroller of the State of Illinois has said, well, I can't make the transfer because it says 'shall pay' instead of 'shall transfer' that money has never been transferred. How much money is in these respective funds? In the Horse Racing Equity Fund right now there is \$109 million that's supposed to go to horse racing, \$109 million supposed to go to horse racing. There's \$14 million that's supposed to go to Chicago State University, \$14 million supposed to go to Chicago State University. How much of the transfers occur here in this Bill? Twenty-three million dollars of that 109 goes to the Horse Racing Equity Fund; 1.4 or 1.5 of that 14 million that was scheduled for the Chicago State University actually goes to Chicago State University. Here's my point. The state made a deal with the horse racing industry and

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

with Chicago State University at the time that the tenth license was issued. And they said we're going to cut you in on certain fees and because those fees have not been transferred over the past decade or more, there is now more than \$120 million that should be going to either the Horse Racing Equity Fund or Chicago State University. Instead, about 25 million is going to go to those two entities. Now, we need the advance deposit wagering and I know the horse industry wants advanced deposit wagering. understand that. But I'm here to tell you when you make a deal with the state they ought to uphold the deal, okay? They ought to uphold the deal. The horse racing industry is giving up \$80 million and this is the deal. If we don't take the 23 million we won't get anything, okay? Well, guess what, you're giving up \$80 million and Chicago State University is giving up \$12 million because they made a deal with the state. Boy, I'll tell you, if that's not a bad partner to make a deal with there isn't a worse one. The Horse Racing Equity Fund and Chicago State University should get the money to which they are entitled not the money... the paltry sums in the scheme of things... that they're going to get under this Bill and notwithstanding advance deposit wagering which is an important element and the horse racing industry needs it, they're being held hostage. On this Bill, I recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

- Bellock: "Representative Lang, following up on Representative Harris's question, was this the lawsuit that went on for years and years and years after the Rosemont Casino license failed?"
- Lang: "Well, there was definitely a lawsuit involving these dollars, Representative, yes."
- Bellock: "Didn't it go on for 8 or 10 years?"
- Lang: "It went on a while. I don't have the exact length of time, but it did."
- Bellock: "So, in the end, the horse racing industry, even though they are in support of this Bill, again, what Representative Harris said is, after all that time and they were given that amount of money, they now are only receiving like a tenth of that money?"
- Lang: "Representative, this was not foisted upon them. There was a long, long, long, drawn-out debate and negotiation over this. The horsemen support this Bill."
- Bellock: "Yeah, I see that."
- Lang: "And you know my history on this floor. There isn't any Legislator in this House who supports the horse racing industry more than I do. They signed off on this. This is a proposal they are for. Where does the rest of the money go? It goes to capital projects to build schools. They are for that. And so, those of us who support the horse racing industry and the horsemen in particular ought to be for this Bill."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'm going to support this Bill 'cause I support the horse racing industry, but I'm disappointed that even though I

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

support schools also, but that the horse racing industry does not get more of that money after they waited so many years for that settlement. I think that was almost 10 years and I know it's important to them for the advance deposit wagering, but... and I will support the Bill, but I want to make it... everybody aware of how much money that they were given in that settlement and how little they are going to receive. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To... will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sullivan: "Representative, right now this fund is building up because we cannot disburse the money. Is that correct?"

Lang: "That's correct, Sir."

Sullivan: "And so, because of that the horse racing industry is getting absolutely nothing."

Lang: "They've gotten zero."

Sullivan: "So, they've gotten zero money and now they want this Bill 'cause they're going to get \$23 million and we're going to divide up the rest to actually build schools?"

Lang: "That's our plan, Sir."

Sullivan: "Okay. So, every horse racing association: Arlington Park, Maywood, Balmoral, the Horsemen's Benevolent Protective Association, they're all in favor of this, right?"

Lang: "They are, Sir."

Sullivan: "And in regard to Chicago State, it's my understanding that they're actually going to get less money now than the previous Bill."

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Lang: "That's correct, but the percentage they're going to get out of this fund is exactly the same percentage the horsemen are going to get out of this fund. So, there's some equity here."

Sullivan: "There's equity, but for those that maybe not want to give Chicago State some money, they're actually getting less than what they would've otherwise."

Lang: "That's correct, Sir."

Sullivan: "Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you want to help the horsemen, we have to pass this Bill. It really comes down to that. Without a change, they will get nothing. That's why they're for this. That's why we must pass it today. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Davis, M.: "Representative Lang, my question is in reference to the number of... how many years ago was that agreement made in which some gaming funds would be going to Chicago State? How many years ago was that?"

Lang: "It's a long time, Representative."

Davis, M.: "Was it 10 years?"

Lang: "I don't have the date, but it's a long time."

Davis, M.: "And why... do you know why those dollars were supposed to go to Chicago State?"

Lang: "'Cause Chicago State needed the money and I supported it."

Davis, M.: "Well, I think it was even deeper than that. I think it was the fact that we were passing riverboat laws.

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Chicago's community would participate in earning money for other communities and this was a way to see that some of those dollars did return to Chicago. That was the reason for that deal."

Lang: "Fair enough."

- Davis, M.: "So, it's kind of disappointing to know that that has been reduced to just \$1 million per year of the incoming funds. It's just... it really is not fair."
- Lang: "Well, Representative, if you look at it in terms of absolute dollars, you might conclude that, but what is happening here is they're getting the same percentage the horsemen are out of the same fund."
- Davis, M.: "That's this time. But you're taking the money they have previously earned and you're doing something else with it. You say you're going to build schools, right?"

Lang: "Yes."

- Davis, M.: "I know you won't be building them in my neighborhood or my community because, don't forget, we have underutilization and they're closing schools. So, we know that money won't be used to build in that community. Am I right?"
- Lang: "I think that's probably incorrect. So, this is going into a fund for school infrastructure to affect the entire State of Illinois. I certainly am not going to decide where their schools are built and neither are you."
- Davis, M.: "But you and I both know, Representative Lang, it's been all over the newspapers that because of and I quote, 'underutilization' schools are being closed. So, it would

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

be kind of disingenuous to say, well, now we're going to build schools in that neighborhood."

Lang: "Well..."

Davis, M.: "Now, if you tell me it's for infrastructure of those buildings, I might say okay, but don't pretend that you're going to build in that community..."

Lang: "Well, I..."

Davis, M.: "...because you're not."

Lang: "Representative, this is the product of negotiation. I'm not going to decide where those schools are being built and by the way..."

Davis, M.: "Hold it, hold it, hold it. Negotiations with whom?"

Lang: "Negotiations with people in the horse racing industry about how to do divide this \$100 million."

Davis, M.: "Was anyone else in the room besides you and the horse racing industry?"

Lang: "I... I don't know, don't remember."

Davis, M.: "You'll have to start writing those things down, Mr. Lang. I'll probably support this Bill against my better judgment, but it's really a very unjust situation that has occurred and I hope, I hope it doesn't happen again. It's a crim... it's almost criminally unjust."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang to close."

Lang: "Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1884 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 90 voting 'yes', 18 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1884, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 1852, Representative Reboletti. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1852, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the Body. 1852 helps us to be in compliance with People v. Contreras which would allow information that one officer has to be imputed to another police officer if a suspect were to cross a jurisdiction... if there was probable cause in one jurisdiction and the police officer saw it, he could call ahead and that officer who received the phone call could then make an arrest because they have the probable cause to do so through this language. I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Bost: "Yeah. I understand that this is a very important vote and I know you wanted to work and get it through, but it kind of got skipped over a while ago. Was there a problem or something you were still working on?"

Reboletti: "Nothing we're working on at this point. It certainly hasn't caused any type of Armageddon to the criminal justice system."

Bost: "That's important."

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti to close."

Reboletti: "Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1852 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 108 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1852, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1898, Representative Fine. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1898, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. SB1898 is an important Bill to protect anyone injured in a car accident. In 1989, the General Assembly voted to require all motorists to carry auto liability insurance. At that time, lawmakers set the rate of coverage at \$20 thousand for bodily injury or death of one person and \$15 thousand for damage to property. These rates have not been changed in 24 years and do not keep pace with rising medical costs. Illinois's rates are currently the lowest in the Midwest and among the lowest in the nation. SB1898 would increase minimum coverage to \$25 thousand for injury or death to one person, \$50 thousand for two people and \$20 thousand for damage to property. This will save people who are injured in an accident that is no fault of their own from some of

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

the out-of-pocket medical costs they may incur. There's no known opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reis: "Representative, I serve on the Insurance Committee and how come this Bill didn't go through the Insurance Committee?"

Fine: "That was up to the Rules Committee. My guess is, and it went to Judiciary."

Reis: "You know, we've had Bills like this come before us before and you know, our biggest concern is what this is going to do to rates. And you say there's no known opposition, but everybody I talk to is complaining about their insurance rates whether it be health insurance or car insurance or property insurance. How much do you think this is going to increase the average auto policy here in Illinois?"

Fine: "The insurance companies haven't given me an exact dollar amount, but what they've said is the increase is minimal. And for anybody who's been injured in an accident, as my family knows very well, those costs for somebody who's in an accident of no fault of their own can be, in our case, it was half a million dollars and that extra \$5 thousand for out-of-pocket costs can go very far."

Reis: "And I understand you have a personal story behind this, but it is going to raise the rates for people. And you know, we have a lot of people that get in trouble for driving uninsured anyway. We passed a Bill earlier in the

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

year that will give driver's licenses to noncitizens in the hopes of buying insurance. So, all we're doing is we're making it harder for people to get insurance and afford this insurance by doing something like this. If they choose to raise their minimum liability they can do so, but we're forcing everyone to do that with this Bill, right?"

- Fine: "Well, most people don't choose to be injured in an accident as well and this floor also voted to raise the speed limit to 70 miles per hour and this is something I think we should really take deep consideration for."
- Reis: "You're not answering my question, Representative. We would like to know how much this is going to raise the average policy."
- Fine: "When I spoke to the insurance companies, like I said, they said minimal and the dollar figure that they gave me at the time was maybe \$75 a year, but it depends on the insurance company."
- Reis: "Okay. To the Bill or to the subject. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we keep going back to the citizens of Illinois with little bitty increases on everything. We have... we have just annihilated our constituencies with these fee increases, tax increases and at the end of the day, when someone pays more for their insurance they have less to buy other things. When they pay more in taxes, they have less to buy goods and services. And we just keep chipping away at everybody and I guess, I just don't see the need for this. If someone wants to increase their minimum liability they can do so, but if they can't afford

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

it they should have the right to do that. I encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

Bost: "First, to clarify one of the things. You said the insurance said how much it would increase per year?"

Fine: "Like I said, they told me minimal. One company said it could be up to \$75 a year, but it really depends on the individual insurance company."

Bost: "Okay. So... so, right now, as the former speaker said, we have several that are actually... quite often get in trouble because they don't have insurance because they've got to make a choice on whether driving to work or paying for their insurance and it's a constant battle. And I understand the needs of those on the higher end. Now, when we purchase insurance we also purchase... part of our insurance are for underinsured motorists or uninsured motorists. Will this cause this part of the rate to go down any at all?"

Fine: "To my knowledge, no."

Bost: "Okay. So..."

Fine: "Oh, I'm sorry. To go down, did you say, or to go up?"

Bost: "To that part to go down because..."

Fine: "Right."

Bost: "...apparently, if... there'll be less underinsured motorists. Is that... I'm..."

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Fine: "Correct. The insurance companies did say that these costs could lower costs for other policyholders, this increase."

Bost: "Say that again. I'm sorry."

Fine: "What the insurance companies did say is this will help lower insurance costs for all policyholders in general."

Bost: "Okay and that's because of the reasons I just spoke of."

Fine: "Correct."

Bost: "Because you have three different parts of your insurance policy on automobile. You have... you have your casualty and that part and you actually have the damage and then you have, what we consider, the uninsured or underinsured motorists, correct?"

Fine: "Correct."

Bost: "Okay. But will that offset enough... do we know how many... did the insurance companies say how many people there are that are... that are on the minimum or riding at the minimum? Do we have those statistics?"

Fine: "I don't have the exact statistic... statistics, but the insurance companies did say that most people do carry above the minimum amount..."

Bost: "Okay. I'd like it."

Fine: "...already."

Bost: "The sad thing is we're debating on this floor. I wish somebody in committee would have found out what most people are because my fear is, and I understand what we're trying to do in your Bill, but my fear is by increasing this those who are on the bubble are just going to fall away and throw their hands up and say, you know what, I'll take the chance

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

on getting a ticket and be totally uninsured. And that's a scary thought because, like I said, I know many people in my district, I wish it wasn't the case, but they just choose not to put insurance on and take that gamble in the fact that, you know, their finances are so close."

Fine: "My hope would be a responsible driver wouldn't mind paying the increase knowing that if they caused an accident that they do not intend to cause..."

Bost: "Okay."

Fine: "...that they wouldn't do as much damage to the victim or the victim's family."

Bost: "And it is... it's really wild that I'm going to say this, but sometimes the people that don't pay, okay, some are irresponsible, don't get me wrong, but some are just poor. Some are just poor and they've got to make a choice on whether insuring their car or providing for other needs for their family or theirselves, and as we increase these costs, you know, we... both sides of us, no matter where we're at, argue that we want to take care of the working poor. Sometimes this might be a little tough on the working poor, but I'll listen to the rest of the debate."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in strong support of this measure. For several years, I tried to increase these rates understanding the arguments that have been made each and every year this issue has come before us. The reason I've supported it is because too many of our constituents have a loved one who was killed in an accident. There's not enough

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

insurance, so in addition to the burial costs they are faced with having to write a check as a consequence of the accident. I know in Representative Tracy's office... or district, Senator Sullivan's district and others of us throughout the state, these examples have come up time and again and I just think that this measure would make an important step forward in reducing the impact on families who are not only dealing with the grief of an accident and a loss of loved ones, but are also being financially harmed as well. I would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "Representative, which insurance companies did you talk to, to get your information about the \$75 increase?"

Fine: "It was the insurance companies that attended the committee hearing in Judiciary. I don't remember what companies were there."

Kay: "The only one I saw there was State Farm. Did you speak
with State Farm?"

Fine: "I did not personally, but they spoke to the Illinois
Trial Lawyers Association who I've been working on with
this Bill."

Kay: "Okay. Again, I'm just curious, are you aware that an umbrella policy can be purchased at an extraordinarily low cost to get done what you're suggesting today?"

Fine: "I was just told it was Kevin Martin from the AIA who gave us the amounts that it might be raised and it was approximately \$70."

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Kay: "Okay. Thank you. Are you aware that an individual like you or me can buy umbrella coverages and in fact, the first and second layers are extraordinarily cheap; in fact, 50 to 75 dollars for an umbrella coverage which does more than you're attempting to do here?"

Fine: "I'm very well versed on auto insurance."

Kay: "Well, then why wouldn't we do that as opposed to mandating this?"

Fine: "Because I don't think everybody would do that with the underinsured or uninsured. And I just feel that if somebody is going to buy insurance based on what medical costs are they don't know what's going to happen if they cause an accident. And if we set a minimum at a higher rate, they will have that coverage."

Kay: "Well, that's an interesting concept. I guess my choice is that I'd like to make the choice and not force everyone in the State of Illinois to ante up more money especially when it can be... more coverage can be purchased at a cheaper rate. So, I appreciate your, I guess, your tackling something like this. I think you're trying to do it for the right reasons, but I think there's a better way to do it. So, I'm not going to be able to support your Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino. Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Gabel: "So, could you please inform the General Assembly of where Illinois ranks..."

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Fine: "Right. Illinois set its rates 24 years ago. Right now, our minimum liability rates are the lowest in the Midwest and among the lowest in the country."

Gabel: "So, there are 33 other states that are higher than Illinois?"

Fine: "Yes."

Gabel: "And when was the last time these rates were... these amounts were raised? Have they ever been raised?"

Fine: "They've never been raised since they were set 24 years ago."

Gabel: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Lady's Bill. In 1989, I believe, when mandatory auto insurance came in, we set these rates at... for minimum rates at 20 thousand for bodily injury or death of one person, 40 thousand for two or more persons and 15 thousand for property damage. And I would venture to say, every person in this room probably has 100 and 300 thousand dollar coverage on theirs. For the impact on this, you would have about \$70 'cause we are increasing from 20 thousand... \$15 thousand damage on property to \$20 thousand damage on property. In reality, that most likely and in many instances wouldn't cover the damage to your car you were hit by someone that had this level of insurance. The American Insurance Association is neutral on the Bill in recognition that the values of property, the values of automobiles have gone up since 1989. So, this puts us on parallel with about 23 other states and I

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

appreciate the Lady bringing the Bill to the Body today. I think it is probably time that we do this. The overall impact is \$70 on the minimum level policies, but it will also have a positive impact on the uninsured motorists which you purchase on your own policies... or uninsured or underinsured motorists that you purchase on your policies at this present time."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. I rise in support of the Lady's Bill. It's been a long time since these minimums were raised. Obviously, the cost of fixing a vehicle, the cost of health care has all increased dramatically since the day we first set the statutory minimum. Mr. Leitch indicated that he had a Bill that did this previously, so did I. I think the statutory minimums that both Representative Leitch and I were trying to change this to were substantially higher than those dollar amounts listed in this Bill. The Lady's worked hard to put this together. Apparently, most of the insurance industry is neutral on it. And this is a good protection for people on the roadways of Illinois. I would suggest your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes, real briefly. I also stand in strong support of this legislation. I think that we need to understand that this really isn't a Bill that we should worry about an individual who has to purchase this insurance: \$25 thousand for one person, \$50 thousand coverage for two or more and \$20 thousand property damage is low in comparison to what it's going to cost a family who is hit by someone who has

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

no insurance or someone who has inadequate insurance. All you have to do is look at the other states and you see that we are way behind other states. These minimums won't even cover the cost of medical in many cases and certainly, as Representative Mautino indicated, doubtful it's going to cost the damage to property. So, I ask for a favorable Roll Call and I commend the Sponsor for the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fine to close."

Fine: "Again, this Bill will save people who are injured in an accident that is really no fault of their own from quite a bit of the out-of-pocket costs that they may incur. I strongly suggest your 'aye' vote and would appreciate it. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1898 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative... Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 70 voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1898, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1921, Representative Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1921, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1921 relates to the Cook County pension fund and it is fairly technical in its nature. It includes a definition of 'earned annuity'

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

which is used in the statute but not defined. It also clarifies existing law with regard to the calculation of final average salaries, so it says that stipends are not pensionable. That's not been the practice, but this clarifies it in the law. And it also has... deals with the calculation of the disability benefit and... and as I said, the calculation of final average salary. It also includes one other item that authorizes the board of trustees to have their records stored electronically."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, are there any additional costs to any of the employees based on these clarifications?"

Nekritz: "No. This, in fact, codifies existing practice."

Reboletti: "And I also would presume and this for legislative intent there would be no enhancements or other sweeteners in the Bill?"

Nekritz: "No."

Reboletti: "Not that I would expect that you would do that, but I just wanted to make sure. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "I ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1921 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1921, having received the

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1551, Representative Burke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1551, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Burke."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an initiative of the Ill... pardon me, Water Reclamation District and it would provide that the district would be able to offer loans to municipal entities with the change that they're asking for in this legislation. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1551 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1551, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1931, Representative Demmer. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1931, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1931 creates the School Security and Standards Task Force within the State Board of Education. It's to study security in schools and provide recommendations back to the Legislature. There are a lot of proposals that were offered in the wake of such

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

tragedies as in Newtown and this task force is to bring those together, make some recommendations about positives or negatives there. It's supported by IEA, IFT, American Red Cross. It passed the Senate unanimously and I know of no opposition."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1931 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1931, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2154, Representative Hurley. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2226, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2226, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2226 amends the Environmental Protection Act by providing that an owner or operator of a landfill shall not accept asphalt roofing shingles for disposal if the landfill is located within a 25 mile radius of a site where asphalt roofing shingles are recycled under a beneficial use determination. As you know, we have limited landfill space here in the State of Illinois, so the... we have begun a recycling program for shingles recycling that can make shingles that come from roofs, tar shingles, into something that is usable. This says that if the shingles are going to be disposed of and

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

the final destination in a landfill and within a 25 mile radius that there is an asphalt roofing shingles recycling center that then the landfills should not accept those shingles. I know of no opposition. The Illinois Asphalt Pavement Association is in favor of this legislation."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Bost: "Representative, I'm very aware of what we're trying to do to here. I'm just kind of questioning enforcement techniques and you know, a lot of times what will happen is people come with their pickup trucks to landfills. They don't know what's in there and they might have, you know, a few shingles. At what point is there a mechanism in how we trace that?"

Hoffman: "This has to be, basically, a load that is entirely of shingles."

Bost: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Thank you. I believe this is a good Bill, environmentally-friendly Bill. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2226 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2226, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr.

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

- Clerk, Senate Bill 2371, can you please move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2371, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been adopted. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Hays."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hays."
- Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is to clean up the Video Gaming Act and to clarify that social clubs, clubs like the Knights of Columbus, are intended to be included in this legislation. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2371. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1912, Representative Sims. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1912, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Sims."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Sims."
- Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 clarifies... attempts to provide more clarity on some of the challenges raised by some of the opponents. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1912. All in favor say 'aye';

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

- all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments, but notes have been requested on the Bill and have not been filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. My apologies. What's the status of the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments, but notes have been requested and have not been filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Please hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Thank you. Senate Bill 1307, Representative Ford.

 Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1307, a Bill for an Act regarding education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Ford."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Ford."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move for the adoption of House Amendment #1. It simply clarifies the Bill and it deals with the underlying purpose of the Bill to lower the compulsory age from the age of 7 to 6. And I move for the adoption of House Amendment #1."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1307. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 394, offered by Representative Cavaletto. House Resolution 395, offered

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

by Representative Sacia. House Resolution 396, offered by Representative Farnham. House Resolution 397, offered by Representative Brown. House Resolution 398, offered by Representative Jefferson. House Resolution 399, offered by Representative Verschoore. House Resolution 400, offered by Representative McAuliffe and House Resolution 401, offered by Representative Costello."

- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, committee announcements.

 Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed
 Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'.

 In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the
 Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee
 announcements."
- Clerk Bolin: "The following committees will meet at 4:45 or immediately following Session. The Agriculture & Conservation Committee will meet in Room D-1, Stratton. The Financial Institutions Committee will meet in Room C-1, Stratton and the Business & Occupational Licenses Committee will meet in Room 115."
- Speaker Turner: "And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Currie moves that the House adjourn 'til Monday, May 27 at the hour of 12 noon, 12 noon. All in favor say 'aye'; all... all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House is adjourned."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 402, offered
 by Representative Ford and House Joint Resolution 43,
 offered by Representative Feigenholtz are referred to the

63rd Legislative Day

5/26/2013

Rules Committee. Committee Reports. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Business & Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2013: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 92. Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2013: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1470. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."