153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. The Chaplain for today is Monsignor Ignatius McDermott, President of McDermott Foundation and the Chicago Clergy Association.

Monsignor McDermott is the guest of Representative Capparelli. The guests in the balcony may wish to rise and join us for the invocation."

Monsignor McDermott: "Eternal Legislator, deep in Your solicitude are all of these Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the Eighty-Seventh Assembly. Вe their morale builder. Currently, sad to say, a public servant is not appreciated. In these days of mass confusion, misdirected zeal, questionable patterns of living, inflated pleasures and under rated treasures, profound their sensitivity for all of the citizens of the Land of Lincoln, in general, of their own constituents, in particular. Continue to deepen their dedication, their dignity, their discretion and their Guard them, and all of us, from the rifles of intensity. resentment, the daggers of discouragement, the darts of sedatives of self-complacency despair, the self-sympathy and from the drowsy opiate of monotony. Daily continue to bless all of us with Your most potent plight of goodies. Help the body and shalom of soul. Amen."

- Speaker McPike: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Hartke."
- Hartke et: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Capparelli.

 Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Speaker, let the record reflect the excused absence

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

of Monique Davis."

Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "The Republicans are all present, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "I think perhaps...maybe the Speaker's..."

Speaker McPike: "The board is correct. Mr...Mr. McCracken is not recorded. Please, record Mr. McCracken as present. Take the record. One hundred and sixteen Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. Please, give the podium your attention, please. Representative Matijevich, in the Chair."

Matijevich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is my version of the beauty and the beast. (You can guess who the beast is.) Let me...let me tell you this young woman here, attractive woman, is in Representative Klemm's district. She's from Island Lake. I and Senator Geo-Karis met her at the Great Lakes Naval Training Center, where she was on the host committee for a drill competition. She is, Janelle Hier Spencer of Long Lake. Earlier this year, she was presented with the honor of being chosen Mrs. Illinois USA, and she will compete in August, in Texas for the Mrs. USA title. With her is her husband, taking pictures here; that's a word of warning, and with her, also is Linda Wygone from Mundelein who is the Illinois pageant director. I would like to have all of you give a warm welcome to Mrs. Illinois USA, Janelle Hier Spencer."

Janelle Spencer: "Thank you very much. I'm really pleased to be here today. It's an honor for me to be recognized by the great leaders from our state, so I'd like to start off by thanking you. It's truly an honor to be recognized because today's women, modern married women, have a difficult time

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

in our society. We are up and coming and playing a vital role in what happens. Right here is where things can take place to begin moving towards family issues and things like marriage and commitment. So, I hope we could all keep that in mind as we forge ahead. Our pageant truly does stand for marriage, virtues and commitment. So, keep that in mind as you go forth and thank you for having me."

Matijevich: "And Dick Klemm has a presentation to make to Janelle."

Klemm: "I just wanted to add that we do have a Resolution due to Mrs. Illinois to express our appreciation and our esteem, and I'd like to just give that to her now."

Speaker McPike: "Committee Report."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Hannig, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations - General Services, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 10, 1992, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' Senate Bills 1483, 1727, 1728, 1729, 1730 and 1733. Representative Stern, Chairwoman of the Committee on Election Law, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 10, 1992, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass as amended' Senate Bill 1992; 'do pass as amended Short Debate Status' Senate Bill 1713."

Speaker McPike: "Would the staff retire? Would the staff retire to the rear of the chamber? Would the Members please take their seats? Would the Members please take their seats? It's...it's my honor today to be...to introduce our guest. We have checked our records and we have had, over the years, a number of Consul Generals from Chicago come to the General Assembly to address us, but we have never had an Ambassador from the...from anywhere in the world address

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

the General Assembly, at least not that we can discover. So this is an honor today. We have the South African Ambassador to the United States with us. This is Harry Schwartz, the Ambassador to the United States, (he) is the first serving politician from the opposition ranks in South Africa to be appointed as the Ambassador in the...to the United States. He accepted this appointment because of the government's commitment in South Africa to the fundamental reforms he has fought for since he entered politics in South Africa in 1951. He has been in the minority opposition party for over 40 years in South Africa and has agreed to be the Ambassador to the United States because he believes that the commitment of his government is So, it is an honor for us to have here today, the South African Ambassador, Harry Schwartz."

Harry Schwartz: "Mr. Speaker, may I express my thanks for the honor given me to be able to address this House. I regard it as a particular honor, and I think you'll also allow me a degree of nostalgia, in that I, myself, served as a Member of the State Legislature in South Africa for some 17 years. Those of you in the minority will know what it's in a minority forl7 years; it's not an easy like to be It's one of those things that happens in thing to do. life. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you, today, as one of 40 million people of South Africa. I don't claim to have been appointed by them all, but I certainly regard it as my task to care for and advance the interests of all my people, as I've tried to do in other capacities in South Africa for a period in excess of four decades. Mr. Speaker, I'm not only opposed to apartheid, but I have never, ever, life supported it. I have defended civil liberties and advocated economic justice, during both my youth and my

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

adult life. I have been appointed, as you indicated, by President DeKlerk to convey the message of a determination to achieve by negotiation a new democratic South Africa. I do not come to plead. South Africans, all of us, are a proud people. I come as a person, however, with deep feelings for America and for Americans. I have fought alongside Americans in a war. I've flown in American I've used American weapons, and I've made aircraft. friends and comrades in my youth, as well as in my adulthood, with Americans. I come to convey to you as Legislators and as individuals who've been opposed to apartheid, and I believe that you have been correctly opposed to apartheid, and I would have been surprised had But insofar as you not have been opposed to apartheid. South Africa is concerned, the book on apartheid is being closed. The laws which discriminated on the grounds race have been repealed. The harsh security laws have either been repealed or brought within more acceptable, There is freedom of political activity, and there levels. is negotiation by 19 political parties, which have now commenced and are still taking place. Former foes, Mr. Speaker, former opponents, have sat down together in order to try and find acceptable solutions. Fundamentals, such as an undivided country, a universal franchise call it one person, one vote and a Bill of Rights have been agreed upon by all as demonstrated in the Declaration of Intent, signed by the parties of Credesa. (And if anybody would like a copy of the...that Declaration of the Convention of a Democratic South Africa, we have it available for those of you who would like to have it.) There are, of course, still differences between the parties. We never thought that it would be easy, but much is already agreed upon and

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

what is outstanding we are convinced we will, in fact, find a solution to. And, again here, I've drawn a document of what has been agreed upon and what is outstanding, which is available to you if you'd like to have it, but obviously time doesn't permit me to outline it. What is important, however, is that a solution is sought not in the with unnecessary loss of life, but that we are seeking a solution around a negotiating table. If we look at the world, we see economic deprivation and conflict, countries are splitting apart because of ethnic, religious and language differences. We are ever determined not to split We want to keep a unified country and to insure we can achieve and maintain this, we need a constitution under which every person and every minority group will be secure. Constitutions should not be imposed on people. They should be based on broad consensus. If a mere majority in South Africa, or a minority, were to determine a Constitution, then, in fact, others, including, in particular, minorities. would lose their ability to insure that provisions to protect would, in fact, not be included. Similarly, if we look throughout Eastern Europe today and the former Soviet Union, with a change to democracy and a market economy, there were great towards а expectations and are still great expectations in But when expectations are too high, there are also frustrations which can lead to serious problems. So. similar situation in our country. The find a expectations as to what benefits the vote will bring or Naturally, to people who've been subject hide. to inadequate education...inadequate education as a matter οf policy on the part of those who applied deliberate apartheid; to people, seven million of whom are living

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

shacks and shanties around our towns: people with 42 percent, 4-2 percent of the work force is unemployed today you can understand that there is an impatience and a desire for a vote, but for social and economic only improvement. But you know, and I know, that freedom is it's exercised in poverty and that jobs and incomplete if work and benefits are not created overnight. Let me just one example of our problem; in the period from 1965...60 to 1965, a 5-year period, we created 157,000 new jobs every year to meet an entry of 194,000 people to the labor market. From 1985 to 1990 (1985 being the year in which the major financial sanctions were imposed) there were only 53,000 new jobs per year created in South Africa in order to satisfy 392,000 new job entrants. explain to you why we now have 42% unemployment and imagine what 42% unemployment would mean in your own country. this is the explanation, also, for the poverty and the consequences from it, which has spawned from such condition. In addition, now, at this moment, we also in South Africa, as in 12 other Southern Africa countries, a drought, the equal of which has not been seen, since the beginning of the century and resources, which should be used in order to correct the imbalances and wrongs of past have had to be deviated, not in order to improve conditions, but, in fact to avoid starvation in our country. So, Mr. Speaker, the task we face is formidable. But our country has other advantages: We have substantial natural resources, a sophisticated financial, industrial, and mining infrastructure. We are the gateway to the markets of Southern Africa, and we have a people who are determined to solve their problems. Mr. Speaker, we have a country that is worth visiting. We have a country that's

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

worth trading with. We have a country that is worth investing in, but of all, Mr. Speaker, we are a country with a people who are removing the shackles of apartheid and will create a just economic system and a true democracy. Mr. Speaker, I express to you my thanks for the opportunity of having been allowed to address this distinguished Body. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker McPike: "Consent Calendar, Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Second Reading. Second Day. Senate Bill 1635, a Bill for an Act to amend the Clerks of Court Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1647, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1652, a Bill for an Act relating to schools and life safety measures. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1655, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading the Bill. Senate Bill 1662, has been removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 1688, a Bill for an Act to amend the Township Law of 1874. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1749, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1848, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, together with Committee Amendment #1. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2178, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure, together with Committee Amendment #1. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2204, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Economic Opportunity Act. Second Reading of the Bill and Bill 2205, a Bill for an Act to repeal the Illinois Neighborhood Corps Act. Second Reading of these Bills."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. The Clerk has three lists up here. One is Senate Bills on Second Reading. If you have

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

any Amendments, the Chair would like to know. Senate Bills on Third Reading that need to be brought back to Second Reading, the Chair would like to know, or any Bills on the Consent Calendar that need to be amended, the Chair would like to know. At this point there are no Bills on any of these lists. Third Reading. Government Administration, appears Senate Bill 698, Representative Steczo. Representative Currie, Senate Bill 1965. Representative Parke, in Senate Bill 1821. Mr. Parke? Representative Regan, Senate Bill 1897. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1897, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Children and Family Services Act. Third Reading of the
Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate
Bill 1897 is an Agreed Bill. There is no problem with it.

It's just the obligation of the legal system for DCFS over
to the Attorney General's Office, and it's agreed to on
both parties, and it's anticipated to save us a
considerable amount of money. So I urge its passage."

Speaker McPike: "On the Gentleman's Motion, Representative Lang."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Lang: "Representative, who is this Bill agreed with?"

Regan: "The Attorney General's office and the Department of DCFS."

Lang: "The Attorney General has signed off on this Bill?"

Regan: "Excuse me, yes...from the very beginning."

Lang: "I have some notes in my file that indicate that this infringes on the Attorney General's powers, but if you tell me that he's okayed this Bill, I won't object to it. Thank you."

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

Regan: "He has. It's okay."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1897 pass?'

 All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the... Representative Parke, to explain his vote."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the same Call of Business, I had a Bill before this one, if you could go back to it, I would appreciate it. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 116 'ayes' and 0 'nays'. Senate Bill 1897, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1821. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1821, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relation to support obligations. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1821 requires a labor union or trade union to enroll a minor child of a union member as a beneficiary in a health insurance plan upon receipt of a court order. It requires unions to give notice to the custodial parent of the enrollment or other changes in coverage provisions. I know of no opposition on this legislation, and I would ask the Body to vote favorably upon this Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? The question is,

 'Shall Senate Bill 1821 pass?' All those in favor vote
 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted
 who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill,
 there are 116 'ayes' and no 'nay'. Senate Bill 1821,

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1823, Representative Bugielski. Senate Bill 1831, Representative Laurino. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1831, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill is now gonna become a shell
Bill. It amends the Acts so that it can become a vehicle
for some county legislation, and I move for the adoption."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Representative, I appreciate your honest explanation of the Bill, but can you...can you give us any...any idea if you have a particular item or a section in mind for counties that this Bill will be used for, later in the Session?"

Laurino: "It's just gonna be, I guess, a vehicle so that we can go into a conference and utilize anything that needs to be cleaned up for anything...anything affecting Cook County."

Black: "Is the section of the Bill relating only to county board meetings?"

Laurino: "To be very honest with you, I...I would assume it does.

I can't, you know, be absolutely positive, but I would assume it does."

Black: "Okay. I appreciate your answers. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Sponsor
has given us a very accurate portrayal of what this Bill
is. It's purely a shell Bill, a vehicle Bill. It only
amends the section regarding county board meetings. I'm

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

not aware, no one has contacted anyone on our side of the aisle saying we need to amend the county board meetings section. So, obviously if there's no perceived or real need for this...I would ask the people on side of the aisle certainly to vote 'no'. I'm not sure that the vehicle is needed, and we have no idea of what form the Bill will come back to us in. So, I would recommend a 'no' vote."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1831 pass?'
 All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all
 voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
 The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 65
 'ayes', 43 'noes'. Senate Bill 1831, having received a
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate
 Bill 1519, Representative Capparelli. Senate Bill 1846,
 Representative Parke. Mr. Parke? The Gentleman is not
 here. Representative Stepan."
- Stepan: "Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to introduce a special guest here in Springfield today. Lobbying on behalf of the circuit court, our Circuit Court Clerk of Cook County, Aurie Puchinski."
- Speaker McPike: "Senate Bill 1638, Representative Regan. Read the Bill, Mr... Out of the record. Senate Bill 1815, Mr. Parke. Representative Parke. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1815, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. Senate Bill 1815 is a Bill that we've done a lot of work on. It provides that group policies of health insurance to provide coverage for the treatment of alcoholism or other drug abuse and dependency on both an inpatient and outpatient basis may not be excluded from

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

coverage from services provided by entities licensed by DASA to provide alcoholism...alcoholism or drug abuse or dependency services. ...I...think we've got agreement from all parties, and I know of no opposition, and I ask the Body to pass this worthwhile Bill, Senate Bill 1815."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1815 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Schoenberg 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 114 'ayes' and 0 'nays'. Senate Bill 1815, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1846, Representative Parke. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1846, a Bill for an Act relating to public community college system. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr....Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1846 changes the credit hour grants rates for each institutional category except general studies. It decreases the grants that districts will receive under the Equalization Grant formula. This is done every year by virtue of statute, I believe, and we put it through the Higher Education... Higher Education Committee. I went through their...questioning and now I believe there are no further questions, and I would ask the Body to support and vote for Senate Bill 1846."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Satterthwaite: "...Representative Parke, as I understand this,

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

the community college distribution under the Equalization formula has been changed by the Board of Higher Education this year? Is that accurate?"

Parke: "Representative Satterthwaite, if I could get a staff member to answer that question, because it's somewhat technical to me, and I would like it. So if a member of our staff that (sic-who) relates to the higher ed... Mr. Speaker, since I do not see the staff member to answer this worthwhile question, I would like to take the Bill out of the record until I could have the staffer answer the question for her."

Speaker McPike: "All right. Thank you. Take the Bill out of the record."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Senate Bill 460, Representative Giorgi. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 460, a Bill for an Act to create Crematory Regulation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi. Out of the record.

Senate Bill 1510, Representative Bugielski. (Senate Bill)

1510. Senate Bill 1789, Representative McAuliffe. Roger

McAuliffe. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1789, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1789 would attempt to put a Statute of limitations on disciplinary procedures against Chicago police officers. There's currently a case in Chicago where three police officers are being heard before the disciplinary board that's ten years old. They've been to federal court twice and (sic-been) found innocent, but the

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

case drags on and on and on. Ordinary criminals are afforded a statute of limitations, and I believe that police officers also should."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1789 pass?'

 All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all

 voted? Representative Williams, to explain his vote.

 Representative Williams, to explain his vote."
- Williams: "Thank you. I just stood because of the fact that I want people to understand this is just putting a limitation, and there's a question as to whether or not we should limit, especially in these times dealing with the recent Rodney King decision and some of the other ones, the ability to bring police complaints at this particular time. I feel that whether or not this is an issue that we should go forth with, is something that we need a little more discussion upon. I'm not absolutely opposed to the concept of limiting what would be good...police procedures so that a person can know when he's free, but I do think this is a wrong time for this Bill and that we should take a little more time and a little more thought."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 98 'ayes' and 7 'noes'. Senate Bill 1789, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Obrzut, on Senate Bill 1892. Representative John Dunn? Representative McAfee? Senate Bill 2134. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2134, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McAfee."
- McAfee: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2134 amends the Code of Civil

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

Procedure. It basically extends immunity to licensed attorneys for malpractice actions based upon life insurers' failure to make periodic payments. This passed the Senate 52 to 0. It came out of Judiciary 11-0. I know of no opposition. I ask your support."

Speaker McPike: "On the Gentleman's Motion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Yes, Representative, is this tort reform?"

McAfee: "I didn't hear your question, Bill."

Black: "Was this tort reform for lawyers?"

McAfee: "No, no it has nothing to do with tort reform, Mr. Black."

Black: "Now wait a minute. Now what are we doing here?

We're...we're immunizing an attorney from legal

malpractice. Isn't that a major reform? Or am I not
reading far enough?"

McAfee: "The basic premise here is for attorneys who are acting in the concept of, of placing a structured settlement with a life insurer to make sure that their legal malpractice is based only on legal malpractice, not on advising in a situation of investment."

Black: "So it's only...it's only tort reform in a very limited instance, in other words."

McAfee: "Well, I wouldn't call it tort reform."

Black: "Well, you're right. You're right. I...I...I won't use that word anymore. It's simply...immunizing an attorney from any malpractice actions only for the failure of a qualified insurer to make payments that that attorney may have set up. Correct?"

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

Black: "Well, as it will satisfy a tort claim or a judgment placing it in a structured settlement. It only relates to the placement of a...in a life insurer...making sure that they're making the proper annuities or the proper payments.

That's the only immunity that's being extended to that attorney."

Black: "Well, a...a serious question that I have: Is it limited only to the extent that if that company goes bankrupt and then, obviously, does not finish the contract or the payment, then, of course, that attorney would be held...held harmless or...or not liable for malpractice?. What if the insurance company just decides that the contract was not written properly, or they are in receipt of additional evidence and they decide they are not going to complete payment? Is that attorney then still exempt from...from any malpractice actions?"

McAfee: "I think insofar as the attorney is (sic-has) committed a negligent act or has committed some form of malpractice, other than the placement with the insurance company, then he would still be held liable, have the same cause of action against him."

Black: "Okay. You've...you've just, you've just hit on the gist of it then. In other words, this doesn't remove any attorney from due diligence. It's...it's really a very specific case is what you're working on here, correct?"

McAfee: "That is correct."

Black: "Okay."

McAfee: "This Bill, once again, protects attorneys from malpractice claims caused by a life insurers purposeful or negligent failure to make timely payments to satisfy negotiated claims or structured settlements."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much. I appreciate your

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

patience. Thank you."

McAfee: "You're welcome."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Keane: "I'm familiar with a number of claims where annuities were set up for victims under personal injury...settlements.
...Some attorneys only went with one annuity company, and other attorneys had... In their settlements they forced the companies to not only have a company to do an annuity, but also to have that annuity insured. Would this have...
Would your legislation let attorneys who only go with one insurance company off the hook?"

McAfee: "No, the specific legislation requires that the insurer be rated A+ by the A.M. Best Company and have a least a an A rating from the major rating houses, and be a size 9 or larger adjusted policy holder surplus as ranked by A.M. Best Company. It has no prohibition on requiring the lawyer to go with any one company, so long as it meets the rating requirements by Best Company."

Keane: "No, I'm aware of two different cases. In one case, the attorney for victim set up an annuity with an insurance firm and then had a reinsurance firm guarantee the initial insurer's ability to function. In another case, the attorney in his settlement just went with one. That company went belly-up, and the person is now settling for less than 10 cents on the dollar. Would this preclude a lawsuit for someone who set something, an attorney who set up, without taking due diligence and, especially, in light of this past executive life going down the tubes, I think that they should be held liable if they don't at least

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

reinsure the first annuitant."

- McAfee: "There's...there's no...there's no question as to what you suggest. My only comment to you is that the law specifically includes that the life insurer be rated A+ by Best and Company. It does not eliminate the attorney's responsibility from doing due diligence in the selection process, in part of the development of the structured settlement."
- Keane: "So, if...if a (sic-an) Executive Life...my understanding was Executive Life was highly rated ...three or four years prior to its going down the tubes. If an attorney, in the future, just put the money with or put the annuity with that person, would that, would a person with that firm, would that keep him from...would that...would your Bill bar him from being sued for failure to reinsure that original annuity?"
- McAfee: "Well, I think we're talking about prospective actions only. I mean, at the time you'd have to work on the information that was available, and this basically, as I said, requires that the lawyer place it with an A+ company, rated by A. M. Best and Company."
- Keane: "So, your answer to me is 'no'?."

- Speaker McPike: "Yes, yes, we have...we have way too much noise in here. It's impossible for the Chair to hear the discussions. Please, please, hold it down. Mr. Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would urge the... people in the room to pay attention to this Bill. What would happen...what happened in the past when Executive Life,

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

which was a major insurance company, went down the tubes was many people, who had taken settlements that had been engineered by attorneys and they used...they were given annuities out of Executive Life and Executive Life went belly up, that company... Those people were getting less than 10 cents on the dollar. What other lawyers did was they reinsured that annuity. So they had a reinsurance policy with another company to insure that if Executive Life went belly-up that these people would be covered by another insurance policy. My understanding of this Bill is, that, if we pass this, we will hold harmless any attorney who puts in a...an insurance policy with a company that at one time is a rated company and subsequently becomes jeopardized. What we will do is for the lack of professionalism (and it doesn't cost that much more to reinsure), we will be jeopardizing the...our constituents. So, I would urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

McCracken: "Is the practical effect of this not to make an attorney responsible for a subsequent financial failure over which he or she never had any control?"

McAfee: "That is correct, other than the fact that he exercises due diligence in his legal profession."

McCracken: "All right. I rise in support of the Bill, and let me explain why. In effect, to deny the protection accorded by this Bill, makes anyone who settles a tort case, either on behalf of a defendant or maybe even a plaintiff, I'm not sure, or especially a plaintiff, maybe even a defendant, an insurer of the continued financial abilities of that company. That is an unreasonable burden to place on

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

anybody. What is required under the law, currently, is due diligence in finding a responsible insuring party for these annuities. If you have done that, you should not have to suffer any further risk, in some cases, many years down the line. This is something that is overdue and strikes a reasonable, fair balance in the ongoing war between plaintiffs and defendants."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "I do think - not to engage everybody in what could be a ...technical discussion - this is an important Bill. And it really does need attention, I think, for people to understand it. With all due respect to Representative McCracken, and the Sponsor, I don't think this characterization of this Bill is correct. Now everybody can pay attention here for everybody accuses us lawyers of always protecting our own profession. I'm speaking on this Bill, against the Bill and against the interests of my profession. (I'll say that to begin with.) To try to make a long explanation short, we have passed a number of statutes in this chamber over the last five to ten years that require structured settlements: in medical malpractice cases, in actions against municipalities. We say that you (as long as they want you to), structure settlements, and in a good many cases, structured settlements are ones that are appropriate for the client anyway. So, the factual setting is, this applies in a lot of cases. In my law practice...our law firm has done a lot of structured settlements. They're really, frankly, a good way, and an often...under...not a lot of attention to these, but a good way of protecting a client. client comes to you and you indicate to them that in your professional judgment a structured settlement is

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

appropriate, you've also got an obligation when you do that, to assure that your client gets the best benefit your legal expertise. If you advise them properly, set them up with a AAA company, or with a company that has a history and reputation for being financially sound and that company goes under later, the law now doesn't make you liable. You've exercised due care and that's all required to do. If on the other hand, a client comes in to you and they're not very well educated, as most clients aren't on insurance companies and structured settlements or anything else, and you're negligent and you refer them to a structured settlement carrier that isn't financially sound there's a good many who aren't), you don't properly research the company (and a lot of lawyers don't where they should), and...that later...that company later goes belly-up, your client (who may be paralyzed, who may have a family who depends on that insurance...that insurance structure for their sustenance and so forth), is out the window. The settlement that you set them up for and then negligently referred them to an improper or a carrier who isn't financially solvent or doesn't have a prospect of being reasonably financially solvent, then they're out the And so the only place they have to look is where they should look, and that is to the lawyer who didn't exercise due care when he set them up with this carrier. really don't believe that immunizing the attorneys, as this Bill purports to do, is a good public policy. If you don't do your job appropriately and even if a company is of a certain rating, if you don't look into the future of that company and make an appropriate determination of whether this is a...a good company for the client that dealing with and the circumstances that you're dealing

153rd Legislative Day

June 10. 1992

with, then you ought to be subjected to liability. And that's the reason that...attorneys carry...medical...or legal malpractice insurance is to cover situations like this. So, with, not really any hesitation, I would urge a 'no' or a 'present' vote on a Bill that really is an attorney's bail-out Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think some of the opponents have made a bigger deal out of this Bill than it is. Mr. Speaker, can I get some order, please? Mr. Speaker, could I get some order?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, this is about the fourth time the Chair has asked for some quiet. It's probably because Senator Munizzi is over here. That's probably the problem. So, Senator, you're welcome, but just please hold it down a little. Hold it down a little."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is not such a big deal. Lang: simple Bill, this It's very and is...this is...it's...this is a situation where an attorney on behalf of a client, trying to get a client a reasonable settlement in a case, discovers that the only way they can get that reasonable settlement is to make, in a deal with the insurance company, where the insurance company pays in installments over a period of years. This covers the situation where the insurance company then insolvent or goes bankrupt. Should that client then be able to sue his attorney for malpractice because the attorney attempted to do something to benefit the client to gain that settlement? I don't think so. The attorney, in good faith, in this situation has made a...has gotten the client a settlement that the client would not have gotten, would not have gotten unless they made this arrangement

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

with the insurance company. We can't require attorneys to...to look at the finances of every insurance company that they deal with. This is a good Bill. There's nothing wrong with it. There's nothing heinous about it. It's a Bill to protect attorneys, yes, but it's also a Bill to protect their clients. It says to their clients, 'Your attorney's going to get this settlement for you in this case, and so if you stick with your attorney, you'll do better in your settlement'. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McAfee, to close."

McAfee: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill does not eliminate any legal malpractice in terms of due diligence on the part of attorneys. The whole issue here is whether an attorney is trying to provide, in the best interests of his clients, an appropriate type of settlement. There are specific financial standards stated in the Bill, and, as I said before, that the life insurer be rated A+, that it has a AA bond rating, and that the company be of a size large or as indicated by adjusted policy surplus. This is no attempt to minimize any duty or obligation of attorney to represent his client in the highest and best interest. I urge your support."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Parcells, to explain her vote."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I think you're overreacting to this. When it was presented in the Judiciary Committee, it sounded so good to me, who is a non-lawyer, that I asked to be put on as a Co-Sponsor. I think if you get to the simple explanation of it, you'll

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

realize it's a very good Bill. Now, a previous speaker said that this was against the legal profession, but, in fact, it isn't, because if I decide to sue a lawyer I have to hire another lawyer to do that, don't I? So, in either event, this is going to, you could say, that this was for the lawyers. Actually, I think you have to realize that this is a good Bill for the consumer, and I would ask for your' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McAfee, one minute to explain your vote."

McAfee: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The ultimate net effect of this is gonna have an adverse effect on trying to complete and conclude settlements. What we're trying here is to effect appropriate settlements for people with the appropriate type of insurer, life insurer. At the time that the settlement papers are drawn up, it is the attorney's obligation (and that's where the malpractice will occur), for him to make the appropriate decision on a Best is AM or A+ type of company. There is no doubt in my mind that, ultimately, the effect of this will have attorneys not trying to work out structured settlements, more cases going trial and less favorable results for plaintiffs. There's definitely an attempt here to try and resolve that and encourage structured settlements and using the appropriate type of companies. This is not to try and insure or insulate attorneys any further."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.

Representative McAfee."

McAfee: "Consideration, please."

Speaker McPike: "Put this Bill on... This Bill has 49 'ayes' and 46 'noes'. The Gentleman asks for Postponed Consideration.

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

The Bill will be placed on the Order of Postponed. Senate Bill 460, Representative Giorgi. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 460, a Bill for an Act to create the Crematory Regulation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 460 has been on the Calendar quite a number of weeks, and I'd like to bring the Members of the General Assembly up to speed on what's in the Bill. This is a Bill that's been in the making for the last couple of years, and it's...Senate Bill 460 is based upon model legislation passed in several states and initiated by the Cremations Association of North America. Now, it's been endorsed by the Illinois Cemetery Authority, Illinois Funeral Directors' Association, Comptroller's Office, the Illinois Department of Public Health, the Cemetery Association of Greater Chicago, the Funeral Director Service Association and the Cremation Association of North What it does is it creates the Crematory America. Regulation Act requires all crematory authorities to register with the Office of the Comptroller and specifies the form of legal documents necessary to authorize the performance of cremation. Ιt requires crematory authorities to keep and maintain pertinent records, specify procedures to be followed by the crematory authorities in and during the performance of a cremation, specify who's responsible for and how the cremated remains may disposed of, and it provides for penalties effective January 1, 1993, and I urge the support of the General Assembly. Mr. Speaker, because of the noise level..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "There's one, House Amendment #2..."

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

Speaker McPike: "This Bill's on Third Reading."

Giorgi: "Yes, Sir."

- Speaker McPike: "Let's take the Bill out of the record. Let's take this Bill out of the record. Senate Bill 1763, Representative Steczo. Terry Steczo? Representative Turner. Representative Turner. Members of the Body, we intend to adjourn today on a Death Resolution of a former Member. Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 2126, offered by Representative Weaver; 2127, DeJaegher; 2128, DeJaegher; 2129, DeJaegher; 2130, DeJaegher; 2131, DeJaegher; 2132, Dunn. House Joint Resolution 146, Hasara."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Introduction, First Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4218, offered by Representative Brunsvold, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "General Resolutions. If the Chair could have your attention. Death Resolution."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 2088, offered by Representative Turner and others. 'WHEREAS, The House learned with sorrow of the death of a former Member, the Honorable William C. 'Bill' Henry, of Chicago, who served in the 81st, 82nd and 83rd General Assembly; and WHEREAS, William C. Henry was born September 24, 1935, to Johnnie Mae and William Henry, Sr. (now deceased); and WHEREAS, William Henry was a member of the 24th Ward Regular Democrat Organization and rose from precinct worker to chief of the most powerful black ward organization in Chicago; and WHEREAS, Mr. Henry was the first black to be elected statewide as treasurer of

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

the Young Democrats, and he served as Assistant Deputy Chief for the Cook County Sheriff's Department under Sheriff Richard J. Elrod and was the major catalyst in getting more blacks hired by the Sheriff's Department; and William Henry became a state Representative in 1979, and he was instrumental in passing legislation that reduced the high sales taxes on prescription pharmaceuticals, made it a felony to recruit minors for gangs, and required all police stations to inform victims of crimes of their right to receive monetary assistance; and WHEREAS. William Henry was one of only two African-Americans to be invited to the White House President Jimmy Carter; and WHEREAS, as an alderman, Bill Henry was effective and was Mayor Harold Washington's most vocal floor leader and was also a leader on the issue of housing, never ceasing in his drive to improve the 24th Ward; and WHEREAS, William C. "Bill" Henry led a full and distinguished life and provided invaluable service to his fellow citizens; and WHEREAS. William C. "Bill" Henry leaves to cherish his memory: his mother Johnnie Mae Henry, ten children, seven grandchildren, two great-grandchildren, a devoted companion Leslie Grant, four aunts, an uncle and a host of nieces, nephews, cousins, and friends; and WHEREAS, William C. "Bill" Henry contributed greatly to community and the State; therefore, be it RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we express our deep sorrow at the death of former State Representative, the Honorable William C. "Bill" Henry, offer our sincere sympathy to his family, and join his friends in his memory; and be it further RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be presented to the

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

family of William C. "Bill" Henry."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. ... I know some of the Members were around when I first came to the Assembly during the 81st Assembly. And Bill and I served together in that Assembly. Infact, our history goes back even further than that. know to some of the new Members it was often referred that I was the quy who took Bill Henry's place here in the General Assembly, and there is some truth to that, but Bill and I also served here together in my early years aspiring to be a state rep. In fact, we were on opposite sides of the aisle and Bill and I fought (and when I fought we literally fought), in my pursuit to serve here in the General Assembly and at the beginning of the 81st I was successful in beating the great 24th Ward Organization and having served here. But during that...ten-year span that we worked much closer together, I come (sic-came) to know Bill very closely and Bill was very committed and dedicated to trying to help, not only the people of the 24th Ward, not only minorities throughout the City of Chicago, but in Two days before his passing, the entire state. called...called me here in Springfield and left a message. I was on the floor. I called him back; he was out. I then called the district office later and called back. got a phone...checked the message there on tape, was asking me if I could do a favor for a constituent, and many of you know for the last nine months Bill had been down with cancer and was going through therapy and even during the last campaign he was out campaigning with oxygen tank on his side as he was trying to work for his candidates. But he called and asked me if there

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

something I could do for a friend of ours, and it was the kind of reputation that I think Bill was...always about, always trying to help people, trying to do what he could and even though we differed on issues, ultimately, he said, 'my goal here is try to do what we can.' primarily for the people of the 24th Ward. The funeral occasion, I was able to drive back into Chicago that night and there was, I won't say standing room capacity-I think that's saying it mildly-but you could not get into the ward that night. There were just that many people there. And there was a public perception about Bill that...that was considered controversial to many, but in the eyes of the people of the 24th Ward and to the people who lived on the Westside of Chicago, and I think to many of us involved in the that if we talk to some of our political arena, I know Constitutional Officers and statewide officials, guys that grew up with Bill through the Democratic Organization, they would say he was truly a politician's politician. He understood this game better than most of us. He was a 24-hour politician... He stayed at it. When Bill told you gave you his word, he went to bat for it. There was no turning him around, no turning him back, and he will truly I learned a lot working with Alderman missed. Bill...the late Alderman Bill Henry...He taught me a lot about this process...I'm going to miss him and I know that those of you who ran into Bill, who had on some occasion met Bill, will probably agree that he was a politician's politician and one that if he said he was with you and going to work for you, he went all the way and I just ask that, at the proper time, that all Members be added to this Resolution."

Speaker McPike: "Representative LeFlore."

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the really got to know Bill Henry, the late Bill I Henry, in 1982 when I was scheduled to come into the House Representatives. Bill was a West-Sider; he was a leader; and he really wanted to make sure that Members from the West-Side of Chicago was (sic-were) well groomed in coming into the House of Representatives. So, therefore, he had the late Ozie Hutchins and myself over to his house for two days to go over the legislative procedures. He didn't have to do this, but he was concerned about myself and the late Hutchins being able to relate to what the duties and responsibilities would be once we was (sic were) sworn in. I must say that Bill, after leaving the House of Representatives, he stayed in touch with me individual and also a couple of days before his death, he also made communication with me. Now, when I called back it was too late, and I feel real bad about that because I'm sure that he wanted to advise me on legislation or either give some assistance to himself. But, nevertheless, he was a good politician; he was a strong politician. He would try to help wherever he could, and he's gonna be missed on the West-Side of Chicago, especially in the 24th Ward and the other wards there. I'd just like to close in saying that Bill was a leader. He was a political leader. He was a strong political leader, and we're gonna miss him, and I just hope all the Members will be added to the Resolution."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Yes. Thank you very much. ... I met Bill when I was a young cat...a young guy down here lobbying, and I, you know, Bill was quite a character. ... I wanna say something about the young... It's really hard to explain it without

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

being blunt. But Bill had balls. This guy was something else. Bill Henry could stand up and he knew exactly what...I mean, it was like when it came to politics, you could sit in the room and, you know, everybody would get scared and, you know, you'd wait for that one person to break out and just say what everybody's thinking. everybody's feeling, but everybody's sitting there just scared beyond belief to say... This guy stand and he'd go to it and sit there and before it was over with, whether you laughed or you cried, you knew Bill Henry was there. You knew Bill Henry. You knew that this was a quy who serious about his politics. He ate, slept and drank politics. I think...I think Art Turner knows better anvbodv... I don't wanna tell Art's story, but the old switcheroo, you know, and when Art thought his career was Harold Washington had won that race, Bill Henry over, and knew what to do. Art's career was revived. Art was on his way back to Springfield. Things went on on the good foot and the politicians (inaudible)...the politician that we all know. And whether you were on the same side with Billy (which for me, being, you know, in the days as a and a lobbyist there was the), I remember when there was the big... You either had to be... You were as a black staffer. You either was (sic-were) a choose Harold Washington guy or a Jim Taylor guy. And there was twain could meet. You weren't even supposed to the eat together if you weren't on the right side of this ball park. And these guys, you know, you'd sit there in the old caucus days and watch'm fight and battle, but with Bill Henry, you know, when this guy, like Art said, when he said he was with you, he was with you. When he said he had to, you know, he was going to be against you, don't bring him

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

on a fancy argument, he was against you. Period. Whatever the reason, he was against you. And I learned to like the years, especially when I became a Bill. Over Legislator and he was an alderman, we conversed a got to know him a lot better than I ever thought I would. I got to like him a lot better, and, more than anything, I gotto respect Bill Henry. I really got to a point where I said. 'This guy eats, sleeps and drinks politics.' Politics is (sic-was) his life and his lifeblood, and to the day he died he went down politicking. He called me up, unable to talk, but he was still politicking all the And I would say that this Body was blessed, and we all know that that was one great guy, Bill Henry."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lou Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I wasn't as fortunate as some of the fellows that iust previously that know Bill as long as...as they did. Bill when I first ran for State Representative and in that...in that particular race I lost, but I did not know Bill Henry. But one day I received a letter during that campaign (as you know I was running against Larry Bullock), and I received a letter, and I opened the letter and in the letter there was a card and all it said was 'Good Luck, Bill Henry; and it was a check. And, I didn't know and didn't know Bill knew me, and I called him to thank him for the check, and I asked him, you know, 'Why were you sending me this check? And I didn't know you, you didn't And he said, 'Well, if you're being supported know me.' by Harold Washington and Bobby Rush that's good enough for And, at that point we became very good friends, and we had kind of a standing joke going every time he would see me on the West-Side of Chicago he would say, 'Jones,

153rd Legislative Day

June 10, 1992

I'm gonna give you 20 minutes to get out of Dodge.' So, then I would see him on the South-Side, and I would do the same thing to him. I will miss Bill Henry. I regret that I did not know him before I did. He was a fantastic person, and I will greatly miss him."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Turner asks that all Members be added as Co-Sponsors of this Resolution. All in favor of the Resolution say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. The House stands adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 12:00 noon."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

92/09/11 12:51:55

JUNE 10 . 1992

HB-4218	FIRST READING	PAGE	27
SB-0460	THIRD READING	PAGE	14
SB-0460	THIRD READING	PAGE	26
SB-0460	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	14
SB-0460	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	27
SB-1789	THIRD READING	PAGE	14
SB-1815	THIRD READING	PAGE	12
SB-1821	THIRD READING	PAGE	10
SB-1831	THIRD READING	PAGE	11
SB-1846	THIRD READING	PAGE	13
SB-1846	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	14
SB-1897	THIRD READING	PAGE	9
SB-2134	THIRD READING	PAGE	15
SB-2134	POSTPONED CONSIDERATION	PAGE	25
HR-2088	ADOPTED	PAGE	34
HR-2088	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2 7

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MCPIKE	PAGE	1
PRAYER - MONSIGNOR IGNATIUS MCDERMOTT	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
INTRODUCE JANELLE SPENCER. MRS. ILLINOIS USA	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	3
INTRODUCE HARRY SCHWARTZ+ SOUTH AFRICAN AMBASSADOR	PAGE	3
CONSENT CALENDAR - SECOND READING	PAGE	8
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	27
ADJOURNED	PAGE	34