

Legislative Journal

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1975

Session of 1975

159th of the General Assembly

Vol. 1, No. 12

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 1 p.m., e.s.t.

THE SPEAKER (Herbert Fineman) IN THE CHAIR

PRAYER

REVEREND DOCTOR DAVID R. HOOVER, chaplain of the House of Representatives and pastor of St. Paul's Lutheran Church, McConnellsburg, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Amidst the turmoil and strife of life, O God, we turn our hearts and minds to Thee with the assurance and confidence that Thou art never far from any one of us, but we know that Thou art ever near to strengthen and sustain us in the tensions and soul-searching decisions which face us. Grant us the benefits of Thy counsel as we pause and meditate upon the course of action which we should follow. Inspire in us the merits of Thy truth as we walk humbly in service to Thee as well as to our fellowmen. And guard us with Thy protection that we may overcome the pitfalls of life and rest in peace with Thee. Amen.

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, approval of the Journal for Tuesday, February 18, 1975, will be postponed until printed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the appointment of Russell Davis as temporary parliamentarian for today's session.

The Chair also announces that pictures will be taken, again allegedly, of only the Speaker today.

Members will report to the floor immediately. A master roll will be taken very shortly.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I request leaves of absence for Messrs. HAMILTON, KATZ, PERRI, SALVATORE, SCIRICA and BUTERA for today's session.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, leaves are granted. The Chair hears no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority whip.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, I request leaves of absence for Messrs. BLACKWELL and TAYOUN for today's session.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, leaves are granted. The Chair hears no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS HOUSE

Mr. ZELLER requested and obtained unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. ZELLER. Mr. Speaker, while we are waiting, I do not think there is anything else that is really of grave importance until the members get here, but I would like to read this little item that I believe the members will be interested in. It is a story about the hawk and the pigeons: (Reading:)

A Hawk, flying around in search of food, spotted a flock of Pigeons on the ground. He swooped down to capture one, but the Pigeons were too quick for him and escaped.

The Hawk angrily retreated to the top of a nearby tree. He pondered his problem for a while and hit upon a plan. He then moved to a tree closer to the Pigeons. They spotted him and got ready to fly.

"Wait! Don't fly away!" the Hawk shouted. "I want to help you!"

The Pigeons waited to hear him out, but remained crouched and ready to fly if necessary.

"I'm sorry if I scared you earlier," the Hawk said, "but I wasn't really trying to hurt you. I only wanted to prove a point."

The Pigeons relaxed a little and the Hawk continued.

"You Pigeons live in constant fear and must always be on the lookout for enemies. You need someone like me to watch over you."

The Pigeons moved closer. The Hawk went on.

"So if you'll just sign this small contract making me your king, you'll never have to worry again."

The Pigeons conferred for a moment and decided to accept the kind offer. One by one they scratched their names on the contract.

The Hawk wasted no time in issuing his first order—for all the Pigeons to clip their wings.

The Pigeons reluctantly obeyed.

The Hawk's second order was for Pigeon stew, and he filled that order himself.

I am just wondering if some of the members understand what this is all about. I believe you will, once you get into ordering yourselves around with these rules.

Thank you.

RESOLUTION REPORTED AS AMENDED

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 37

By Mr. WARGO

The Speaker of the House of Representatives appoint the

members of the Agriculture and Dairy Industries Committee of the House of Representatives to investigate, explore and determine the causes, effects and solutions to the economic difficulties of the agricultural cooperatives.

Reported from Committee on Rules.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. The Chair is about to take up the business of today's master roll call. Only those members present and in their seats are permitted to vote.

The roll was taken and was as follows:

YEAS—189

Abraham	Geisler	McCue	Schweder
Anderson, J. H.	George	McGinnis	Seltzer
Arthurs	Giammarco	McGraw	Shane
Barber	Gillespie	McIntyre	Shelhamer
Bellomini	Gillette	McLane	Shelton
Bennett	Gleason	Mebus	Shuman
Beren	Gleeson	Menhorn	Shupnik
Berlin	Goodman	Milanovich	Sirjanni
Berson	Green	Miller, M. E.	Smith, L.
Bittle	Greenfield	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Spencer
Bradley	Grieco	Milliron	Stahl
Brandt	Gring	Miscevich	Stapleton
Brunner	Halverson	Mochlmann	Stout
Burns	Hammock	Morris	Sullivan
Caputo	Hasay	Mrkonjc	Taddonio
Cessar	Haskell	Mullen, M. P.	Taylor
Cimini	Hayes, D. S.	Mullen	Thomas
Cohen	Hayes, S. E.	Musto	Toll
Cole	Hepford	Myers	Trello
Cowell	Hill	Novak	Turner
Crawford	Hopkins	Noye	Ustynoski
Cumberland	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien	Valicenti
Davies	Hutchinson, W.	O'Connell	Vann
Davis, D. M.	Irvis	O'Donnell	Vroon
DeMedio	Itkin	O'Keefe	Wagner
Deverter	Johnson, J.	Oliver	Walsh, T. P.
Dicarlo	Kelly, A. P.	Pancoast	Wansacz
DiDonato	Kelly, J. B.	Parker, H. S.	Wargo
Dietz	Kernick	Perry	Weidner
Dininni	Kistler	Petrarca	Westerberg
Dombrowski	Klingaman	Pievsky	Whelan
Dorr	Knepper	Pitts	Whittlesey
Doyle	Kolter	Pratt	Wilson
Dreibelbis	Kowalyszyn	Prendergast	Wilt, R. W.
Eckensberger	Kusse	Pyles	Wilt, W. W.
Engelhart	LaMarca	Rappaport	Wojdak
Fawcett	Laudadio	Reed	WorriLOW
Fee	Laughlin	Renninger	Wright
Fischer	Lederer	Renwick	Yahner
Fisher	Lehr	Richardson	Yohn
Flaherty	Letterman	Rieger	Zearfoss
Foster, A.	Levi	Ritter	Zeller
Foster, W.	Lincoln	Romanelli	Zord
Fryer	Lynch	Ruggiero	Zwikel
Gallagher	Manderino	Ryan	
Gallen	Manmiller	Saloom	Fineman,
Garzia	McCall	Scheaffer	Speaker
Geesey	McClatchy	Schmitt	

NOT VOTING—14

Blackwell	Katz	Ross	Smith, E.
Bonetto	Perri	Salvatore	Sweeney
Butera	Polite	Scirica	Tayoun
Hamilton, J. H.	Rhodes		

The SPEAKER. One hundred eighty-nine members having indicated their presence, a master roll is established.

REQUEST FOR COPY OF RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Montgomery, Mrs. Fawcett.

Mrs. FAWCETT. Mr. Speaker, is the amended House resolution No. 40 available? I do not have a copy.

The SPEAKER. Will the chief clerk make certain that copies of House resolution No. 40, as amended, are available for the membership?

We will not vote on it, Mrs. Fawcett, until it is available.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Chester, Mr. Smith. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. E. H. SMITH. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. E. H. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be placed on the master roll call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be so recorded.

LETTERS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Weidner.

Mr. WEIDNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With your permission, I would like to enter something into the record.

Mr. Speaker, in the last session, on September 25, 1974, I read into the Journal an open letter addressed to Governor Shapp from a constituent, Mr. Albert Koehler, Riegelsville, Pennsylvania, regarding the appointment of Col. Oran K. Henderson to the Pennsylvania Bicentennial Commission by Lieutenant Governor Kline.

I am now in receipt of the Lieutenant Governor's reply to Mr. Koehler and a five-page response from Mr. Koehler, which he feels should also be public record and appear in the Journal. I am not going to read it in length but am submitting it for the record.

Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will submit the letters for the record.

Mr. WEIDNER presented the following letters for the Legislative Journal:

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
 Harrisburg

October 9, 1974

ERNEST P. KLINE
 Lieutenant Governor

Mr. Albert Koehler
 1217 Durham Road
 Riegelsville, Pennsylvania 18077

Dear Mr. Koehler:

The Governor has asked me to respond to your letter of September 19, 1974, concerning the appointment of Oran K. Henderson to the position of Assistant Director of the Pennsylvania Bicentennial Commission.

I find it hard to believe that a person of your obvious intelligence would write such an unfair and prejudicial letter without first making an attempt to learn the true facts surrounding the appointment.

First, let me put your mind at ease. The appointment was neither personal nor political on my part. Early last year, the Henderson's took up residence at the Edward Martin Military Reservation, where my family lives in a home maintained by the Commonwealth.

My son, Samuel, met, fell in love, and married the Henderson's daughter, Ann. They are living

now in Pittsburgh, where our son attends Duquesne Law School.

I did not know the Hendersons before they came to the Gap. I did not visit often with them socially while they lived there; and I have not seen them socially since they moved from the Gap in July. I doubt if I ever will see much of them on a personal basis.

My wife and I like the Hendersons; we are fond of and happy with our daughter-in-law; but our close social and personal relationships rest with other persons.

There was, of course, no political intention in the appointment. I knew the appointment would be well received by the community in Lebanon County, because Henderson had made a great impact on the entire community as a hard-working, sincere, honest, gentle human being. Countless citizens, including community leaders, were pleased with his appointment.

Now, to some other points in your letter.

What right have you to decide that Henderson is any more tainted with blood of hundreds of non-combatant innocent women and children, any more than you and I are so tainted. He is probably less tainted, because you and I as civilians didn't do enough to end that war, while he was serving with others in the military, under orders to conduct the war.

It might be well for you to learn the facts in Henderson's case before you pop-off. Henderson assumed command of the brigade of 5,000 men less than 18 hours before the MyLai incident. The Calley platoon was one of more than 70 within that brigade. Henderson had no knowledge of MyLai before it happened and this was clearly brought out in the Court Martial.

Our system provides for due process in these matters; and even though you summarily dismiss military justice, the fact remains that Henderson was tried and acquitted of any complicity in the MyLai matter, both before and after the fact.

Henderson has served his country with honor and valor in three conflicts. He was wounded in World War II; wounded in Korea; and wounded in VietNam. As a non-West Pointer he rose in military command on the basis of his dedicated service.

Henderson is one of the most decorated officers in the history of our country. He was awarded 5 silver stars, 5 purple hearts and 7 bronze stars, as well as a host of lesser decorations.

For you to characterize Henderson as a body-counter is disgraceful, and you should be ashamed of yourself.

As I indicated earlier, the real culprits in VietNam were not the men and women we called upon to fight that awful war. They were this nation's people as a whole who permitted it to happen. It may make you feel righteous and humane to lash out at Henderson, and it may help your conscience; but it doesn't satisfy mine.

Henderson was appointed to his post because of his high personal character; his administrative skills; and his availability to fill a job that has a two-year life.

Ken Henderson earned a Bachelor's Degree from the University of Maryland, and is six hours short of a Master's Degree in International Affairs from George Washington University. His unique understanding of international affairs led me to assign him as the Commission's liaison with the Congress of World Unity.

Actually, his principal assignment will cover administrative matters in our Harrisburg office. He has wide experience in personnel and contract matters. He has broad management experience. He has held many sensitive high level staff and command positions throughout the world. He is a graduate of the prestigious Naval War College, which is a PH.D. level educational institution in the military profession. He has been responsible for budgets in the hundreds of millions of dollars. In summary, he is a sensitive, competent professional of the highest order of character and ethics.

If you are genuinely interested in evaluating Henderson's appointment fairly, I would be pleased to have you meet or receive written communiques from leading citizens in Lebanon County who came to know this man. If I would show these people, all good, decent Americans, your letter, they would say you're nuts to pre-judge a person like that.

Your closing paragraphs mystify me. How is it that you have established yourself as some supreme judge of all that is right and honorable for the plain citizen. Do you possess some special insight that has made it possible for you to rise above us; to permit you to judge, not only Henderson, but the entire American System?

If you come forth with more than self-righteousness and prejudicial emotion, you might be able to make a contribution to this society. I am willing to listen to more from you, but please try in the future to be fair.

Sincerely,

ERNEST P. KLINE

EPK:kah

October 19, 1974.

Ernest P. Kline
Lieutenant Governor
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Harrisburg, Pa. 17120

Sir:

Acknowledgement is made of your letter to me dated October 9, 1974.

Since you wrote "I am willing to listen to more from you, but please try in the future to be fair" I accept your invitation to respond to your letter which was written in defense of your appointment of Oran K. Henderson to the position of Assistant Director of the Pennsylvania Bicentennial Commission, to which I objected most strenuously.

You wrote that the Governor asked you to respond to my letter of September 19, 1974 which was addressed to him rather than to yourself. I so addressed my open letter, feeling as I did, that were it addressed to you, it would elicit no re-

sponse and most likely would have been destroyed. I do not state this categorically, though I surmised this would have been its fate as the probabilities were in its favor.

I was unaware that Henderson's title was Assistant Director of the Pennsylvania Bicentennial Commission as the Philadelphia Bulletin of September 15th, simply stated that his appointment was that of an official. I had thought of his appointment as that of a minor functionary, though the salary belied it, and now knowing that he holds a high post only fortifies my objections.

As to my writing "such and unfair and prejudicial letter without first making an attempt to learn the true facts surrounding the appointment." The basic facts were given in the Philadelphia Bulletin. The additional comments you supplied in your letter as to where the Hendersons resided, who your son married, whether or not you visited them socially, that you and your wife are fond of your daughter-in-law, that your son attends law school, and that you and your wife liked the Hendersons, etc. are extraneous and have nothing to do with, nor have any relationship to my cardinal objections to his appointment.

You write "the appointment was neither personal nor political on my part". This response just doesn't wash, especially coming from a politician. Since you mention that he was "hard working" the assumption must be that he was employed, and coupled with his Colonels retirement income would, I am certain, keep him at arms length from the welfare rolls. If he had been unknown to you, some one else would have received the appointment for one or the other of the two reasons. The question arises as to whether such a post existed, whether it was a especially created post, or if indeed it is vital to the success of the Bicentennial?

You write that the appointment was well received by the community in Lebanon County as he made a great impact on the entire community, and, countless citizens, including community leaders were pleased. Whether or not you conducted a survey to justify this statement, made casual local inquiries, or simply faced Pennsylvanians with a fait accompli I do not know.

Among his attributes you mention him as "a hard working, sincere, honest, gentle human being." Personally, I have never ascribed the last quality to the military, the balance apply to most people and are therefore not unique. Given the facts, I do not believe the other Pennsylvania Counties would agree, nor even the preponderance of those residing in Lebanon.

Paragraph 8 your letter.

A typically simplistic statement. Never the less I respond. I was opposed to our Viet Nam war since its inception, since the Gulf of Tonkin incident, along with but few others including a few U.S. Senators and Congressmen. At that time, and for a few years thereafter it was a very unpopular position as one was assailed with the usual derogatory remarks all coming under the head of being un-American. It is quite true, I did not march nor demonstrate as I am by nature pacific.

Those that did were accorded broken noggins and given the hospitality of our jails. Your contention that we as civilians are as blood tainted as those Americans who actually committed atrocities since we did not do enough to end that war, is highly debatable. We believed our government, up to the point when we could no longer accept its propaganda releases. Every government lies to its citizens, especially in times of stress, ours no different than any other. We were told of the unspeakable actions committed by the National Liberation Front, many of which doubtless were true which stiffened home front resolve. Later, we were informed, not by our government, but by writers and newsmen that our forces had committed similar atrocities. These reports could hardly be believed, not because they were not true, but because we did not wish to believe our soldiers would be capable of such actions. Americans, simply would not do those things attributed to them, such as cutting off the ears of the vanquished, it just wasn't American. We were a civilized nation, whereas the enemy were less than human. Paralleling the above, in 1944 as Battalion interpreter I stood in front of the Rathhaus (City Hall) in Bielefeld Germany where we (U.S. Army) had erected hugh photographic blow-ups of pictures taken of the Nazi "Death Camps". I stood in uniform for the purpose of overhearing what the German civilian re-action was. Mothers, daughters, and old men, no different than our own, mumbled and spoke among themselves that this simply could not be as Germans simply do not do such things, though they were faced with the incontrovertable.

Paragraph 9.

Your suggestion that it might be well for me to learn the facts in Henderson's case before I "pop-off" thereby inferring that I know very little about his involvement, beyond what the press published at that time, or what I learned from inconsequential and un-reliable sources. Space does not allow marshalling all my sources, suffice my mentioning two books which I am certain are un-known to you, and which I suggest you read, available in any library and they are not of an arcane nature. "Cover-Up" by Seymour M. Hersh a Pulitzer prize winner for his international reporting on My Lai, based on his access to the Army's 40 volume Peers Report, not yet accessible to the public and which is probably the most definitive book on the subject. "One Morning in the War" by Richard Hammer, magazine articles, etc. Should you prove any negative statements made against Henderson by Mr. Hersh to be untrue, you are assured of my sincerest public apology.

Paragraph 10.

True, the Pentagon Peers Inquiry, only after intense public pressure, tried and acquitted Henderson, despite conflicting testimony for his involvement in My Lai in which at least 347 women, children, and old men were "wasted." He spent more time before the Peers Panel than any other witness. His testimony filled more than 400 transcribed pages. An account of the charges filed

against him appeared in the New York Times February 27, 1971. Not generally known, a second massacre of about 155 Viet Nameese occurred the same morning in the hamlet of My Kheh located about 1½ miles east of My Lai. Whether or not Henderson shared any complicity will perhaps never be known as it was not investigated. Many authorities regard the acquittal, along with numerous other officers never tried as a military white-wash. Two members of the Peers Panel, Gen. Barnes and Col. Franklin were themselves officially charged by a fellow officer with several counts of dereliction of duty and murder of Vietnamese prisoners. What resulted from these charges and whether or not they were supported or proved is not known as the results were not published. It is obvious that the system of Military Justice, when trying its own, is incapable of coping with War Crimes.

Paragraphs 11-12.

Since I am not knowledgeable concerning his pre-Viet Nam career I cannot therefore comment. As to his "rising in military command on the basis of his dedicated service" this is a moot question among officers, as to whether in many cases it is a result of actual ability or favoritism, as it is well known in military circles that many are always "bucking" for preferment in one way or another. As to his decorations, while they may all be well deserved and honestly won, it is well known that the officer corps are a "Mutual Admiration Society," each recommending the other, for decorations and advancement. It could as well be argued that many German Wehrmacht and SS Colonels also had distinguished and valourous careers and were much be-medalled. Never the less, we as victors found many guilty of War Crimes. Our sole method of judgment should be the U.S. Field Manual concerning the law of land warfare which states "Every violation of the law is a War Crime." Lest it be felt that I have a distinct prejudice against the army in which I served (in a just and righteous cause in WW2) and officers in particular, allow me to commend in the highest a few who possessed sufficient moral fibre to speak out S/S Donald Duncan, Generals Gavin and Shoup, Col. Wm. R. Corson etc.

Paragraph 13.

"Body-Counting" is indeed disgraceful, and the U.S. military should be ashamed of itself for having coined it and added it to its lexicon. At the time however, it was not considered so. It was a daily yardstick to determine our successes, of individual soldiers as well as commanders, appearing in military reports, newspapers and at the time offended few. I daresay that it was part of Henderson's vocabulary at the time. It is only in retrospect, guilt ridden as we now are, that we now find it so offensive.

Paragraph 14. (Refer to paragraph 8)

You state "They were this nation's people as a whole who permitted (Viet Nam) to happen." *Your statement displays either ignorance or casuistry as to the mechanics employed by governments to create conditions whereby citizens are manipulated to the point of willing sacrifice.*

"Truth is the first casualty of War" is an ancient adage. *Certainly, in your own political experience you must know that statements emanating from Harrisburg for the purpose of forming public opinion are sometimes less than truthful? One cannot seriously accept your statement. Those at first who were cognizant of the true facts underlining our involvement were the radicals, non-conformists, Quakers, etc. who were pilloried as un-American and accorded treatment conforming with their views, till such time as their opinions were vindicated overwhelmingly by most. Were you amongst these? Would you not agree, that had Senators, Congressmen, and the people been told the whole truth concerning the Gulf of Tonkin incident and what preceded it this sorry history may never have happened?*

Paragraphs 15-16.

Henderson's educational background is accepted as stated, and has no relationship as to why his appointment is questioned. The "Congress of World Unity" founded by two priests was, as I understand, organized for the purpose of gathering the world's best brains to concentrate on planning lasting peace, which is, indeed a noble undertaking, and its intent will be applauded by all. Is it not therefore, inconceivable, and incongruous, that any military man, who throughout his adult life has carried the sword, never the Dove, tainted with My Lai, should have been appointed to co-operate and collaborate with two priests? I concur with Professor Trembley who wrote Shapp objecting to Henderson's appointment stating that no military man should have been appointed.

Paragraph 17.

The public pronouncement emanating from your office was that you were "going to put him (Henderson) to honcho-ing all the stuff about the Congress" as stated in the Philadelphia Bulletin. This brief, vague, and idiotic job classification seems to revolve around the linguistic nugget "honcho-ing" the meaning being incomprehensible and non-existent, purposely it would appear coined to mislead and camouflage. Credit, however, must be given the author for his imaginative attempt to confound and obfuscate. From such a job description, I daresay most readers would conclude that the job was created especially and exclusively for a political or personal favorite. Any other conclusion is hardly possible.

Paragraph 18.

I have not pre-judged Henderson as you state. Judgement has already been rendered despite his acquittal by a military tribunal. Numerous books and articles concerning him have been written. G.I. Ronald L. Ridenhour who initially exposed My Lai has stated publicly "The whole thing has been handled in a cynical Machiavellian way, I don't think anything that has gone on since the revelations has had anything to do with justice." "Calley is obviously a scapegoat. He's also obviously guilty, but he is not the only one responsible for what happened. The crucial thing about My Lai is that if it was atypical, then only the officers of My Lai were responsible." The plain

fact is, when U. S. Army field officers feel their careers are imperiled, most will boil their code of honor down to the old practical barracks motto CYA. You are free to reproduce this letter, along with the two pre-ceding ones addressed to Shapp, and circulate it among the leading citizens of Lebanon County. It may well be that some will not think me "nuts" and might now even agree with me.

Paragraphs 19-20.

I do not think anyone, other than yourself would find anything "mystifying" in my closing paragraphs of my letter of September 19th. Doubtless your long political associations have blunted your early concepts of honesty, integrity, ethics, etc. which to politicians is quite different from that held by citizens. I could, as could anyone, quote conditions and situations in which politicians see no "wrong doing" which would certainly be so considered by non-political persons. Casuistically, you state that I as an individual set myself personally above others, as a judge of Henderson, and the entire American system, as if I were a voice in the wilderness. I plainly stated that while I personally wrote, I wrote on behalf of those who would agree with me, but who would not take pen in hand for reasons of apathy or any other. I suspect a considerable number of persons will agree with what I have written, and for those who do not, and can convince me of my errors, to them I shall be indebted. If indeed I have written truthfully, though considered by you prejudiced, so be it.

SUMMARY:

Your contention that Henderson's appointment was neither personal nor political will, I fear, convince few as political tradition is to the contrary, despite your protestations.

I am quite certain that a panel of citizens would have set the following brief criteria, devoid of personal or political considerations, for the post of Assistant Director of the Pennsylvania Bicentennial Commission.

Non-Military. Male or Female. Scholar, Teacher, writer, Professor, etc. having field and administrative experience in world peace movements and organizations, such as Quakers or any other. Author of research articles on world peace and having some acquaintance with world movements in this area. Historian and student of Peace Movements. etc. etc.

Certainly some one exists in Pennsylvania whose qualifications merit their appointment other than Henderson?

Cordially,
ALBERT KOEHLER
1217 Durham Road
Riegelsville, Pa. 18077

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Wilson. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WILSON. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON. I note on the calendar today that it states, as a heading, "Bills Reported and Considered First Time and Tabled." Could you tell me what position these bills are in—first, second, third consideration?

The SPEAKER. When the bills are taken from the table and appear on the calendar in place, they will appear in second-reading position.

Mr. WILSON. Then all the bills that are on this calendar today are in fact on second consideration?

The SPEAKER. That is correct. The information that appears on the calendar is for informational purposes only.

Mr. WILSON. Okay. I thank the Chair. I will get used to the rules.

STATEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Rappaport.

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to the House that the Ethics Committee had an organization meeting today. The lady from Philadelphia, Mrs. Kelly, was selected as the secretary of the committee.

Hopefully, we will have no business this session, but in the event that we do, we are prepared for same.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

QUESTION OF INFORMATION

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Chester, Mrs. Crawford. For what purpose does the lady rise?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. I rise to a question of information.

The SPEAKER. The lady will state it.

Mrs. CRAWFORD. On the calendar today, you said that the bills that are reported out are on second consideration. Does that mean that they will be brought up today for movement to third consideration?

The SPEAKER. No. The bills are on the table, and what appears on page 1 of the calendar is for the information of the members.

Heretofore, the calendar indicated by bill number only what bills were on the table. We felt it was in the best interest of the members to have the titles of those bills added, so that the members would not have to be searching out the House History to find out what those bills are about.

What appears on page 1 and page 2 is for informational purposes only. The bills have received first consideration, and when the bills are taken from the table, on motion, and when they appear on the calendar, they will be on second consideration.

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, a further question of information since this is a new system that we are working under: I have amendments that I plan to offer to House bill No. 45. How much notice will people be given as far as this type of thing is concerned? In other words, will the bill be removed from the table and considered immediately or just how will that work?

The SPEAKER. On Wednesday of each committee-meeting week, the majority leader will make a motion aking certain bills from the table and moving them to the calendar. The lady will, therefore, have from Wednesday of that week until all of the next week in which

to have her amendments prepared and ready to be offered. The lady will be free to offer her amendments either on second consideration or third consideration. Mrs. CRAWFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority whip.

Mr. MANDERINO. As a point of further clarification, there was an amendment accepted yesterday as agreed, which indicates that the bill will be on second consideration the next legislative day after the same is removed from the table.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MEETING CANCELED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Vann.

Mr. VANN. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the members of the Urban Affairs Committee, I would like to announce that the meeting scheduled for 3:30 today will be canceled.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING CANCELED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Wojdak.

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, notices have been placed in the boxes of the members of the Appropriations Committee. For anyone who has not seen that notice, the Appropriations Committee meeting scheduled for 3:30 today has been canceled.

REQUEST FOR COPY OF RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. Pyles.

Mr. PYLES. Mr. Speaker, the first business on the calendar today is House resolution No. 40 as amended, and the people over in this section have not received a copy of House resolution No. 40 as amended.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has so been advised previously, and we will not take up House resolution No. 40 until copies are provided to the membership.

Mr. PYLES. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Will the chief clerk please make certain that copies of House resolution No. 40, as amended, are available to the membership of the House?

PRINTING ERROR

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster, Mr. Miller.

Mr. M. E. MILLER. Would this be the proper time to show the House a technical error apparently in House resolution No. 40 on page 46? I think it is an error of editorial omission.

If you will turn to page 46, starting on line 10, the sentence which begins, "The Chairman" is an incomplete sentence. The brackets that bracket out "may censure him or" are apparently incorrectly placed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. M. E. MILLER. Thank you.

CALENDAR

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 40 ADOPTED

Mr. IRVIS called up **HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 40, printer's No. 544**, entitled:

Proposed amendments to the rules of the House, Session of 1975-1976.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution as amended?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that amendments might be offered. Is that accurate or inaccurate?

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, I am informed now that there are no further amendments.

The SPEAKER. Does any member have amendments to House resolution No. 40?

The Chair recognizes the lady from Susquehanna, Miss Sirianni.

Miss SIRIANNI. I have an amendment to House resolution No. 40.

On the question recurring,

Will the House adopt the resolution as amended?

Miss SIRIANNI requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend House Resolution, page 10, by inserting between lines 17 and 18:

RULE 14 (a)

Contingency Expense Funds

No contingent expense fund shall be maintained or established in the House of Representatives after June 30, 1975.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Susquehanna, Miss Sirianni.

Miss SIRIANNI. Mr. Speaker, the amendment I am offering is to eliminate the contingency funds in the House of Representatives. This does not touch the members' expense accounts but all contingent funds.

The SPEAKER. Thanks a lot.

Miss SIRIANNI. You are welcome, anytime.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority whip. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MANDERINO. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that contingency funds that have been established for various purposes have been established by law and are written into legislation. It is my further understanding that we cannot adopt House rules inconsistent with law, and I would suggest to the House that the amendment offered is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is well taken. This House cannot entertain any resolution that contravenes established law, either statutory law or constitutional law,

and the resolution is not properly before the House for that purpose.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montour, Mr. Wagner. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WAGNER. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGNER. It is my understanding this amendment does not take effect until July 1, 1975. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. The House cannot adopt any resolution that runs beyond the term of the current session of this General Assembly.

Mr. WAGNER. But the amendment does not take effect until July 1, 1975, and the statutory provision provides for a budget, which we have not adopted yet. This would not affect the budget for 1974-1975, but this amendment would only affect the budget for 1975-1976.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend for just a moment?

The gentleman, Mr. Wagner, is correct in his observation that the contingency expense fund deletion, as proposed by this amendment, is not effective until after June 30, 1975. The statutory provision calling for the establishment of the funds is annually contained in the legislative budget document. Therefore, the amendment is in order. The Chair reconsiders its decision that the amendment was not properly offered. The amendment is properly before the House at this time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Renninger.

Mr. RENNINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion for the amendment of the rules. I think it is about time we get rid of these contingency funds whereby one member or another is preferred over others in the distribution of public funds to be expended for the benefit of the public and not for members individually, which is what is done here. And I think this process should change and should change now, and I ask your support. I plead for that support in fairness to each and every one of us.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the defeat of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Susquehanna, Miss Sirianni. Does the lady desire to be recognized on the amendment?

Miss SIRIANNI. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to make a request of the membership to vote their consciences, not their wishes.

The SPEAKER. I must admit I am struggling with that one.

Miss SIRIANNI. It is going to be a hard 2 years.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other observations that any member wants to make?

On the question recurring,
Will the House agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Miss SIRIANNI and Mr. IRVIS and were as follows:

YEAS—56

Anderson, J. H.	Foster, W.	Kusse	Renninger
Burns	Geesey	Lehr	Scheaffer
Cessar	Gleason	Levi	Sirianni
Cimini	Gricco	Lynch	Stahl
Crawford	Gring	McClatchy	Taddonio
Cumberland	Hasay	McCue	Thomas
Davies	Haskell	Manmiller	Turner
Deverter	Hayes, D. S.	Mebus	Wagner
Dorr	Hayes, S. E.	Miller, M. E.	Weidner
Dietz	Hepford	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Wilson
Fawcett	Hutchinson, W.	Noye	Wilt, R. W.
Fischer	Kelly, J. B.	Parker, H. S.	Worrlow
Fisher	Klingaman	Pitts	Wright
Foster, A.	Knepper	Pyles	Yohn

NAYS—128

Abraham	Gillespie	Morris	Shelton
Arthurs	Gillette	Mullen, M. P.	Shuman
Barber	Gleeson	Mullen	Shupnik
Bellomini	Goodman	Musto	Smith, E.
Bennett	Green	Mrkonic	Smith, L.
Beren	Greenfield	Myers	Spencer
Berlin	Halverson	Novak	Stapleton
Berson	Hill	O'Brien	Stout
Bittle	Hopkins	O'Connell	Sullivan
Bradley	Hutchinson, A.	O'Donnell	Taylor
Brunner	Irvis	O'Keefe	Toll
Caputo	Itkin	Oliver	Trelio
Cohen	Kelly, A. P.	Pancoast	Ustynoski
Cole	Kernick	Perry	Valicenti
Cowell	Kistler	Petrarca	Vann
Davis, D. M.	Koiter	Pievsky	Vroon
DeMedio	Kowalyshyn	Prendergast	Walsh, T. P.
Dicarlo	Laudadio	Rappaport	Wansacz
DiDonato	Laughlin	Reed	Wargo
Dininni	Lederer	Renwick	Westerberg
Dombrowski	Letterman	Rhodes	Whelan
Doyle	Lincoln	Richardson	Whittlesey
Dreibelbis	Manderino	Rieger	Wilt, W. W.
Eckensberger	McCall	Ritter	Wojdak
Englehart	McGinnis	Romanelli	Yahner
Fee	McGraw	Ruggiero	Zearfoss
Flaherty	McIntyre	Ryan	Zeller
Fryer	McLane	Saloom	Zord
Gallagher	Menhorn	Schmitt	Zwikl
Garzia	Milanovich	Schweder	
Geisler	Milliron	Shane	Fineman,
George	Miscevich	Shelhamer	Speaker
Giammarco	Moehlmann		

NOT VOTING—19

Blackwell	Hamilton, J. H.	Perri	Scirica
Bonetto	Hammock	Polite	Seltzer
Brandt	Johnson, J.	Pratt	Sweeney
Butera	Katz	Ross	Tayoun
Gallen	LaMarca	Salvatore	

So the question was determined in the negative and the amendment was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. Zeller.

Mr. ZELLER. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

I would like to call attention to the members that it would be almost impossible for us to vote against these rules, and I will tell you why.

If we were to vote against these rules as they are now, in effect we would be saying that we approve of the action on January 7, because that is what we would be living with. Stop and think about it a moment. I am not saying that what is here is right and the methods by which it got here are right. I am saying that if we vote against these rules, in effect we are saying to the Speaker, you were right on January 7.

Thank you, folks.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority whip.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that House Resolution 40 embodies the will of the majority of

the membership of this House so far as rules under which we should operate in this session, and I ask for an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that we must have rules to work under in this House. Speaking personally, I am in favor of the rules, for the most part, that are contained in House Resolution 40. I intend, however, to vote against it.

I think I place my opposition principally to the absolute, irregular, unlawful adoption of the original rules; at least the way the Journal puts that we adopted it; and the discourteous way that the whole matter was handled on January 7.

I refer the Speaker and the members of the House to several things that were called to the attention of the House by Mr. Yohn on January 27 when it became first known to us what had happened on January 7, the opening day of this session.

At that time Mr. Yohn called to the attention of the House the fact that the Legislative Journal for January 7 was not only slightly inconsistent but completely inconsistent with what actually happened here on the floor of the House the day of that vote.

Now by way of background most all of you, I think without exception all of you, were present on the floor of the House on January 7 because it was the day we were sworn in.

I understand the Speaker, who has explained to me he was, naturally, excited on that day because he too had a fight for his position—and giving the Speaker the benefit of all doubts—and perhaps was not paying strict attention to exactly what was taking place on that day because of his own—

The SPEAKER. —preoccupation with other matters.

Mr. RYAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very gently put.

The fact remains, however, that on that day a couple things happened. First—really last as you look at the calendar—Mr. Beren, Representative from Montgomery county, after hearing the debate and after hearing the remarks of various members, asked that the House, within the 5-day period, Mr. Speaker—

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. Ritter. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RITTER. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's remarks should be confined to the resolution before us and not the reading of the record of some other date.

The SPEAKER. Strictly speaking, the Chair would rule that the point of order is well taken. However, since we are now passing upon the adoption of rules that will govern the conduct of the House for the next 2 years, the Chair would like to extend the widest latitude possible to the gentleman who has the microphone.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

By way of further answer to the gentleman, I think it is appropriate in that it is my own position that what has been done heretofore, and really the adoption of what is here before us today, is probably illegal, so that is justification enough for my "no" vote and my reference to the Journal.

But in any event, the Journal shows Mr. Yohn pointing out to the House that the House Journal of January 7 was incorrect. The House Journal reads that the resolution that was adopted starts out by saying, and now this is what the House Journal says:

RESOLVED, That the Standing Rules of the House of Representatives for the 1973 and 1974 Sessions be and the same are hereby adopted as the Rules of this House for the Session beginning January 7, 1973,

And now I am going to add emphasis.

with the following amendments:

Now that is what the House Journal reads. Then it goes on, the House Journal goes on, and recites all of these amendments that were added to the 1973-74 rules.

The Journal of January 7, as it was printed and as it was approved by us, recites that the point that was brought to this House was the adoption of the rules beginning January 7, 1975, with the following amendments and then recites those amendments.

In actuality, this is what happened that day, as verified by the tape recordings made of the session, and in case any of you do not know it or did not know it, everything we do here that goes over the microphone goes down into the reporters' office on the Dictabelts and the girls in the reporters' office transcribe from the Dictabelts and from the stenographic transcript taken here on the floor. So there is a double check as to what actually takes place on the House floor.

These Dictabelts were checked, and the transcript, as originally prepared by the girls, of the proceedings of that day were transcribed and compared with what the Journal said for January 7. And what actually took place on that day, the day we were sworn in, was this, with regard to these rules. What was said by the reading clerk was:

RESOLVED, That the Rules of the House of Representatives for the 1973 and 1974 Sessions, as amended, be adopted as the rules of the 1975 Session of this House until otherwise ordered.

And then the Speaker put the question:

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Now we raised this point a number of weeks ago when we found out about it. I believe we raised it on this very day that I am reading from the Journal, January 7.

We had been bilked. Everyone in this room had been conned. We did not vote on these rules that were before us yesterday on January 7; each one of us on January 7 voted for the 1973-74 rules as they had been amended in 1973 and 1974.

The Legislative Journal lies. The Journal lies. This was not an editorial change made to that Journal. The Journal was changed. The Journal now reads for that date "with the following amendments," and that is not what took place on the floor of the House on January 7, the day we were sworn in.

Now let me go a step further. This came to our at-

tention at a later date. Maybe we were negligent. But if you recall the debate back on January 27 when this came to our attention, we asked what was in the amendment, what was in the resolution that we acted on on January 7, and we were told that we had copies of it on our desks at the time, which is a requirement.

Later in that debate—and the Journal of January 27 bears out what I say—the majority leader, Mr. Irvis, points out that, indeed, we did not have copies of those resolutions on our desks; that through some oversight, through some oversight, those very resolutions were in his office and were not distributed on January 7, the day we were sworn in.

Contrary to some of the remarks that were made earlier in the Journal on that day of January 27, we did not have before us what was voted on on January 7. We got hold of it on January 27 when we found out how we had been railroaded, and that is what I call it, we were railroaded.

Now what difference does it make? This is the difference it makes: Despite assurances from the other side that this would not act to our detriment, the actual difference it makes that they adopted these rules with the Fineman amendments—and I am going to call them Fineman amendments for the moment because it was the Speaker who had suggested—the now Speaker, then the minority leader—a course of amendments to run the new session this year, this session. And he did distribute those amendments several weeks beforehand. So just for the sake of clarity, in trying to differentiate between these new amendments proposed by the Speaker and the amendments that were made to the 1973-74 session, I will refer to them as the Fineman amendments.

The 1973-74 rules, with the Fineman amendments in them, were adopted. And they may very well have been adopted anyway, I do not know that. But this is the difference that it makes to us as members: In order for the Fineman amendments to become the rules of the House, it would be necessary for 102 members to vote in the affirmative for those amendments when they were offered on the floor of the House as has been the course of conduct and as has been customary for as many years as I have been here, seven terms. There are people who have been here longer than I have and they agree that that is the customary way of doing it and that that is what we voted on on January 7.

But because of what happened, because we were railroaded—and we were not only railroaded but we were railroaded through a tunnel that had no light—it became incumbent on us to remove what we did not want with 102 votes, and I also question that one. If I had 102 votes, I would show that the Speaker was wrong in his ruling yesterday, but I do not have them.

I do not know how to say it without using a television bleeper; I do not know how to express my feelings without the record being expunged; so I will just refer again to the railroading that took place here on January 7. I hope, I sincerely hope, that it does not indicate the actions that we will be dealing with for the next 2 years.

I suggest that we got off to a very, very poor start. I suggest that the leadership on the other side of this aisle did not intend that this happen the way it happened. I suggest to the other side that in fairness it should not have been permitted to continue as it continued yesterday. I suggest to the Speaker of this House, who properly

ruled out of order a motion to reconsider the vote by which those resolutions were adopted on the 7th because more than 5 days had passed, and I say to the Speaker and to the other side, refer to the Journal of January 27 when Mr. Beren asked for a reconsideration motion. And the majority leader, trying to smooth it over, as he always does—he is the great peacemaker, and he is one of the great men in this House today—smoothed it over and we thought we were not being led down the so-called primrose path. It did not develop that way.

I am not voting “no” because these are bad rules. Some of them I definitely disagree with. The super-rules committee, I think, goes against everything we have tried to do here over the past couple of years. We have talked about openness which we, 2 years ago, proposed and which was opposed by some of the members on the other side who today speak out in favor of the great rules’ changes for the good of the public, and we can look to the Journal on that one.

I speak out against the rule change that requires 10 members to report a bill out of committee when heretofore—and probably in every parliamentary body in this country—a majority of a quorum could report legislation out of committee. These are steps backward.

I approve of many of the other things in the rules. I am willing to be shown that this new system of committee meetings and no floor action will work. I frankly do not believe it will. I hear complaints from every one of our members about the meetings being canceled at 9:30 on Monday. They get here, after driving here from all parts of this state, to find that 9:30 meetings are canceled without any notice.

I am willing to wait; I am willing to be shown; I am willing to give you a chance on these committee meetings and this scheduling. But I strongly protest what took place here on January 7; I strongly protest what took place here on January 27 when it became known not only to us but to the other side the truth of the matter, and I vote “no” in protest.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority whip.

MR. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how long the gentleman on the other side of the aisle who just spoke wants to continue to beat a dead horse. I would like to put on the record certain facts that he conveniently eliminated.

When the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Shelton, proposed the resolution and handed the written resolution to the desk, that written resolution contained every one of the changes that he is complaining about. Mr. Irvis already apologized for not having that particular resolution with its changes on the desks of the members. There was no railroading intended. There was no intentional withholding of those amendments from any member.

Mr. Ryan has been on the floor of this House long enough to know that had he wanted to question the proponent of that resolution, he could have on that day. He could have interrogated him when he heard the words “as amended” to find out what those words “as amended” meant. He could have gone up to the reading clerk, as he has on many occasions and asked to see a copy of that resolution. He did not do any of these things. Let

me say to you that on that day we had no rules of this House that would require anything less than was done. The resolution was introduced; it was in writing; and it was adopted by a unanimous vote of this House.

Be that as it may, what we are doing today is adopting rules for the House. The expression of this House during the debate yesterday I think is clear. I think a majority of the members of this House—and that is important, the majority of the members of this House—agree with each and every one of the rules that is being adopted, each one of the changes that is being adopted, and the expression, when House resolution No. 40 is put to a final vote, will test whether the members of this House agree that these are the rules under which we should operate.

I apologize to the gentleman who complains and members who complain about the cancellation of meetings. No one intends that these meetings be canceled. Unfortunately, we in the House have a way of taking longer to adopt rules, with caucuses, with floor action, with amendments. We spend more time on this than we do on many major pieces of legislation. But this is the way it has always been and perhaps this is the way it will always be. But beginning next week, hopefully, with the rules having been adopted, we will get into the extensive committee meetings, the extensive deliberations, and the system will work under the proposed rules, once they are adopted, as I believe it was intended to work. I can only say to the gentleman on the other side of the aisle, try it; you are going to like it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I listened to Mr. Manderino answer my protest, and I really thought it was humorous that he said that we take such a long time to adopt rules. We adopted that whole set of 1973-74 rules with the Speaker's proposed amendments in about 30 seconds, and none of us knew it.

The Speaker of the House, the majority side—the now majority side—every one of them knew; the press knew what Mr. Butera's thoughts were on the proposed Fineman rules. His thoughts were—and they are part of the Journal—that generally he agreed with the concept that the Speaker was proposing, that he thought it may be innovative and that it might very well be good. But he vigorously questioned the idea of the super-rules committee. There is no one on that side of the aisle in that leadership, nor would the Speaker, deny the fact that Mr. Butera, from the very first time he had a chance to examine the proposed rule changes, questioned whether or not we could go for the super-rules committee. Forget the 10-member requirement to report a bill from committee and forget some of the other things. We questioned, we quarreled and we doubted the wisdom of the super-rules committee, so no one can say that we knew or had any reason to know that on January 7 we were adopting it.

I have talked to members who have been here longer than me, and they will agree, and I will bet you that some of your older members will agree, that, as a matter of custom, we adopt the rules from the preceding session to keep going until such time as we have had an opportunity to review and adopt additional rules.

So I disagree with you, Mr. Speaker, that we spent a lot of time on these rules. We spent less than 30 seconds on

these rules and we spent 2 days trying to undo what we should have had an opportunity to do.

And then to get that ruling yesterday that we needed 102 votes to amend a resolution, I think the Speaker made new law. I do not know whom it is going to come back to haunt, but I accept that. I can count the numbers, and you know, when you have the horses, you go ahead and run, and you had them yesterday. And I understand that part of the game. But that ruling will come back to haunt us someday; I do not know whether it is going to be your side or our side. But it was not done in a good fashion; it certainly was not done in a courteous fashion. We in the leadership have, time and time again over all of the years I have been involved, attempted to work courteously and cooperatively, one with the other. Partisan, yes; but we have never tried to pull end runs on the other guy. And I say to you, be it intentional or unintentional, an end run was pulled on January 7, and something was railroaded that should not have been railroaded and a disservice was done to this House on that date.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Vann.

Mr. VANN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ryan has a right to say anything he wants to say, and apparently he is saying it today. But his memory is very short. When he says that his side of the aisle has always extended courtesy to our side of the aisle, I am not accusing him of being a liar, but I am accusing him of having a very short memory and I want that to get on record.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. Beren.

Mr. BEREN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ryan voiced many of my objections to the passage of House resolution No. 40. They surround almost entirely the adoption of the new rule 22 which I argued against yesterday, and I feel that sets such a dangerous precedent that I intend to vote against this rule.

But one other thing disturbs me. I do not think there is anybody in this House who questions the fact that on January 7 we had another sneak attack. We had it and there is no question about it. And what burns me up is that Mr. Manderino is saying that is the way we are going to run the House; I defend it; keep your eyes open. We will.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Valicenti.

Mr. VALICENTI. Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand the other side of the aisle saying we railroaded this stuff through. They are saying we are doing things that are not just right. But I think they ought to think back maybe about a year or so ago when we were in the minority and a gentleman by the name of Stan Kester got up and told the Speaker, we do not care what the other side of the aisle says; go ahead; we have got the votes; roll the bill. That is exactly what he said. He did not care about any debate. Evidently it looks like Mr. Kester is not with us any more.

Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tioga, Mr. Spencer.

Mr. SPENCER. Would the majority leader consent to be interrogated?

The SPEAKER. Will the majority leader consent to interrogation?

Mr. IRVIS. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I shall.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. Speaker, by what authority was the press moved down to the front of the House?

Mr. IRVIS. I think that was granted, Mr. Speaker, when we adopted the rules on January 7. Is that not part of the rules adopted January 7?

Mr. SPENCER. I refer to rule 72, page 60, line 3, which says: "Persons assigned to the press gallery on a permanent or temporary basis shall not walk onto the floor of the House of Representatives or Senate nor approach the rostrum or the clerks' desks during session or while being at ease." Does this then mean that if we adopt House resolution No. 40, the press will be removed to the rear of the House?

Mr. IRVIS. No, Mr. Speaker. Walking on the floor of the House indicates moving away from their assigned position and coming to the members' desks.

Mr. SPENCER. It does not say that.

Mr. IRVIS. Please take my word for it; that is precisely what it means. It has always been that.

Mr. SPENCER. My interpretation is that being on the floor of the House, they are out of order and should be removed by the sergeant at arms.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is in error. The Speakers of the House of Representatives have traditionally—and will continue, I think, to observe the tradition—kept the floor of the House available to members only.

The press has traditionally been allocated a separate space which it must occupy and none other. And that is all that this rule says—that they have their own particular gallery, their own particular seat. They are not to leave that seat to go and visit on the floor with any member.

Mr. SPENCER. But that is covered by the second section, line 7:

Persons assigned to the press gallery on a permanent or temporary basis wishing to confer with a Senator or Representative shall disclose this fact by having a message delivered by a page to the Senator or Representative. Such conversation shall be conducted off the floor of the Senate or House of Representatives.

That takes care of the situation you are explaining.

My position is, from my interpretation of these rules, that no member of the press can be on the floor of this House during the session or while at ease.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has a right to his own interpretation. I think he is in error and I think we will prove that he is in error as the days go on.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Romanelli.

Mr. ROMANELLI. I wonder if Mr. Ryan would stand to very brief interrogation.

The SPEAKER. Will the minority whip consent to interrogation?

Mr. RYAN. I shall, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. ROMANELLI. Mr. Speaker, were you on the floor of the House of Representatives January 7, 1975?

Mr. RYAN. I was.

Mr. ROMANELLI. And then you can stand there and allude to end runs?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RYAN. You bet I can. I would like to further my answer, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. RYAN. It is customary, Mr. Speaker, that resolutions come from a rules committee. The resolution adopted on January 7 did not come from a rules committee.

It is customary—just let me finish my answer; I see you jumping back—that resolutions be on the members' desks before we adopt them. The rules that were adopted on January 7 were not on the members' desks.

It is customary, under the new rule even, that before you do something by agreement it be explained. The rules that were adopted on January 7 were not explained.

It is customary that the rules be read or a resolution be read. Now we know that in practice they are not read in their entirety, but here we did not even get the right lead that there were additional amendments being offered. We got some hogwash that came out of here that came out differently when it was printed in the Journal.

You bet I was here, and I was not negligent because I trusted what was read from that podium by the reading clerk.

Mr. ROMANELLI. Let me save you a little breath here.

Mr. RYAN. Now wait a minute. I am finishing my answer.

Mr. ROMANELLI. You are not answering the question.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Romanelli, yield until Mr. Ryan finishes?

Mr. RYAN. It is customary, and if I were negligent—and maybe I was—I was negligent because I believed what was read by the reading clerk that day. It was not until later, on the 27th, that I was proven wrong—that what was read is not what happened in the Journal. It was not until the 27th that we found we had been railroaded and misled.

I find no negligence. I had nothing on the floor. We had nothing here. We had nothing but the custom of this House to adopt the prior year's or the prior term's resolution on rules. The rules from the prior term have customarily been adopted on the opening day, and that is what everyone here thought, including your leadership.

Mr. ROMANELLI. Custom of the House, right?

Mr. RYAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROMANELLI. I was not alluding to the adoption of the rules, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RYAN. Then maybe I was negligent just being here that day, if that is what you mean.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tioga, Mr. Spencer.

Mr. SPENCER. I do not want to beat this to death, but I would like to further comment on the majority leader's statement. Rule 72 states that a person assigned to the press gallery should not walk onto the floor of the House, and he says that means they can still walk between their assigned seats and the rear of the House. But if you go to the front of the resolution on line 14, it says: "Floor of the House' shall be that area within the Hall of the House between the Speaker's rostrum and the brass rail behind the Members' seats."

All I am saying is that these rules are not clear; they are sloppily drawn; we should not endorse them today.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, I did not really want to get into this, because I think we have heard a lot of nonsense today and we do not need any more from the majority leader. But I would point out to the gentleman that if this rule is nonsense, it is the rule by which we abided for the 2 years that his party was in the majority, and I would suggest that he look at it carefully before he starts cross-examining. Any lawyer will tell you, you had better not ask questions if you do not know the answers that are coming out from the witness.

I did not want to state it, but these rules which you are criticizing are not new rules. They are the rules under which we coexisted from 1973 through 1974. If you look on page 60, you will see that the rule that you were reading is not an underlined rule and, if it is not underlined, it is exactly the same as it was in 1973-74.

And I will further guarantee you that if the gentleman is worried about the press being able to get to their seats and get back, I will personally escort any member of the press who is afraid to walk that distance from the brass rail back to his seat or from his seat back to the brass rail.

Now if the Speaker will recognize the rest of the members who wish to orate on this question so that we may get to the passage of the rules which are going to pass today, I would appreciate it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Bittle.

Mr. BITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct one of the majority leader's statements. I think when he talks about the rule, he is not reading both rules which governed that. The rule which governed the location of the press during the last session of the legislature put them off the floor of the House but within the hall of the House. I think he overlooked that part of it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. IRVIS. I may have overlooked it, but you and the press have my promise—if you are afraid, I will personally escort them every day up and down the aisle, if that is what they need. I do not think they need that protection and I do not think they are going to require that protection, but if you think they need it, I will provide it for them.

Let us get on with the rules.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. Pancoast.

Mr. PANCOAST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House resolution No. 40. We need rules to operate in this House, and whether we have had rules or whether we have not had rules, I think is beside the point at this particular moment.

The rules of the House are determined by a majority of the members, as the majority whip has so well pointed out. Yesterday in the course of the debate, it was very interesting to see some reflections of that old saw, all that is new is not necessarily good or all that is old is not necessarily bad, because sometimes one side of the aisle was arguing for something new and at the same time a little later that same side of the aisle would be arguing for something that is old. It seems to me we have arrived at a compromise in the presentation of these rules.

I am reminded of the words of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Robert Hamilton, when I was

a freshman. He said, the minority will have its say; the majority will have its way. And I think that is the way it is with the adoption of the rules.

I think it is about time that we get together and we make every effort to make these rules work effectively and to represent all of the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster, Mr. Miller.

Mr. M. E. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of the rules and I rise with a tinge of sadness because today should really be a historic day in this assembly. The majority of the members of this House have voted for reforms that many of us thought we would never see in the House rules. We are going to take a look at contingency funds; we are going to require amendments to be explained on the floor; we are going to try and formulate an adequate way of doing things; and we are going to permit, if the occasion arises, the live media to broadcast or telecast.

I say to you members, I congratulate you on your willingness to reform, on your willingness to venture into areas of which we are uncertain, and I urge you to support the rules.

Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Bittle.

Mr. BITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I am just a conservative little country boy trying to get ahead. Some of the things that have happened on the floor of the House continue to amaze me, and I guess one of those happened again on January 7. And I do not look at it as having happened to us in the minority; I look at it as having happened to you in the majority, too, because I daresay if I ask everyone on the floor of the House here now who knew exactly what we did when we adopted those rules on January 7 to give me a call in my office later this afternoon, my phone would not exactly jump off the hook. They probably would not call anyway.

But what did happen was a set of rules was adopted that nobody knew was contained in the resolution because it was changed from the reading clerk to the Journal of this House, and then when we withdrew our objections to that, we were assured we would get a chance to change it. We did not get that chance and we did not get a chance for a good reason, I guess—because we are in the minority and you have 102 votes on that side of the aisle.

That is one of the things I cannot get used to and I cannot get used to it whether Stan Kester says it or Jim Manderino says it, because I do not think when you do something that is wrong, that the Speaker knows it is wrong and the leadership knows it is wrong and the membership knows it is wrong, that it becomes right because there are 102 votes that say it is right. But you can never change that. It is something we are going to have to live with.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Some of the junior members came to me privately to say that they were honestly confused as to what House resolution No. 40 is in front of them. I suspect there may be some of the senior members, after I have heard the debate, who may share that confusion.

I would suggest to the junior members, and to those senior members who are not ashamed to admit it, that they pay attention to the statement I am about to make so you know what you are voting on.

House resolution No. 40 supersedes all other rules of the House of Representatives, if it is passed here this afternoon.

There are three types of languages in this bill. There is language which existed in 1973 and 1974—the rules under which most of us were accustomed to abide. That language is in simple print with no underlining.

There is a second type of language in House resolution No. 40 which is in upper- and lowercase letters, capitals and noncapital letters, and underlined. That is the language which was suggested by the Rules Committee, which reported this resolution out, as additional language to the existing language.

The third type of language is in solid caps and underlined.

If you will look on page 9 of the resolution, you will see all three types of language illustrated. On page 9, beginning on line 1 and going down through line 8, you will see the language of the rules as we have observed them through 1973 and 1974. Beginning on line 9 and going through line 11, you will see upper- and lowercase language underlined. That is language suggested by the Rules Committee as reported to the House. Beginning on line 18 and going through line 30 at the bottom of the page, you will find solid caps underlined. That is amendatory language put into this resolution yesterday by the members of this House of Representatives.

Once this resolution is passed, it will constitute the rules of the 1974-75 session and it will supersede any and all other rules.

I call for the question, Mr. Speaker.

All right, I will yield to the minority whip.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman, Mr. Irvis, consent to interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Will the majority leader consent to interrogation?

Mr. IRVIS. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. RYAN. Let me confess that at the beginning I was not really listening because I was one of the older members who did not understand it and I thought I would not admit it. But then as I listened to you and I tried to put myself in the position of a new member, I said to myself as I went through your page 9, the language that appears without any underlining and the language that is not in caps is the language of the 1973-74 rules?

Mr. IRVIS. That is correct.

Mr. RYAN. The language on lines 9, 10 and 11 that is underlined is what?

Mr. IRVIS. Language as referred to the floor of this House by the Rules Committee.

Mr. RYAN. All right. Now, the language on lines 9, 10 and 11—

Mr. IRVIS. I am sorry; I thought you were asking me about lines 9, 10 and 11.

Mr. RYAN. I am.

Now, was the language on 9, 10 and 11 part of the resolution that passed here January 7?

Mr. IRVIS. Yes.

Mr. RYAN. Now, as I understand it, if in fact there was

a proper adoption of that resolution on January 7, there would be no need to underline lines 9, 10 and 11 because it would be the existing rules of this House. Is that not correct, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, I misstated my answer. I am informed by counsel that lines 9, 10 and 11 is language as I originally stated, submitted to the House by the Rules Committee, and not necessarily language which was adopted on January 7.

Mr. RYAN. The resolution of January 7 with amendments—that portion of it that I refer to as the Fineman amendments—

Mr. IRVIS. Yes.

Mr. RYAN. —those amendments do, of course, appear in this resolution?

Mr. IRVIS. They do. But they appear as—

Mr. RYAN. Do they appear underlined?

Mr. IRVIS. —not underlined.

Mr. RYAN. All right.

Mr. IRVIS. As not underlined, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RYAN. Thank you.

Mr. IRVIS. I call for the question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make this observation: I think the essential question before the House today, as indicated by Mr. Pancoast, is whether or not the rules that we have before us, which are a complete set of rules, will militate in the best interests of the House.

I am quite certain that there is no mortal—at least not in this chamber—who can conceptually draw a set of rules that is going to satisfy 203 members. Under those circumstances, a majority would have to prevail. But I think what is important here is not that there is a prevailing number of votes on the majority side of the aisle—the Democratic side—and a minority number of votes on the Republican side of the aisle, but what, rather, is important is whether or not in the viewpoint of the members of this House these rules can inure to the benefit of the membership and enhance the legislative operation of this General Assembly.

I strongly share the view that the concept that is embraced within House resolution No. 40, while admitting that each detail of that concept might not be to the liking of 203 members, nevertheless is a concept that will inure to your benefit. And I would hope that the members would be voting upon whether or not the rules as they have them on their desks today are good rules, without regard to whether or not the mechanics that were employed in bringing them to this position were all that the minority side would have wanted them to be.

I understand the minority position on this thing. I have been in that position many times, particularly in the past 2 years. I fought for what I, as the minority leader, thought was the proper position of the Democratic Party and I was foremost among those who yelled when I saw some impropriety being perpetrated. So I understand full well the position of the minority—

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berks, Mr. Gallen. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GALLEN. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GALLEN. I am willing to extend a lot of latitude, Mr. Speaker, but I think if the gentleman would like to

give a speech, he should come down to the floor and give a speech.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman feels constrained to make that kind of observation, the Chair will refrain from any further utterances, and I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

On the question recurring,
Will the House adopt the resolution as amended?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. MAN-
DERINO and RYAN and were as follows:

YEAS—151

Abraham	Gillespie	Mebus	Schmitt
Arthurs	Gillette	Menhorn	Schweder
Barber	Gleeson	Milanovich	Shane
Bellomini	Goodman	Miller, M. E.	Shelhamer
Bennett	Green	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Shelton
Berlin	Greenfield	Milliron	Shuman
Berson	Grieco	Miscevich	Shupnik
Bradley	Gring	Moehlmann	Smith, E.
Brunner	Halverson	Morris	Stapleton
Burns	Hammock	Mullen, M. P.	Stout
Caputo	Haskell	Mullen	Sullivan
Cessar	Hayes, D. S.	Musto	Taddonio
Cohen	Hill	Myers	Taylor
Cole	Hopkins	Novak	Thomas
Cowell	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien	Toil
Cumberland	Irvic	O'Donnell	Trello
Davies	Itkin	O'Keefe	Turner
Davis, D. M.	Johnson, J.	Oliver	Velicenti
DeMedio	Kelly, A. P.	Pancoast	Vann
Dicarlo	Kelly, J. B.	Parker, H. S.	Wagner
DiDonato	Kernick	Perry	Walsh, T. P.
Diminni	Kistler	Petrarca	Wansacz
Dombrowski	Knopper	Pievsky	Wargo
Doyle	Kolter	Pitts	Weidner
Dreibelbis	Kowalyszyn	Pratt	Wilson
Eckensberger	LaMarca	Prendergast	Wilt, R. W.
Engelhart	Laudadio	Pyles	Wojdak
Fawcett	Laughlin	Rappaport	Worriolow
Fee	Lederer	Reed	Wright
Fischer	Lehr	Renwick	Yahner
Fisher	Letterman	Rhodes	Yohn
Flaherty	Lynch	Richardson	Zearfoss
Fryer	Manderino	Rieger	Zeller
Gallagher	Manmiller	Ritter	Zord
Garzia	McCall	Romanelli	Zwinkl
Geesey	McCue	Ruggiero	
Geisler	McGraw	Saloom	Fineman,
George	McLane	Scheaffer	Speaker
Giammarco			

NAYS—37

Anderson, J. H.	Gallen	Lincoln	Smith, L.
Beren	Gleason	McClatchy	Spencer
Bittle	Hasay	McGinnis	Stahl
Cimini	Hayes, S. E.	Noye	Ustynoski
Crawford	Hepford	O'Connell	Vroon
Deverter	Hutchinson, W.	Renninger	Westerberg
Dorr	Klingaman	Ryan	Whelan
Dietz	Kusse	Seltzer	Whittlesey
Foster, A.	Levi	Sirianni	Wilt, W. W.
Foster, W.			

NOT VOTING—15

Blackwell	Hamilton, J. H.	Perri	Seirica
Bonetto	Katz	Polite	Sweeney
Brandt	McIntyre	Ross	Tayoun
Butera	Mrkonic	Salvatore	

The majority required by the constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the resolution was adopted.

LEWIS MILLS HIGH SCHOOL BAND AND
CHOIR WELCOMED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House today the band and choir from Lewis Mills High School and their music director, Mr. David

Jones. These folks are from Burlington, Connecticut, and are the guests of the gentleman from Northampton, Mr. Ruggiero.

The Chair notes that the band and choir have already left. They wanted to make more pleasant music.

REASON FOR VOTE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, now that the vote has been cast, I would like to mention for the record that the vote I cast in the negative was not a vote against all of the rules as presented. I want that, I daresay, to be clearly understood.

I think, too, that this is the position of many of the members of the Republican side who voted against these rules rather as a protest than as a vote against the contents of House resolution No. 40.

HOUSE SCHEDULE

The SPEAKER. The Chair would advise the members of the House that for the next 2 weeks the sessions on the floor will be token sessions only. The committees of this House will be operating at full tilt the next 2 weeks, and the floor sessions will be held for the purpose of a master roll and moving matters across the Speaker's desk.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Bittle. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BITTLE. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BITTLE. Am I to understand from what the Speaker just said that during the next 2 weeks there will be no master roll calls taken on the floor of the House?

The SPEAKER. No; there will be master roll calls.

There will be a master roll call.

Mr. BITTLE. You are referring to them as token sessions because they will not be working sessions, but there will be master roll calls?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

The Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. RYAN. To clear up further this question that was initially raised by Mr. Bittle, assuming for a minute that a member has no committee meetings scheduled for Wednesday because for some reason or another both of his committee meetings have been canceled on Wednesday—or Tuesday or Monday; it is not important—why should that person be here just for the purpose of answering a master roll call? Will it be necessary for him to answer that master roll call?

The SPEAKER. It will be necessary, Mr. Ryan.

Under the schedule of meetings as it has been outlined, each committee will be meeting 2 out of 3 days of the scheduled 3 days. On the day that a member does not have a committee meeting, I am certain that there are many legislative responsibilities and duties that can fill his day more than adequately. The members have constituent work. They have bill review work. They have bill preparation work. I am hoping that the members, on the days on which they do not have committee meet-

ings, will make maximum use of those days for those responsibilities. The concept of having committee meetings without any floor sessions was not designed to be a vehicle for members to remain at home.

It is the intention of the Chair to have sessions at least 3 days a week, and later on perhaps 4 days a week, and each member is expected to be present in Harrisburg when the House is in session.

Mr. RYAN. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would be kind enough to advise the chairmen of the various committees that if they intend to call off meetings, particularly the 9:30 meetings on Monday mornings, they should contact the members prior to the members' coming up here to find that they have nothing at all to do.

The SPEAKER. Well, that is very much in order. I am sure, however, that the cancellations were as a result of the House's preoccupation with the rules, but it certainly would be a courtesy that should be extended to the membership, to be advised ahead of time if a 9:30 Monday morning meeting has been canceled.

GAME AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Elk, Mr. Renwick.

Mr. RENWICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to announce that the Committee on Game and Fisheries will meet at their designated time at 3:30. It is impossible for us to move that time up, which I would like to do, but because of the "sunshine" law it is impossible. So please stay here. At 3:30 we will have our meeting right here on the floor of the House.

Thank you very much.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS HOUSE

Mr. LYNCH requested and obtained unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the new member of the other august body of this General Assembly from Delaware County today addressed himself to a problem of great concern to the residents of Upper Darby Township, whom I represent in this House.

The gentleman today accused Governor Shapp of holding up governmental appointments in Delaware County "for some unknown reason" and took particular issue to a vacancy in the office of district justice of the peace for the 115th district. I might add that this is a first-class magisterial district with a population of about 30,000, which is completely contained in my legislative district.

For more than 2 years now, the people of Upper Darby have had to depend upon rotating substitute district justices to take care of this size population while the position remains vacant.

What the gentleman failed to mention in his speech, however, is that this unconscionable delay in making the appointment is due to the fact that the "leaders" of the Delaware County Democratic Party cannot seem to agree upon a name to fill this post in the minor judiciary.

To date, I understand, three names have been put forward for consideration. One candidate, who is reported to have the Senator's backing, has been described in the press as unqualified by the wife of the Democratic Chairman of Delaware County. Another, the favorite, it appears, of the Democratic County Chairman, is a Philadel-

phia private detective who says he lives in Upper Darby but who has, however, his wife and children living on South 18th Street in Philadelphia.

The third candidate, so I am told, for this position is a 23-year-old law student who presumably, if he were appointed, would receive on-the-job training at the rate of \$16,500 a year.

I can readily understand why His Honor, the Governor, is not particularly thrilled by any of these three proposals.

But the local press recently devoted a headline article to a report that the gentleman has been receiving local and state police protection because of threats to himself and his family, which he said resulted from his nominating whom he did for the district justice post. In fact, it was reported to the local newspapers that a man had come to his home and "made offers" if he would support one of the other nominees. When he declined, he reported, the visitor threatened him.

In the same article, one of the ward leaders is reported to have said that the county Democratic leader recommended somebody without talking to anybody in the district. He is further quoted as saying, "No one here has ever heard of him and we're not even sure he lives in the district."

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that for a political organization which aspires to leadership in the third largest county in this Commonwealth, it might be worthwhile and, I might say, imperative that these so-called leaders attempt, first, to achieve a little order in their own house. At the moment the prospects of this occurring appear dim. The people, however, might not be quite so long-suffering.

What deeply concerns me is that any group aspiring to government leadership should engage in such infighting and indecision, and I can only say that I hope that wiser counsel is taken in the future and that my voters are not made to suffer further by such disgraceful and unreasonable delays.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Mrkonic. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MRKONIC. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MRKONIC. Mr. Speaker, I had temporarily removed myself from the House chamber. If I had been here, I would have voted "yes" on House resolution No. 40.

The SPEAKER. The remarks of the gentleman will be spread upon the record.

LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. Yohn.

Mr. YOHN. Mr. Speaker, we meet here today to legislate for citizens in troubled times. We are in the midst of an economic recession, and many of our citizens are out of work. They are looking to us to provide help and ultimately provide a solution to their problems.

Yet these citizens look to us reluctantly. The events of Watergate in Washington have shaken their confidence in the integrity of elected officials. In Harrisburg we

have seen one elected official indicted for extortion and a former cabinet official indicted for bribery.

Events such as these have led a great many of our citizens to believe that politics is a dirty business and politicians cannot be trusted. The evidence of this disgust and disillusionment is seen in low voter turnouts at important elections.

On the one hand, many people no longer believe in the political system; on the other hand, they must look to the products of this system—elected and appointed officials—to find solutions to the many hard problems we all face today.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we went about the business of cleaning house in government and eliminating the kinds of conflicts of interest which have so tarnished the records of some public officials in the past.

As public officials we have all given up a portion of our privacy. We do this because we must if we are to be entrusted with the power to decide how public money—our constituents' tax dollars—is to be spent.

To help recreate a climate of trust in government by Pennsylvania citizens, I am today introducing legislation to establish standards of ethics for both the executive and legislative branches of state government and to enforce these standards.

Mr. Speaker, we have discussed such standards before. I believe we are all agreed that such standards must be established and given the force of law. That is why the House overwhelmingly approved such legislation during the last session.

By giving this legislation early consideration this session, I am hopeful we may produce new ethics laws during this General Assembly.

These proposals are contained in three bills. The first bill toughens the Legislative Code of Ethics of 1968. It requires legislators and legislative employes who make \$12,000 a year or more to file disclosure statements containing sources of income, names of clients or customers significantly affected by the Commonwealth or its agencies, relatives employed by the Commonwealth, and creditors for debts of \$5,000 or more.

This measure would prohibit legislators and their firms from receiving compensation for representing persons in transactions involving the Commonwealth except under highly restricted circumstances which present no conflict of interest. Basically, this bill is the same bill as this House passed overwhelmingly last year, known as House bill No. 1306.

The second proposal, the executive code of ethics, requires the Governor and key elected and appointed officials, as well as employes making \$20,000 per year or more in the administrative branch of government, to file disclosure statements like those required of legislators.

This bill further establishes standards of conduct for officers and employes of the executive branch, designed to eliminate potential conflicts of interest. This bill also passed the House of Representatives unanimously last year and was known as House bill No. 2130.

The third bill, Mr. Speaker, is new this year. It creates an independent Commonwealth ethics and public disclosure commission to oversee the conduct of members of both the executive and legislative branches.

This commission would consist of three members of outstanding character and reputation, not more than one of whom shall be a lawyer and not more than two of whom shall be from the same political party. All mem-

bers of the commission shall be appointed by the Governor with the consent of the Senate and shall serve staggered 5-year terms.

The members of the commission shall hold no other public position with any state agency nor shall they be eligible for any office or position filled by appointment of the Governor within 2 years after termination of their membership on the commission.

No person shall be eligible to serve as commissioner who has been an officer of a political party, a public officer, a legislator or legislative employe within the 2 years preceding his appointment.

The commission shall have the power to conduct investigations, subpoena witnesses, take testimony, and initiate and prosecute complaints of violations of these ethics laws.

After hearings and consideration, the commission may recommend dismissal of employes who violate the law, criminal prosecution, dismissal by impeachment of elected officials, or divestiture of interests deemed in violation of the ethics laws.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing these bills at this time and I will ask the clerk to hold them on the table for the balance of the day in the event that any other members may seek to join in cosponsorship. I ask you and all my colleagues in the House today to join with me in securing speedy passage of these measures to help reestablish public trust in our elected officials.

Thank you.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one announcement, and I hope those members who are here will relay it to the numerous members who have departed.

There has been a problem about the so-called super-rules committee, and, in trying to alleviate the worry about that committee, I am inviting any member who has a bill on the table which he wishes the Rules Committee to report or lift from the table, to please contact me or contact the young man who is standing to my left, who is my aide for legislative matters, Mr. Mark Schwartz, in my office. You will be invited to attend the Rules Committee meeting, and indeed you are welcome to attend any Rules Committee meeting whether you are interested in a specific piece of legislation or merely interested in the procedure. We do not intend to try and run a closed meeting. So any of you who wish to influence the Rules Committee as far as lifting a bill from the table, you are hereby invited to do so.

I will have other announcements on Monday, but I think they are useless at this time.

RULES SUSPENDED TO ADD SPONSORS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, I would move that the House of Representatives suspend its rules to permit additions of sponsors on the following bills:

House bill No. 3—Mr. M. E. Miller, Jr.;

House bill No. 6—Mr. Ruggiero;

House bill No. 22—Mr. Taddonio;

House bill No. 76—Messrs. McClatchy and Petrarca;

House bill No. 84—Messrs. Pratt and Reed;

House bill No. 155—Messrs. Cimini, Turner and Zoller;
 House bill No. 156—Mr. Morris;
 House bill No. 161—Mr. O'Donnell;
 House bill No. 162—Mr. O'Donnell;
 House bill No. 163—Mr. O'Donnell;
 House bill No. 164—Mr. O'Donnell;
 House bill No. 165—Mr. O'Donnell;
 House bill No. 166—Mr. O'Donnell;
 House bill No. 167—Mr. O'Donnell;
 House bill No. 168—Mr. O'Donnell;
 House bill No. 169—Mr. O'Donnell;
 House bill No. 170—Mr. O'Donnell;
 House bill No. 171—Mr. O'Donnell;
 House bill No. 172—Mr. O'Donnell;
 House bill No. 173—Mr. O'Donnell;
 House bill No. 174—Mr. O'Donnell;
 House bill No. 175—Mr. O'Donnell;
 House bill No. 176—Mr. O'Donnell;
 House bill No. 180—Messrs. Ustynoski, McIntyre and Cimini;

House bill No. 191—Mr. Cimini;
 House bill No. 202—Mr. Ruggiero;
 House bill No. 253—Mr. McClatchy; and
 House bill No. 440—Mr. Ruggiero.

On the question,
 Will the House agree to the motion?
 Motion was agreed to.

BUSINESS AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mercer, Mr. Bennett.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the planned meeting of the Business and Commerce Committee will be held tomorrow morning at 9:30 a.m. in room 246. It has been announced to the members previously; it was announced here on this floor last evening; and this is a further announcement that that meeting will be held tomorrow morning, the same agenda prevailing.

REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE PERSONS WELCOMED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House a group of Republican committee persons and their friends from the 98th Legislative District in Lancaster County. They are here as the guests of the gentleman from Lancaster, Mr. Brandt, along with the other gentlemen from Lancaster, Messrs. Hill, Gring, M. E. Miller, M. E. Miller, Jr., and Moehlmann.

LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Hammock.

Mr. HAMMOCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing for your consideration today a bill that we hope will be of great aid in curing the well-known doctor-shortage problem in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

This bill, coupled with two other bills which will be introduced later this month by Mr. Shane, Mr. DiCarlo, Mrs. Kelly and myself, will constitute a major effort by this House of Representatives to solve the doctor-shortage problem in Pennsylvania. The other bills will focus on

the problem of physician training and will encourage young doctors to move to rural and inner-city areas by changing the places where young doctors will do their residencies.

Another bill which will be cosponsored and introduced later this month will focus on establishing medical districts as political subdivisions created by local initiative, which will have the power to set up facilities for young physicians who will be provided for under the other bill.

The bill that I introduce today was introduced by myself in the last session of this legislature and I believe it has wide support. I think that several of us who have considered this problem in the last session realize that there is probably no quick and easy solutions or fast solutions to solving this doctor problem. Nonetheless, what we feel we have to do is to try to create some new incentive programs for young doctors, and the bill I introduce today is primarily aimed at creating these incentive programs.

At the same time, recognize that we have got to be able to create some kind of vehicle to channel the young doctors through so that they will not just be able to do as they have in the past; that is, to avoid the rural and the inner-city areas.

What we hope to do through the incentive programs and by establishment of corporations in medically deprived districts is to be able to set a pattern by which young doctors will be encouraged to enter certain areas and practice in the state. I think the bill that I introduce today is just part of many pieces that will be introduced on this problem.

I think what we need is open and informed and intelligent presentation by many people, many of whom will oppose the concepts that we offer today. But, nonetheless, we have got to move forward now in trying to cure this problem and that is why I offer this bill, and I will encourage members to join in sponsorship with their signatures.

Thank you.

LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Mr. Dorr.

Mr. DORR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just briefly, I wanted to let the members know—and I hope some of them are listening on the PA system in their offices—that I am today introducing a bill which would require the Commonwealth to pay interest to vendors and contractors to whom the Commonwealth owes money when the bill is more than 30 days old.

Perhaps the members may want to come up from their offices and sign the bill or take note of its introduction so they can ask that their names be added at a later time.

Thank you.

LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. Mebus.

Mr. MEBUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the floor, if I may. I would like to have permission to do so regarding a constitutional amendment proposal which I have had drafted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. MEBUS. This morning's Patriot carried an editorial about the legislative reform, which is something we have heard a great deal about over the past several years. It has been attempted several times and still remains to be brought before the people on referendum.

The intent of these proposals I think is good, but I do not think it is really going to cure a problem. To my way of thinking, whether this House be of 100 members or 300 members really is not an important thing. That is not the serious matter. Whether the Senate is 60 members or 40 members or its present 50 members really is not going to cure any ills. I think any change of this nature would prove to be, in the final analysis, cosmetic only. I think the real problem is not size but the matter of intellectual honesty on the part of the membership.

It is often impossible to be totally frank with your constituents during a year you are running for election. Therefore, the electorate judges you on the apparent intent of issues, not having an opportunity to recognize the full impact of some of those issues on which you vote during an election year, and you do not have the chance to really make all of the innuendos clear to them. Therefore, you are put into a box where you may vote one way, knowing full well that that is not truly what you want to do or what you believe is best, but you kind of have to if you hope to be reelected.

I think I have in my hand now, which I hope other people will join me in sponsoring, a partial, at least, cure for this problem.

If you reduce the number of years that one runs while serving in office, I think you will get to a goodly part of this problem. The question then arises, how can this be accomplished? I would change the constitution in two ways: First, to provide 4-year terms for House members. That is not a new idea. Secondly, I would limit the number of terms that a member could serve either in this body or the other one and, in this way, the number of years that you are running while serving would be held down to a minimum.

I have had prepared a constitutional amendment which will do these things then: Change the term of House members to 4 years and provide that the entire legislature be elected at the same time as the Governor, thereby limiting the effect of issues from outside this Commonwealth on the election of the General Assembly; and, lastly, to limit a member, whether he be a Senator or a member of this House, to three 4-year terms in one body. Generally speaking, few of us serve more than 12 years in either the House or the Senate, but it would mean, again, that during only two of these 12 years of service would you be running for office.

No suggestion will prove to be a panacea, but I sincerely believe that this will be more effective in providing responsible statesmanlike representation for the people of Pennsylvania than simply reducing the size of the Senate to 40 members and the House to 121. Lastly, by enlarging the geographic size of some of our more rural districts, we would make representation more difficult and make the elected representatives of the people more remote from that electorate.

I hope that my proposal will be reviewed seriously and, if need be, altered. But in any case, I ask that it be given an opportunity to be dealt with this year by the House and by the other body in the hope that it can conceivably pass in each of those and be considered again

during the next term of the General Assembly and then, of course, go to the people.

I do not propose to introduce this bill today, but I will have it here next week, and one day next week after anybody who wishes to has signed it, I will introduce it and I hope that it will be acted upon promptly and favorably.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (Lester K. Fryer) IN THE CHAIR

LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Shane.

Mr. SHANE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I circulated a memo to the members saying that I had two bills relating to medical education, medical districts, that I had available for the signature of our colleagues. I said that these bills were going to remain on my desk until the end of this month. However, after conversing with Chairman Gallagher and our staff, we decided it would be appropriate to submit these bills now.

For those members who are in their offices who have not yet signed these bills, I am going to submit them now. They will be on the chief clerk's desk if you care to come from your offices to sign them. We have approximately—no, exactly—73 signers on these bills at this point. There seems to be broad support within this House for these bills.

Although many members are, at this point, familiar with them, with the indulgence of the Chair, I would like to take a couple of minutes to once again explain the provisions of these bills to the members.

The first bill is the proposed statewide medical education act. This would set up a statewide medical education council composed of the deans of the medical schools of Pennsylvania and schools of osteopathy in Pennsylvania, two representatives from the House, two representatives from the Senate, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Health.

The purpose of the council would be to set up a statewide medical plan, whereby more teaching hospitals would be established throughout the state and satellite clinics could be established throughout the state in conjunction with the medical schools of Pennsylvania.

A telecommunication system would be set up whereby there could be instant consultation between the physician in the rural area or in an intercity area with an expert at a university medical center on a particular patient. The telecommunication system would also provide for continuing education courses being beamed throughout the state.

It is possible we may use the hardware of the Pennsylvania Public Television Network for this concept. The assumption is that by more widely distributing the post-medical residency training, the physician is more likely to locate in the area where he takes his residency. This concept has been proven in the State of Indiana where it was inaugurated in 1967. The results have been as follows:

Prior to inauguration of this plan, only 40 percent of the graduates of the Indianapolis Medical School stayed in the State of Indiana. Now approximately 60 percent

of the graduates of the University of Indiana Medical School stay in the State of Indiana.

Furthermore, in addition to greatly decreasing the State of Indiana's brain drain, the physicians are more widely dispersed in physician-shortage areas.

So it is our hope that this statewide medical education council will come up with a plan for more widely distributing the residency education throughout Pennsylvania and then they will come back to the Pennsylvania legislature with a plan and its price tag.

In this year's current tight financial situation, we are not calling for a large expenditure of money but only a modest planning grant. Then, when the statewide medical education council forms the plan, they will come back to the legislature for the legislature's approval of the plan and financing, hopefully at a time when our Pennsylvania economy and our state government coffers are more generously filled.

An important and indivisible adjunct of and partner to the statewide medical education act is the second bill called the medical district bill. This bill would set up a mechanism whereby local people could form medical districts on local initiative. It would be similar in structure to our successful experience with the local school boards. Under this plan, a group of people could get together and apply to the Secretary of Health to have their area designated as a medical district. They could form, through nonpartisan election procedures, a medical district board and they would be authorized to issue bonds for the purpose of constructing medical clinics and perhaps establishing health-maintenance organization plans and contracting with physicians to come and form practices in that group's area.

Now if you just build facilities alone, you sometimes encounter a problem that was experienced by the Sears Roebuck Foundation when they made vast amounts of money available all over this country to build medical buildings. What resulted was that many of these medical buildings were empty and continue to be empty. What must go hand in hand with a plan for building medical facilities is a plan for populating or manning those facilities with doctors and physicians' assistants. This is why it is so crucial that the statewide medical education act go hand in hand with a plan for providing medical facilities such as the medical district act.

We think this is an imaginative proposal, but not too imaginative in that it has already proved to be successful in the State of Indiana. Indeed, the University of Pittsburgh Medical School a couple of weeks ago paid us the ultimate compliment of borrowing our plan and putting it forward to a group of western Pennsylvania legislators as a proposal applying specifically to the University of Pittsburgh. We were flattered.

We see our two bills as part of a mosaic of a number of bills that have merit. The Governor's hospital cost control plan is one; Mr. Hammock's bill is another. We hope that concepts from all of these bills can be fitted together in a mosaic that has a forward thrust in improving the health services to our people in Pennsylvania, because, Mr. Speaker, we truly are dealing with life-and-death issues here.

I have been called on a number of occasions by people in my district who said to me, Mr. Shane, we are in the emergency room of the Indiana Hospital and there is no doctor here to take care of us. I have seen other instances where people have suffered because they did not

have access to a doctor, and there have been instances, although I cannot prove it, where I suspected that persons died prematurely for lack of access to doctors.

So, truly, when we deal with these bills, we are dealing with life-and-death issues for the people of Pennsylvania.

I have often told my friends that if I could bring four medical doctors to Indiana County, that would probably be the most significant accomplishment of my public life, because bringing those four doctors to Indiana County will probably do more for the health and happiness of my people than any legislative scheme we can dream up in this Capitol Building and attempt to implement through whatever kind of generous funding we may advance.

With these concluding remarks, Mr. Speaker—I appreciate the indulgence of the Chair in giving me this time to explain the bills—I invite our colleagues, wherever they may be in the Capitol complex, if they have not already, to sign these bills. I will place them on the clerk's desk. I hope you will come forward and join us in this effort to deliver better health care to all the people of Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman from Indiana for his brief but enlightening remarks.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Berks, Mr. Davies.

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Speaker, under point of personal privilege, I submit the following questions and concern relative to the exercise of voting in this body by electronic voting device.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Hammock. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HAMMOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief moment? I want to follow up on the brief comment of Mr. Shane.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, I will.

Mr. HAMMOCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Mr. Shane for the brilliant work that he has done over the past several years in bringing before this House the issue of the medically deprived people in Pennsylvania and the need for better health care, especially primary care medicine.

Certainly, as we have just heard, Mr. Shane has outlined as he calls it—and I think rightly so—a broad mosaic for which we can begin now to consider bringing doctors to the crucially needed areas of the Commonwealth. Certainly Mr. Shane—and I cannot say this enough and I will be saying it throughout the entire session—is paving the way in writing new legislation for health care.

I am especially interested in the second bill that Mr. Shane spoke about, that is, the medical districts bill. The concept that I have introduced earlier today is the concept that I, too, have worked on for sometime, and I think together we will be able to thrash these things out and come up with the best plan, the most feasible, the most workable plan for the people of the Commonwealth.

Our plans seem to be of very similar nature, but there are some distinguishing factors, and I just wanted to take the brief time this afternoon while the Representatives and others are on the floor to say that we are going to have a particular problem in certain areas of the

state in creating medical districts if we do it on the basis of anything that resembles politics or political subdivisions. I think the sensitivity of the issue ought to be beyond the purview of political frame of thought. It ought to be beyond the pale of anything that resembles politics because of the sensitive nature of the issue. As the Representative pointed out earlier, we are dealing with people's lives, in fact. I know because I face it too.

In my district I represent the vast majority of the Temple health sciences area, and we have had the emergency ward at Temple close, as are emergency wards in other places in Philadelphia. There are several hospitals that have closed. The former Mercy-Douglass Hospital closed, which was a black-operated hospital that had been established by the black people in the early 1800's, but that was forced to close and subsequently to go into bankruptcy and receivership. It is possible now that Graduate Hospital in the city of Philadelphia will be closed, or at least the emergency wards will be closed for a period of time. It is even possible that Temple University may close.

So I think because of the sensitive nature of the entire question, we have got to ferret out a concept that will continue to bring health care, especially primary health care, to our people. I would hope that we can come up with a mechanism that will bring and encourage the young doctor just out of school to spend some time in the intercity and the rural areas. I would also hope that we could encourage some of the older physicians to maybe spend 6 months in Florida and the other 6 months in Pennsylvania, bringing health care to citizens in the rural and the intercity areas and, in fact, to all those who need it. I think we are going to be able to do that.

I just wanted to add my brief comments once again to, No. 1, Mr. Shane and say that I think his bills will go a long way in establishing health care in this state, and I think we are going to win that fight in this House and in the Senate and it will go on to the Governor in the near future for his signature. I just hope that we will have all of our members on board in trying to create the best pattern for health care in this state.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Hammock, and now returns to Mr. Davies, who had yielded to the gentleman.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berks, Mr. Davies. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. DAVIES. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DAVIES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Under a point of personal privilege, I submit the following question and concern relative to the exercise of voting in this body by electronic voting device in the short session of last Wednesday, February 12.

I realize the 6 inches of snow and some sort of emergency conditions existed. I raise this question because when the vote was taken on Senate bill No. 22, I failed to visually ascertain the physical presence of certain members on both sides of the aisle who had their votes appear on the electronic voting board.

I feel fortunate to have only been 10 minutes late my-

self in arriving after negotiating 60 miles of icy Routes 78 and 81. I feel reassured that I cast my own vote on Senate bill No. 22. What guarantees against any such re-occurrence does a concerned member have about the protection of his own voting right in the event that he would have such an emergency absence himself? I have this concern and I have expressed this concern and questioned the leadership on this side of the aisle as well.

I cannot abide by the cautions of the majority leader that he gave earlier. I am not a lawyer and I do not know the answer to the question before I ask the question, so I submit the question, honestly pursuing an answer. My constituency has passed this question on to me as well, and I must answer that constituency.

I also want to serve notice that if any such event again occurs, I will ask that a quorum be called for, regardless of the nature of the bill or constitutional deadlines such as were on Senate bill No. 22 at the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rules of the House clearly state that only members in their seats are granted the right to vote. Does that answer the question of the gentleman from Berks?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir, it answers one of my concerns. I do not know whether it answers the guarantees about any of our own emergency absences. I would have concern about that question as well.

I thank you for your time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I might further add that the gentleman has the right to call for a quorum at any time.

Mr. DAVIES. Yes; I realize that. I also realize the nature of the bill and the conditions under which we were operating, but I must express concern about it because of my inability to ascertain that certain members were present, yet, by either some mental telepathy or some other method, their votes did appear.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS HOUSE

Mr. STAPLETON requested and obtained unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. STAPLETON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to make some remarks in relation to the remarks made several minutes ago by Mr. Lynch from Delaware County.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lynch recounted to the members of the House a situation, an intolerable situation, which has existed in Delaware County, specifically in the magisterial district in Upper Darby. However, there were a few remarks made by Mr. Lynch which I would like to clarify.

First of all, he stated that the magisterial district has been, in effect, vacant for almost 2 years. This is true because the incumbent district justice was incapacitated and refused to resign. When the incumbent did leave his post, it had, in effect, left the district without a district justice now for several months, and that in itself is nonetheless intolerable.

Mr. Lynch was quoting someone, I believe, with regard to the qualifications of a Rachael Munafo who is the person who has been recommended to the Governor by Senator John Sweeney from the 26th Senatorial District.

I believe Mr. Lynch was quoting a Mrs. Falcone who is the wife of the Democratic county chairman in Delaware County. I speak to this point because Mr. Lynch may

have given the impression that he was speaking with regard to the overall qualifications of Mrs. Munafò and not one person's opinion.

Mrs. Munafò happens to possess a master's degree and has been a very active member of the community and certainly is qualified to fulfill this vacancy.

If he was, in fact, quoting Mrs. Falcone, I would simply like to point out that the chairman of the Democratic Party, Mr. Falcone, has also submitted to the Governor a name for this vacancy.

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to speak not only for myself but also for the other members of the Democratic Party of this House. I speak not only for myself but for Mr. Doyle, Mr. Gillespie, Mr. O'Keefe, and Mr. Garzia, by stating that the five of us have joined with the state Senator, Senator Sweeney, in urging the Governor to make an immediate appointment to this vacancy.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

By Mr. GARZIA **HOUSE BILL No. 497**

An Act requiring the State to take responsibility for all bridges.

Referred to Committee on Transportation.

By Mr. GARZIA **HOUSE BILL No. 498**

An Act amending the "State Highway Law," approved June 1, 1945 (P. L. 1242, No. 428), providing for the State to pay certain lighting and traffic control costs.

Referred to Committee on Transportation.

By Mr. GARZIA **HOUSE BILL No. 494**

An Act amending "The Permanent Registration Act for Cities of the Second Class, Cities of the Second Class A, Cities of the Third Class, Boroughs, Towns and Townships," approved April 29, 1937 (P. L. 487, No. 115), providing for further requirements before removing names from registration lists for not voting.

Referred to Committee on Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GARZIA **HOUSE BILL No. 495**

An Act amending "The First Class City Permanent Registration Act," approved March 30, 1937 (P. L. 115, No. 40), providing for further requirements before removing names from registrations for not voting.

Referred to Committee on Urban Affairs.

By Messrs. BONETTO, ZORD and LETTERMAN
HOUSE BILL No. 496

An Act amending "The Administrative Code of 1929," approved April 9, 1929 (P. L. 177, No. 175), limiting the time during which certain actions relating to transportation programs may be brought.

Referred to Committee on Transportation.

By Messrs. BONETTO, KOLTER, ZORD and ARTHURS
HOUSE BILL No. 497

An Act amending "The Administrative Code of 1929," approved April 9, 1929 (P. L. 177, No. 175), providing for certain traffic accident reports and their use.

Referred to Committee on Transportation.

By Messrs. BONETTO, BEREN, KOLTER, GREEN and ZWIKL
HOUSE BILL No. 498

An Act amending "The Vehicle Code," approved April 29, 1959 (P. L. 58, No. 32), requiring mirrors on motorcycles.

Referred to Committee on Transportation.

By Mrs. GILLETTE and Mr. BONETTO
HOUSE BILL No. 499

An Act authorizing the Department of Property and Supplies, with approval of the Governor and the Secretary of Transportation, to sell and convey certain lots or tracts of ground with improvements thereon situate in the Borough of Tarentum, Allegheny County.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

By Messrs. BONETTO, BEREN, GEORGE, ARTHURS, KOLTER and STOUT
HOUSE BILL No. 500

An Act amending the act of June 30, 1966 (No. 29-A), entitled "An act making an appropriation out of the Motor License Fund to the Department of Highways for the Appalachian Local Access Roads program," further regulating the lapsing of funds.

Referred to Committee on Appropriations.

By Messrs. BONETTO, BEREN, LEDERER, ZWIKL, ARTHURS, KOLTER and GREEN
HOUSE BILL No. 501

An Act requiring the installation of ramps at crosswalks under certain conditions.

Referred to Committee on Transportation.

By Messrs. BONETTO and GREEN
HOUSE BILL No. 502

An Act amending the "Public Utility Law," approved May 28, 1937 (P. L. 1053, No. 286), exempting from the commission's powers to appropriate property at crossings, property condemned by the Secretary of Transportation for projects financed entirely by the Commonwealth.

Referred to Committee on Consumer Protection.

By Messrs. BONETTO, LETTERMAN, ARTHURS, KOLTER and STOUT
HOUSE BILL No. 503

An Act amending "The Liquid Fuels Tax Act," approved May 21, 1931 (P. L. 149, No. 105), providing for additional uses of fuel tax funds.

Referred to Committee on Finance.

By Messrs. BONETTO, LETTERMAN, ZORD, ZWIKL, ARTHURS, WILSON, KOLTER, GREEN, GEORGE, DORR and STOUT
HOUSE BILL No. 504

An Act amending the "Outdoor Advertising Control Act of 1971," approved December 15, 1971 (P. L. 596, No. 160), making certain exemptions to permits and further providing for tags in connection with permits.

Referred to Committee on Conservation.

By Messrs. SHANE, M. E. MILLER, JR., GALLAGHER, WRIGHT, WILSON, PANCOAST, WEIDNER, BERLIN, DICARLO, LINCOLN, GREENFIELD, RICHARDSON and McGINNIS
HOUSE BILL No. 505

An Act amending the "Public School Code of 1949," approved March 10, 1949 (P. L. 30, No. 14), providing for the extension of professional's leave privileges.

Referred to Committee on Education.

By Messrs. GLEASON and WHELAN
HOUSE BILL No. 506

An Act amending the "State Highway Law," approved June 1, 1945 (P. L. 1242, No. 428), requiring the Commonwealth to repair and maintain guardrails along State highways in cities.

Referred to Committee on Transportation.

By Messrs. GLEASON, WHELAN and HASKELL

HOUSE BILL No. 507

An Act authorizing municipalities in Pennsylvania to exempt certain persons from municipal service charges or fees.

Referred to Committee on Urban Affairs.

By Messrs. WILSON, RENNINGER, BURNS
and WRIGHT

HOUSE BILL No. 508

An Act amending the "Public School Code of 1949," approved March 10, 1949 (P. L. 30, No. 14), restricting certain building leases and contracts of intermediate units.

Referred to Committee on Education.

By Messrs. McCUE, USTYNOSKI, CUMBERLAND,
PRATT, SHUMAN, L. E. SMITH, GEISLER,
LETTERMAN and O'CONNELL

HOUSE BILL No. 509

An Act amending the "Public School Code of 1949," approved March 10, 1949 (P. L. 30, No. 14), providing referendum procedure for withdrawal from a reorganized district; and providing for paying indebtedness and apportioning property of former district.

Referred to Committee on Education.

By Messrs. KISTLER, COLE, VANN, STAHL,
E. H. SMITH and IRVIS

HOUSE BILL No. 510

An Act authorizing the Department of Property and Supplies to acquire, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, a tract of land in the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and making appropriations.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

By Mr. M. P. MULLEN

HOUSE BILL No. 511

An Act authorizing the Department of Property and Supplies, with the approval of the Governor and the Secretary of Public Welfare, to convey a certain parcel of land approximately bounded by Roosevelt Boulevard, Poquessing Creek, Townsend Road and Southampton Road in the City of Philadelphia to the City of Philadelphia.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

By Messrs. O'BRIEN, SHUPNIK, USTYNOSKI,
WANSACZ and NOVAK

HOUSE BILL No. 512

An Act amending "The Third Class City Code," approved June 23, 1931 (P. L. 932, No. 317), changing service requirement and amount of pension and providing for certain military service credit for employe retirement other than city-paid firemen and police.

Referred to Committee on Urban Affairs.

By Messrs. McCUE, BONETTO, CESSAR, SCHMITT,
KNEPPER, TADDONIO, KELLY, R. W. WILT,
PETRARCA, Mrs. TOLL, Messrs. GEORGE,
DeMEDIO, Mrs. GILLETTE, Messrs. SCHEAFFER,
ZORD, PARKER, BRUNNER, ENGLEHART,
STOUT, GLEASON, GEISLER, VALICENTI
and NOVAK

HOUSE BILL No. 513

An Act relating to the dispensing and sale of hearing aids, regulating those engaged therein, prescribing certain

powers and duties of the Attorney General, and prescribing penalties.

Referred to Committee on Consumer Protection.

By Messrs. WILSON, RENNINGER, BURNS,
WRIGHT and WEIDNER

HOUSE BILL No. 514

An Act amending the "Public School Code of 1949," approved March 10, 1949 (P. L. 30, No. 14), authorizing withdrawal by a school district of an intermediate unit from a provided program of service under certain circumstances.

Referred to Committee on Education.

By Mr. GLEASON

HOUSE BILL No. 515

A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, reducing the number of senatorial and representative districts.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

By Messrs. GLEASON, WHELAN and ZEARFOSS

HOUSE BILL No. 516

An Act amending the "Solicitation of Charitable Funds Act," approved August 9, 1963 (P. L. 628, No. 337), exempting certain nonprofit library associations from the act.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

By Mr. GLEASON

HOUSE BILL No. 517

An Act amending the "Local Delinquent Tax Return Law," approved May 29, 1931 (P. L. 280, No. 132), reducing the redemption period.

Referred to Committee on Finance.

By Messrs. WORRILOW, DOYLE, ZEARFOSS, LYNCH,
O'KEEFE, GILLESPIE, STAPLETON, GARZIA,
Mrs. WHITTLESEY and Mr. RYAN

HOUSE BILL No. 518

An Act amending the "Eminent Domain Code," approved June 22, 1964 (1st Sp. Sess., P. L. 84, No. 6), requiring the recorder of deeds to notify the county board of assessment when a notice of declaration of taking has been lodged in his office.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. GLEASON

HOUSE BILL No. 519

An Act amending the "Liquor Code," approved April 12, 1951 (P. L. 90, No. 21), further providing for special occasion permits.

Referred to Committee on Liquor Control.

By Mr. SALOOM

HOUSE BILL No. 520

A Joint Resolution proposing amendments to the Constitution of Pennsylvania reducing the number of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives; providing for their salaries and expenses; and providing for a constitutional convention with limited powers.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

By Messrs. WESTERBERG, RENWICK, ANDERSON
and SHELHAMER

HOUSE BILL No. 521

An Act amending the "Pennsylvania Loyalty Act," approved December 22, 1951 (P. L. 1726, No. 463), providing for changes in the loyalty oath.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

By Messrs. WOJDAK, RENWICK, GEORGE,
LETTERMAN, KUSSE, W. W. FOSTER,
CUMBERLAND and DREIBELBIS

HOUSE BILL No. 522

An Act amending "The General Appropriation Act of 1974," approved June 26, 1974 (No. 21-A), further providing for the use of certain appropriations.

Referred to Committee on Appropriations.

By Messrs. JOHNSON, BARBER, OLIVER,
Mrs. KELLY, Mr. VANN, Mrs. TOLL,
Messrs. REED, GIAMMARCO, RUGGIERO, COHEN,
DiDONATO and RHODES **HOUSE BILL No. 523**

An Act amending the "Spirituous and Vinous Liquor Tax Law," approved December 5, 1933 (1st Sp. Sess., P. L. 38, No. 6), providing for the sale and affixing of tax stamps to spirituous and vinous liquor containers and providing certain penalties.

Referred to Committee on Liquor Control.

By Messrs. HOPKINS, NOYE, BELLOMINI,
DOMBROWSKI, DiCARLO, M. E. MILLER,
SALOOM, KLINGAMAN, HALVERSON, HASKELL
and R. W. WILT **HOUSE BILL No. 524**

An Act relating to the prevention of excavations or demolition operations resulting in damage to transmission facilities and providing penalties.

Referred to Committee on Business and Commerce.

By Messrs. ARTHURS, FEE, GLEESON, MILANOVICH,
SCHMITT, MEBUS, WAGNER, PETRARCA,
GOODMAN, KOLTER, A. K. HUTCHINSON
and BENNETT **HOUSE BILL No. 525**

An Act amending "The Vehicle Code," approved April 29, 1959 (P. L. 58, No. 32), further regulating the issuance of special registration plates to handicapped persons.

Referred to Committee on Transportation.

By Messrs. ARTHURS, FRYER, McCUE, GLEESON,
SCHMITT, MEBUS, WORRILOW, WAGNER, KUSSE,
GOODMAN, KOLTER, A. K. HUTCHINSON and FEE
HOUSE BILL No. 526

An Act amending the act of June 17, 1913 (P. L. 507, No. 335), referred to as the Intangible Personal Property Tax Law, changing the time of making a tax return.

Referred to Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. TOLL, Messrs. SULLIVAN, JOHNSON,
RIEGER, VANN, CESSAR, BARBER, PIEVSKY,
GREENFIELD, McGINNIS, GIAMMARCO,
ROMANELLI, Mrs. KELLY, Messrs. PERRY,
DiDONATO, COHEN, OLIVER, USTYNOSKI
and HAMMOCK **HOUSE BILL No. 527**

An Act amending the "Liquor Code," approved April 12, 1951 (P. L. 90, No. 21), further regulating the transfer of a license.

Referred to Committee on Liquor Control.

By Messrs. SULLIVAN, PIEVSKY, McGINNIS
and WORRILOW **HOUSE BILL No. 528**

An Act amending the "Child Labor Law," approved May 13, 1915 (P. L. 286, No. 177), authorizing the employment of minors as entertainers in certain licensed establishments.

Referred to Committee on Labor Relations.

By Messrs. HASAY, JOHNSON, TURNER, WHELAN,
PYLES, M. E. MILLER, JR., WAGNER,
KOWALYSHYN, WEIDNER, McGINNIS,
McCLATCHY, Mrs. FAWCETT, Messrs. USTYNOSKI,
WILSON, FISHER, CESSAR and RICHARDSON

HOUSE BILL No. 529

An Act amending the "Tax Reform Code of 1971," approved March 4, 1971 (P. L. 6, No. 2), excluding interest from United States savings bonds as income.

Referred to Committee on Finance.

By Messrs. KNEPPER, GEISLER, TADDONIO,
ABRAHAM and TRELLO **HOUSE BILL No. 530**

An Act amending the "Milk Marketing Law," approved April 28, 1937 (P. L. 417, No. 105), authorizing any school to purchase milk and milk products from the lowest responsible bidder.

Referred to Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. KERNICK, Messrs. COWELL, KNEPPER,
TADDONIO, CESSAR, ZORD, FISHER, PARKER,
ABRAHAM and MISCEVICH **HOUSE BILL No. 531**

An Act amending the "Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code," approved July 31, 1968 (P. L. 805, No. 247), exempting agencies and personnel from civil liability in the performance of their duties.

Referred to Committee on Urban Affairs.

By Messrs. MUSTO, WARGO, SHUPNIK, LaMARCA,
O'CONNELL, BELLOMINI, DiCARLO, JOHNSON,
GALLEN and McGINNIS **HOUSE BILL No. 532**

An Act amending the "Liquor Code," approved April 12, 1951 (P. L. 90, No. 21), further providing for hours of sale.

Referred to Committee on Liquor Control.

By Messrs. FISHER, CESSAR, PARKER, TADDONIO,
KELLY, KNEPPER, ZORD and WILSON
HOUSE BILL No. 533

An Act amending the act of March 31, 1937 (P. L. 160, No. 43), entitled "An act creating a commission to be known as the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission; * * * and transferring and appropriating to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission any unexpended balance of any existing appropriation to The Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania," changing the terms of members of the commission.

Referred to Committee on Consumer Protection.

By Messrs. PRENDERGAST, HEPFORD, SPENCER
and RITTER **HOUSE BILL No. 534**

An Act amending the act of March 6, 1901 (P. L. 16, No. 11), entitled "An act making it unlawful for district attorneys to stand aside jurors in empanelling any jury in the trial of any indictment charging a felony or a misdemeanor in any court of this Commonwealth, * * *" further providing for the number of peremptory challenges and removing obsolete provisions.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

By Messrs. WHELAN, GLEASON, GREEN,
HALVERSON, ENGLEHART, PETRARCA, SALOOM
and A. K. HUTCHINSON **HOUSE BILL No. 535**

An Act amending the act of May 26, 1949 (P. L. 1844, No. 547), entitled "An act establishing the Pennsylvania State Firemen's Training School in or adjacent to the borough of Lewistown, * * *" providing for certain week-end classes and making an appropriation.

Referred to Committee on Appropriations.

By Messrs. WILSON and GLEASON

HOUSE BILL No. 536

An Act amending "The Administrative Code of 1929," approved April 9, 1929 (P. L. 177, No. 175), creating the Department of Building Construction and defining its functions, powers and duties; and transferring certain functions, personnel and appropriations from the Department of Property and Supplies and other State agencies to such department.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

By Messrs. O'BRIEN, O'CONNELL, ANDERSON
and A. C. FOSTER

HOUSE BILL No. 537

An Act authorizing certain workers to engage in their business in any municipality in a county of the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh or eighth class under certain circumstances if they are licensed by one of the municipalities located within the county.

Referred to Committee on Business and Commerce.

By Messrs. RHODES, DiCARLO, LINCOLN, BARBER,
Mrs. KELLY, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CRAWFORD,
Messrs. HILL, JOHNSON, CAPUTO, ITKIN,
FLAHERTY, FEE, OLIVER, DORR and MORRIS

HOUSE BILL No. 538

An Act providing for the licensing of boarding homes for the aged or handicapped and establishing penalties.

Referred to Committee on Professional Licensure.

By Messrs. RHODES, DiCARLO, LINCOLN, BARBER,
Mrs. KELLY, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CRAWFORD,
Messrs. M. E. MILLER, JR., FEE and OLIVER

HOUSE BILL No. 539

An Act amending the "Public Welfare Code," approved June 13, 1967 (P. L. 31, No. 21), further providing for certain medical assistance payments.

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare.

By Messrs. RHODES, BARBER, Mrs. KELLY,
Messrs. COHEN, JOHNSON, FEE and OLIVER

HOUSE BILL No. 540

An Act amending the "Public Welfare Code," approved June 13, 1967 (P. L. 31, No. 21), further providing for State supplemental assistance.

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare.

By Messrs. HAMMOCK, SHANE, Mrs. KELLY,
Messrs. DiCARLO, BELLOMINI, FINEMAN, IRVIS,
VANN, GALLAGHER, SHUPNIK, COHEN,
O'DONNELL, RHODES, COWELL, PANCOAST,
DeMEDIO, ZELLER, MRKONIC, LAUGHLIN,
M. E. MILLER, JR., DOMBROWSKI, MILANOVICH,
REED, LINCOLN, ZORD, Miss SIRIANNI,
Mr. ZWIKL, Mrs. TOLL, Messrs. PARKER, FISHER,
CESSAR, KNEPPER, ROMANELLI, CAPUTO,
LETTERMAN, DREIBELBIS, MORRIS, DOYLE,
VALICENTI, HOPKINS, HASKELL, MUSTO,
WARGO, WANSACZ, FLAHERTY, TRELLO,
GEISLER, BERLIN, ABRAHAM, Mrs. GILLETTE,
Messrs. R. W. WILT, DiDONATO, WALSH,
Mrs. KERNICK, Messrs. GOODMAN, SALOOM,
PETRARCA, A. K. HUTCHINSON, KOLTER,
BRUNNER, YAHNER, STOUT, GREEN, BRADLEY,
MISCEVICH, KOWALYSHYN, OLIVER, RUGGIERO,
NOYE, BARBER, FISCHER, USTYNOSKI, GRIECO,
TAYLOR, FEE and GARZIA

HOUSE BILL No. 545

An Act providing for the creation of medical districts as bodies corporate and politic in counties, cities, bor-

oughs, townships and towns within this Commonwealth; providing for the election of boards of medical district directors; prescribing the rights, powers and duties of such boards including the power to impose certain taxes, borrow money and issue bonds therefore; and imposing powers and duties upon the Secretary of Health and the Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Referred to Committee on Education.

By Messrs. SHANE, HAMMOCK, Mrs. KELLY,
Messrs. DiCARLO, BELLOMINI, IRVIS, VANN,
GALLAGHER, SHUPNIK, LINCOLN, COHEN,
O'DONNELL, RHODES, COWELL, PANCOAST,
DeMEDIO, WAGNER, M. E. MILLER, JR.,
LAUGHLIN, GEORGE, ZELLER, BERLIN,
MISCEVICH, MILANOVICH, REED, LINCOLN,
ZORD, Miss SIRANNI, Mrs. TOLL, Messrs. PARKER,
LETTERMAN, DREIBELBIS, DOYLE, MORRIS,
VALICENTI, HOPKINS, HASKELL, MUSTO,
WARGO, WANSACZ, FLAHERTY, TRELLO,
GEISLER, Mrs. GILLETTE, Mr. WALSH,
Mrs. KERNICK, Messrs. NOYE, R. W. WILT, ZWIKL,
GOODMAN, MRKONIC, PETRARCA, KOLTER,
A. K. HUTCHINSON, SALOOM, BRUNNER,
YAHNER, STOUT, GREEN, BRADLEY, McLANE,
OLIVER, RUGGIERO, BARBER, DiDONATO,
KNEPPER, CESSAR, FEE, FISCHER, FISHER,
USTYNOSKI, GRIECO, TAYLOR and GARZIA

HOUSE BILL No. 546

An Act creating the Pennsylvania Medical Education Council; establishing the powers and duties of such council; creating Regional Advisory Boards to such council; regulating certain appropriations to medical schools and schools of osteopathy; and making an appropriation.

Referred to Committee on Education.

SENATE MESSAGE

BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, presented for concurrence bills numbered and entitled as follows:

SENATE BILL No. 33

An Act amending the act of September 30, 1961 (P. L. 1778, No. 712), entitled "Lobbying Registration Act," prohibiting the payment of compensation contingent upon the passage or defeat of legislation and revising and adding penalties.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

SENATE BILL No. 54

An Act amending the act of December 5, 1936 (1937, P. L. 2897, No. 1), entitled "Unemployment Compensation Law," eliminating the waiting week for unemployment compensation.

Referred to Committee on Labor Relations.

**HOUSE RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED
AND REFERRED**

By Messrs. MEBUS and RAPPAPORT

RESOLUTION No. 48

The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania condemns absolutely the unprovoked and illegal invasion of Cyprus by Turkey, the barbarous atrocities committed by her armed forces on the Cypriot people; her insincere negotiations in Geneva and her cynical resort to arms to achieve her unlawful goals.

Referred to Committee on Rules.

By Messrs. A. K. HUTCHINSON, LAUDADIO,
MANDERINO, PETRARCA, SALOOM, WHELAN,
TADDONIO and SCHMITT **RESOLUTION No. 49**

The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania directs the Judiciary Committee of the House to investigate the operation of the State Regional Correctional Facility No. 5 in Westmoreland County to ascertain whether the charges in connection with its alleged improper operation are substantiated and, if so, to recommend corrective action, via legislation or otherwise, to correct the situation.

Referred to Committee on Rules.

By Messrs. O'DONNELL, LEDERER, IRVIS,
ROMANELLI, L. E. SMITH and SCHEAFFER
RESOLUTION No. 50

The Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania appoint a bipartisan committee of five members, three from the majority and two from the minority, to conduct a thorough investigation of the mortgage market in Pennsylvania.

Referred to Committee on Rules.

By Messrs. RICHARDSON and BLACKWELL
RESOLUTION No. 51

The Speaker of the House of Representatives appoint an eleven member bipartisan committee, six from the majority and five from the minority, to study and investigate the questions and concerns of the public relating to the Mercer Hall Community Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center with a view to improving the same.

Referred to Committee on Rules.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE CITATIONS

Mrs. KERNICK, chairperson of Select Committee on Legislative Citations, presented the following citations, which were read, considered and adopted:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Miss Elsie Channing, vice president of the Board of Trustees of the California Public Library, will be honored for her many valuable contributions to the library and her community; and

WHEREAS, Miss Elsie Channing has devoted a lifetime to the important task of establishing and maintaining a public library for the citizens of the California area; and

WHEREAS, Miss Elsie Channing's efforts for the California Public Library are only a small indication of this fine citizen's devotion to education, both as a school teacher and as a leader in civic affairs.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pauses in its deliberations and joins in congratulating Miss Elsie Channing, vice president of the Board of Trustees of the California Public Library, for her many outstanding efforts in establishing and maintaining a public library in the California area, and wishes this fine citizen further success and achievement in her work in public education; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Miss Elsie Channing, Vice President of the Board of Trustees of the California Public Library, c/o California Public Library, Water and Wood Streets, California, Pennsylvania 15419.

A. J. DeMEDIO

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Keith Mousley, seventeen, has earned the Eagle award in Scouting. This is the highest award that Boy Scouts can bestow and as such represents great sacrifice and tremendous effort on the part of this young man. Keith, although he is deaf, demonstrated his ability

to lead and work with his peers. He conceived, planned and developed and carried out a bicycle rodeo for hearing impaired children. He is a member of Troop No. 303.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, congratulates Keith Mousley on the occasion of his being honored with the Eagle Scout Award, commends him on the outstanding work he has done to earn this coveted honor, and wishes him continued success in the future; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Keith Mousley, 1635 Clearbrook Road, Lansdale, Pennsylvania 19446.

ROOSEVELT I. POLITE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, The people of the Socialist Republic of Romania have demonstrated unsurpassed warmth and hospitality to the members of the Boyertown Area Senior High School Marching Band during the band's tour of this great and historic nation; and

WHEREAS, The people of the Socialist Republic of Romania, by the extension of their kind invitation and their warm reception of the Boyertown Area Senior High School Marching Band, have demonstrated an admirable recognition of the need for increased international understanding and goodwill.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania extends to the people of the Socialist Republic of Romania its greetings, thanks them for the warmth and hospitality which they have extended to the members of the Boyertown Area Senior High School Marching Band, and expresses its sincerest hope that the bonds of understanding will continue to grow between their nation and the United States; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to the people of the Socialist Republic of Romania.

LESTER K. FRYER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Reverend and Mrs. Edward R. Rein of North East will receive the Exchange Club's Golden Deeds Award on February 27, 1975; and

WHEREAS, Reverend and Mrs. Edward R. Rein are richly deserving of this coveted award which recognizes their enormous contributions to the community and the humanitarian approach which characterizes their relations with their friends and neighbors; and

WHEREAS, Reverend and Mrs. Edward R. Rein have nobly and honorably served various congregations of Erie County's Presbyterian Churches and have thereby enhanced the spiritual lives of many of the county's citizens.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania salutes and congratulates Reverend and Mrs. Edward R. Rein of North East on their receipt of the Exchange Club's Golden Deeds Award, thanks them for their enormous contributions to their community and wishes that they continue to enjoy the respect and admiration of their many friends, neighbors and acquaintances; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Reverend and Mrs. Edward R. Rein, North East, Pennsylvania 16428

FOREST W. HOPKINS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Ben F. Miller celebrated their fortieth wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by five children and eleven grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. The couple was married October 18, 1934.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Ben F. Miller on their fortieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered

to Mr. and Mrs. Ben F. Miller, R. D. 2, Avella, Pennsylvania 15312.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mrs. Sarah Clark Jones, prominent Harrisburg resident, has observed her seventy-ninth birthday on Valentine's Day, 1975. Originally from Anderson, South Carolina, Sarah was the ninth of ten children. Her parents were slaves until their early teens. Her grandmother was sold twice on the slave market block. Sarah married and raised seven sons and one daughter. There are thirteen grandchildren and nine great-grandchildren; and

WHEREAS, Sarah Clark Jones has been a consummate volunteer worker in the community serving especially the indigent. She is well known for her appearances at Council meetings advocating programs for the needy.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pauses in its deliberations to note the seventy-ninth birthday of Mrs. Sarah Clark Jones and joins her many friends and neighbors in wishing her many happy returns of the day; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mrs. Sarah Clark Jones, 533 Peffer Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17102.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Charles S. Graeff of Harrisburg have recently been named recipients of 1974 Service Citations from the National Center for Voluntary Action and will receive the Citations on February 21, 1975 in ceremonies to be held in the City of Harrisburg; and

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Charles S. Graeff richly deserve coveted awards recognizing the outstanding counseling, outreach and referral services which these two fine persons have provided for the Harrisburg area's senior citizens; and

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Charles S. Graeff, despite their retired status, were particularly effective in computing property tax and renters assistance forms, thereby saving senior citizens over \$100,000 in tax monies.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Mr. and Mrs. Charles S. Graeff of Harrisburg on being named recipients of 1974 Service Citations from the National Center for Voluntary Action and thanks this generous couple for their outstanding contributions to their community and the Commonwealth;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Charles S. Graeff, 2174 Brookwood Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17104.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mrs. Isabel McKeever of Springfield will soon celebrate her one hundredth birthday; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Isabel McKeever of Springfield was born on February 23, 1875, and worked as a silk weaver before she married Abraham Lincoln McKeever in 1907; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Isabel McKeever has won the respect and admiration of her friends, neighbors, and acquaintances by her dedication to her church, family and community.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania extends its heartiest congratulations to Mrs. Isabel McKeever of Springfield on her one hundredth birthday and wishes her many more years of health and happiness;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be de-

livered to Mrs. Isabel McKeever, 317 Summit Road, Springfield, Pennsylvania 19064.

THOMAS J. STAPLETON, JR.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, T. Reed Ferguson, Vice President for Public Affairs and Director of University Relations for Pennsylvania State University, has selflessly served as both a teacher and administrator in the Commonwealth's higher education system for over three decades; and

WHEREAS, As a result of T. Reed Ferguson's outstanding efforts, the citizens of the Commonwealth now have available to them the expanded educational and informational resources provided by the Pennsylvania State University; and

WHEREAS, T. Reed Ferguson enjoys the undying esteem and respect of the House of Representatives for his many kind and generous efforts in aiding the General Assembly and its members in their relations with this outstanding academic institution; and

WHEREAS, This distinguished gentleman has continually demonstrated by his actions and personal interest, his vital concern for the problems faced by our youth in securing higher education.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pauses in its deliberations to congratulate T. Reed Ferguson, Vice President for Public Affairs and Director of University Relations of the Pennsylvania State University, for his many accomplishments during the past three decades, commends him for his dedication and devotion to the cause of improved higher education, and expresses its heartfelt thanks to this outstanding public servant for his sincerity and kindness over the the years;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to T. Reed Ferguson, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802.

FRED J. SHUPNIK
WILLIAM F. RENWICK

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Richard C. Dietrich of Kutztown was recently awarded the Keystone Farmer Degree by the Pennsylvania Future Farmers of America; and

WHEREAS, Richard C. Dietrich is richly deserving of the award recognizing his outstanding contributions to the Kutztown Area Farmers of America, where he has held numerous executive positions, and his tremendous success in agricultural projects; and

WHEREAS, Richard C. Dietrich has made notable contributions to his high school as a member of the National Honor Society and the varsity basketball team.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania salutes and congratulates Richard C. Dietrich of Kutztown on being awarded the Keystone Farmer Degree by the Pennsylvania Future Farmers of America, and wishes this fine young Pennsylvanian continued success and achievement; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Richard C. Dietrich, R. D. 3, Kutztown, Pennsylvania 19530.

JOHN S. DAVIES

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRADLEY moved that this House do now adjourn until Monday, February 24, 1975, at 1 p.m., e.d.t.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and (at 3:25 p.m., e.s.t.) the House adjourned.