

# Legislative Journal

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1975

Session of 1975

159th of the General Assembly

Vol. 1, No. 30

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 9:30 a.m., e.d.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:

Heavenly Father, to Thee belongs the praise for life and all the joys associated therewith. It is with heartfelt thanks and gratitude that we express to Thee our appreciation for the many evidences of Thy bounty. We beseech Thee to make known Thy truth through the talents of these workmen of Thine, and enable them through dedicated service to show forth Thy honor and glory. O God, we humbly pray that Thou wilt grant to them a vision of how this Commonwealth can best serve every Pennsylvanian, and fill them with the daring to accomplish that dream with the continued effort and cooperation of each loyal and faithful servant. Amen.

### JOURNALS APPROVED

The SPEAKER. Are there any corrections to the Journals of March 10, 11 and 12, 1975?

If not, and without objection, the Journals are approved.

### JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, approval of the Journal for Monday, April 14, 1975, will be postponed until printed.

### HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

By Messrs. BENNETT, MCGINNIS, PRATT and COLE  
**HOUSE BILL No. 992**

An Act amending the "Motor Boat Law," approved May 28, 1931 (P. L. 202, No. 121), removing provisions relating to the Navigation Commission for the Delaware River and its navigable tributaries.

Referred to Committee on Transportation.

By Mr. FINEMAN **HOUSE BILL No. 993**

An Act amending the "Pennsylvania Prevailing Wage Act," approved August 15, 1961 (P. L. 987, No. 442), changing and adding definitions, specifying duties of certain officers of public bodies, adding criminal and civil remedies and changing certain time limitations.

Referred to Committee on Labor Relations.

By Messrs. TRELLO, SHELHAMER, FRYER, MEBUS, WEIDNER, ABRAHAM, ARTHURS, MORRIS, SHUMAN, LEVI, NOYE, A. C. FOSTER, BURNS and DeMEDIO **HOUSE BILL No. 994**

An Act providing for appropriations for building hospitals in incorporated towns.

Referred to Committee on Appropriations.

By Messrs. ARTHURS, SHELHAMER, MEBUS, FRYER, ABRAHAM, WEIDNER, TRELLO, MORRIS, LEVI, A. C. FOSTER, NOYE, BURNS and DeMEDIO **HOUSE BILL No. 995**

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1870 (P. L. 343, No. 335), entitled "An act to define the limits and to organize the town of Bloomsburg," authorizing taxes for fire protection.

Referred to Committee on Finance.

By Messrs. O'KEEFE, PETRARCA, RUGGIERO, MEBUS, WEIDNER, ABRAHAM, ARTHURS, TRELLO, GARZIA, MORRIS, SHUMAN, LEVI, NOYE, A. C. FOSTER, BURNS and DeMEDIO **HOUSE BILL No. 996**

An Act amending "The First Class Township Code," approved June 24, 1931 (P. L. 1206, No. 331), authorizing appropriations for observances and celebrations.

Referred to Committee on Local Government.

By Messrs. BEREN, PANCOAST, POLITE, YOHN, SCIRICA and MEBUS **HOUSE BILL No. 997**

An Act to provide for four additional law judges of the court of common pleas in the thirty-eighth judicial district.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

By Messrs. REED, MRKONIC, KOWALYSHYN, DIDONATO, TAYOUN, Mrs. KELLY and Mr. PRATT **HOUSE BILL No. 998**

An Act amending the "Fire and Panic Act," approved April 27, 1927 (P. L. 465, No. 299), further providing for sprinkler systems in certain buildings.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

By Messrs. NOVAK, RENWICK, McCLATCHY, HALVERSON and Mrs. FAWCETT **HOUSE BILL No. 999**

An Act amending "The Game Law," approved June 3, 1937 (P. L. 1225, No. 316), authorizing the commission to grant additional rights on State game lands.

Referred to Committee on Game and Fisheries.

By Messrs. REED, SCHWEDER, KOWALYSHYN, DIDONATO, BERLIN, Mrs. KELLY, Messrs. PRATT, MILLIRON and McLANE **HOUSE BILL No. 1000**

ment which I had introduced at that time. Several weeks ago when we were discussing it, we split the amendment. Part of that amendment was adopted, that is, the definition of expenses.

Today I am offering amendments to change the definition of lobbyist as it is now provided, not in House bill No. 3 but in the act which House bill No. 3 would amend.

I have two amendments. They should be numbered one and two. I want to consider amendment No. 1 first. The amendments are essentially the same, I might add, except that amendment No. 1 provides for two exceptions and amendment No. 2 would add a third exception basically, the Commonwealth employe or an employe of any political subdivision.

But let me get back to amendment No. 1. Basically, we are trying to make clearer the definition of lobbyist. It was brought to our attention, basically by the people of the Chamber of Commerce, that with the existing definition of lobbyist as it is now provided in law, there is a great deal of uncertainty as to just who should be registering; whether it is applicable to the president of a firm who, on a one-shot basis, contacts his Representative; whether it is applicable to an individual who might be called before the legislature to present expert testimony to one of our committees; whether it is applicable, in fact, to one of our small businessmen in our own community who might write a letter to us or call us on behalf of or in support of a particular piece of legislation. Consequently, we are trying to make clearer, as I indicated, that definition of lobbyist.

It is pretty self-explanatory, I believe. I will be glad to answer any questions. Again, the two exceptions that are provided in this first amendment would be the individual who simply or solely testifies before a committee of the General Assembly. That individual would not be, just because of that activity, deemed a lobbyist. The intent here again is that we do not want to inhibit expert testimony before our committees. So often we find it necessary to call upon individuals in different walks of life to offer comment or testimony to us as we are deliberating legislation.

The second exception is for an individual, again, who simply or only communicates with a member of the General Assembly who represents his district, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the majority or minority leader, or the committee chairmen in either House of the General Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, those are all the comments I have with respect to the amendment. I will be glad to answer any questions that there might be.

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman, Mr. Cowell, consent to interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Cowell, permit himself to be interrogated?

Mr. COWELL. I shall, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in this amendment No. 1, if a person were hired for compensation by a municipality to advocate the passage or the defeat of legislation, would he in fact have to register as a lobbyist under this amendment?

Mr. COWELL. With this amendment an individual

hired by a municipality is not excluded. We want to deal with that question separately in the second amendment which I am offering. With this amendment alone though, he would not be excluded and would be covered by the Lobbying Registration Act.

Mr. WILSON. That is all. The question was answered, Mr. Speaker.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. COWELL and WILSON and were as follows:

YEAS—155

Abraham	Geesey	McLane	Scirca
Anderson, J. H.	Geisler	Mebus	Seltzer
Arthurs	Giammarco	Menhorn	Shane
Bellomini	Gillette	Milanovich	Shelhamer
Bennett	Goodman	Miller, M. E.	Shelton
Berlin	Green	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Shuman
Berson	Greenfield	Milliron	Shupnik
Bittle	Grieco	Miscevich	Sirianni
Bonetto	Halverson	Moehlmann	Smith, E.
Brunner	Hamilton, J. H.	Morris	Smith, L.
Burns	Haskell	Mrkonic	Spencer
Butera	Hayes, D. S.	Mullen, M. P.	Stapleton
Caputo	Hayes, S. E.	Musto	Stout
Cessar	Hepford	Myers	Taddonio
Cimini	Hopkins	Novak	Taylor
Cole	Irvis	Noye	Thomas
Cowell	Itkin	O'Brien	Toll
Cumberland	Johnson, J.	O'Connell	Turner
Davies	Katz	O'Donnell	Ustynoski
Davis, D. M.	Kelly, A. P.	Oliver	Vann
DeMedio	Kernick	Pancoast	Vron
Deverter	Klingaman	Parker, H. S.	Wagner
Dicarlo	Knepper	Perri	Wansacz
DiDonato	Kowalyszyn	Petrarca	Wargo
Dietz	Kusse	Pitts	Weidner
Dombrowski	Laudadio	Polite	Westerberg
Doyle	Laughlin	Pratt	Whittlesey
Eckensberger	Lederer	Prendergast	Wilson
Engelhart	Lehr	Pyles	Wilt, R. W.
Fawcett	Levi	Rappaport	Wilt, W. W.
Fee	Lincoln	Reed	WorriLOW
Fischer	Lynch	Rieger	Wright
Fisher	Manderino	Ross	Yahner
Flaherty	Manmiller	Ruggiero	Yohn
Foster, A.	McCall	Ryan	Zeller
Foster, W.	McClatchy	Salvatore	Zwickl
Fryer	McCue	Scheaffer	
Gallagher	McGinnis	Schmitt	Fineman,
Gallen	McIntyre	Schweder	Speaker
Garzia			

NAYS—12

Crawford	Hill	Letterman	Renwick
George	Hutchinson, A.	Mullen	Ritter
Gillespie	Kolter	O'Keefe	Tayoun

NOT VOTING—36

Barber	Gleason	McGraw	Sullivan
Beren	Gleeson	Perry	Sweeney
Blackwell	Gring	Pievsky	Trello
Bradley	Hammock	Renninger	Valicenti
Brandt	Hasay	Rhodes	Walsh, T. P.
Cohen	Hutchinson, W.	Richardson	Whelan
Dininni	Kelly, J. B.	Romanelli	Wojdak
Dorr	Kistler	Saloom	Zearfoss
Dreibelbis	LaMarca	Stahl	Zord

So the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments were agreed to.

On the question,  
Will the House agree to the bill as amended on third consideration?

Mr. COWELL requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendments, which were read:

Amend Sec. 1, page 1, line 9, by inserting after "1,"

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 1 and 2: Section 2. Definitions.—As used in this act:

(1) "Lobbyist" means any natural person who [is employed or engaged, for compensation, by any other person or any partnership, committee, association, corporation or any other organization, to advocate the passage or defeat of legislation by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, except that an officer or employe of the Commonwealth or any political subdivision thereof, who acts only in his official capacity, shall not be deemed a lobbyist.], for compensation, in the course of his regularly assigned duties, represents the interests of any other person, or any partnership, committee, association, corporation, or other organization before the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, except that an officer or employe of the Commonwealth or any political subdivision thereof, who acts only in his official capacity shall not, solely because of such action, be considered a lobbyist.

(2) "Legislation" means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations and other matters pending or proposed in either the House of Representatives or the Senate, including any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. COWELL. Thank you again, Mr. Speaker.

The essence of this amendment would be to make an addition to the amendment which we have just adopted. It would be a subparagraph, (iii). Again it would provide for an exclusion for an individual who is representing the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or a political subdivision, and that individual acting only in his or her official capacity should not be considered a lobbyist solely because of that action.

I might add that I am offering this basically because it is provided in current law. When we adopted the first amendment, we pulled out the current definition of "lobbyist"; consequently, we should make a decision as to whether or not we want to continue this practice that has existed in the past and continues to exist today.

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in this particular amendment I believe the gentleman is excluding the person hired or compensated by a municipality, the state government, for example, who in his official capacity would be advocating the passage or defeat of legislation; in effect, in his official capacity he is a lobbyist.

I believe that, personally, any person who is compensated, who is paid, to advocate the passage or the defeat of legislation should be under the purview of this act, and I think at this point the gentleman has divided the question, in effect, and I would urge the defeat of this particular amendment.

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

Mr. COWELL. Mr. Speaker, I think that we might consider this in two lights. I think that there is a good deal of sympathy on this floor to require representatives of various Commonwealth departments to be included in this act, to be required to register as lobbyists and make the required reporting. I question, however, whether there is much sympathy to require every mayor, every councilman, every school director and

the many, many representatives of local government that we have throughout this Commonwealth, I question whether they ought to be, or whether anyone on this floor really wants them to be, covered by this act. So I would remind the members that we are talking about both of these groups. We are talking about not only the employes of the Commonwealth, but we are talking about just about every elected official throughout this Commonwealth. I think perhaps, to particularly include all the elected officials throughout this Commonwealth under this act, we might be putting an undue burden on these locally elected officials.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority whip.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman at this time. There are many people who are employed by the Commonwealth who, in varying degrees as to their duties, have the responsibility of reviewing the manner in which laws this General Assembly passes are working, suggesting to the General Assembly, from time to time, amendments and requesting that members of the assembly introduce remedial legislation on various legislation that the particular department or the particular bureau or the particular director deals with day in and day out. These persons have traditionally been exempt from the Lobbying Registration Act, and it is my opinion that they should continue to be exempt. The evils that we are attempting to get at in the passage of a Lobbying Registration Act have nothing to do with the legislation being recommended and being sent to the General Assembly and even, at times, being pursued by members of the administration, employes of government. I think that the exception being carved out by this amendment, which traditionally has been there, should remain and I urge all members of the House to vote in favor of Mr. Cowell's amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Columbia, Mr. Shelhamer.

Mr. SHELHAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the amendment could be divided.

The SPEAKER. Let us not do that.

Mr. SHELHAMER. Well, Mr. Speaker, might I speak to that for just a second?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would advise the gentleman that a portion of this amendment has, in effect, already been adopted. So that all the House really has before it by way of new language are the last three lines of the paragraph that are underlined, beginning with ". . . an officer or employe of the Commonwealth or any political subdivision thereof, who acts only in his official capacity shall not, solely because of such action, be considered a lobbyist." That question by itself is not capable of division.

Mr. SHELHAMER. Thank you.

#### QUESTIONS OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TRELLO. May I have my name added to the

master roll and, had I been in my seat, I would have voted in the affirmative on Mr. Cowell's amendment to House bill No. 3.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Sweeney.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, may I have my name added to the master roll and, had I been in my seat, I would have voted in the affirmative on Mr. Cowell's amendment to House bill No. 3.

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

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

Mr. ROMANELLI. Mr. Speaker, had I been in my seat, I would have also voted in the affirmative on Mr. Cowell's amendment to House bill No. 3.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. Ritter.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment. If you go back to the amendment that we just adopted, it said that if in the course of his regularly assigned duties, he lobbies, then he has to register as a lobbyist. It seems to me it does not make any difference whether you work for a private employer if, in the course of your regularly assigned duties, you lobby. If that is what you really want, then you should defeat this amendment and have everyone who, in the course of his regularly assigned duties, lobbies to register as a lobbyist. I think we should defeat the amendment.

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

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman, Mr. Cowell, consent to a brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Cowell, consent to a brief interrogation?

Mr. COWELL. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, would this amendment if adopted exclude persons of the housing authorities or parking authorities or any other authorities from exemption from this act?

Mr. COWELL. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is essentially the same language that we have in current law. I really do not know the correct answer to that question. Perhaps, somebody who has been here for some time might comment whether or not the current language has included or excluded housing authorities.

I do not know whether or not that is deemed a political subdivision.

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

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if there was anyone in this House who could inform me as to my question.

The SPEAKER. No one desires to respond, Mr. Itkin.

Mr. ITKIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment. The most important part of this amendment which raises my opposition is the second to last line of the underlined section which says, "who acts only in his official capacity."

In defining those public employes, those state public employes and local subdivisions who shall not be considered lobbyists, they are the very people who should be considered lobbyists, because right now none of us in this House could produce for anybody else a complete listing of what public employes we in this House appropriate money to so that they can come before us and urge passage or defeat of legislation.

All we want is to identify the people whom the public is sponsoring to engage in this worthwhile activity. The last administration would not give it to us and nor will this administration give it to us. We have an obligation, regardless of where we line up politically, to get that information. The people are paying for these people. None of us know who they are. We have got to defeat this amendment and then pass Mr. Wilson's amendment and make this thing complete.

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

Mr. ZELLER. Mr. Speaker, in following up with what the minority leader had to say, I would like to give you an example of what problems we could run into by passing this type of an amendment.

We are in the process now of the Governor's Justice Commission having problems in the area of the Fed's coming in here and setting up programs which must be approved by local political subdivisions and then later on, 3 years later, walking away from it and saying, well, state help us; we need the money.

You have organizations who are employes of various political subdivisions trying to get these various grants. They will hire RCA and various training programs. They will hire all kinds of organizations who, in effect, are employes. So they come down here as employes of the political subdivisions trying to get funds from the state to carry on the program that they walked us into originally with Federal money.

I am sure Mr. Ritter's feelings are correct on this because of the fact that he is dealing directly with this fed-state relationship, and I know he is alarmed with it. I happened to have talked to him; I know what his input is going to be.

So these are the kinds of things that I know I am worried about, and I feel—I am not speaking for Mr. Ritter, but I feel—that his committee, I am sure, is concerned about this, and these employes who are representing large organizations out to make money, PR outfits, designing programs, are, in effect, employes of that political subdivision. Therefore, they are lobbyists; that is what they are. And we as legislators are going to be blessed with this monster later on by trying to meet these commitments.

So, therefore, we have got to look into this area of all this money—and I happen to be a member of this organization of the Governor's Justice Commission, Northeast Regional Criminal Justice Planning Council, and I happen to know and I have hounded it for years, the problem we have in regard to these funds coming in over the heads of the legislature, coming into these

various areas, and our having to inherit the monster. So I think it is about time we start looking into it.

Thank you.

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

Mr. SHANE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have noted in the past that the lobbyist for the University of Pittsburgh registers as a lobbyist, which I think he should, although he is not legally required to do so as I read present law. The lobbyist from Penn State does not register as a lobbyist. I sincerely feel that all these gentlemen who lobby for the various state-owned and state-related institutions of higher education really should register as lobbyists, and we should have some detailing of the amount of tax dollars they spend to advocate their particular institutional point of view.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### QUESTIONS OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

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

Mr. W. D. HUTCHINSON. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. W. D. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, may I have my name added to the master roll call and I would like the record to show that if I had been present in my seat, I would have voted in the affirmative on Senate bill No. 30 and in the affirmative on the Cowell amendment to House bill No. 3.

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

Mr. RENNINGER. I, also, would like to be added to the master roll call. I am going to ask for a reconsideration of Senate bill No. 30, since I have amendments to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is out of order.

Does the gentleman desire to have his presence noted?

Mr. RENNINGER. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's presence is noted.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster, Mr. Gring.

Mr. GRING. May I have my presence noted?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's presence will be noted.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Pievsky.

Mr. PIEVSKY. I would like my name added to the master roll call.

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the previous speaker and I understand his concern about the mayor, for example, the head of an authority, and any of these officials from the political subdivisions, writing to the committee chairman, his member of the legislature, to the Speaker and whomever, suggesting certain action be taken on certain legislation or certain legislation to be introduced. I think the gentleman, Mr. Cowell, has covered that point in his first amendment. He has made and specified the exclusions: a person testifying or one

who communicates with the General Assembly, and so forth.

But I think there is the great concern about the in-house lobbyist—the person who is being paid to influence legislation here in the House and Senate. I think, as the minority leader said, the taxpayer has the right to know how much of their money is being spent, on whom it is being spent, and for what purpose.

There must be something in the closet, if we have to keep this under wraps, if we have to keep this cloistered, if we are afraid to divulge exactly how much money is being spent to influence legislation.

I think that the time has long gone that we have to open the door and just let a little light in. If they are not doing anything out of the ordinary, if they are not doing anything unusual, if they are not spending the taxpayers' money wrongly, why not account for it, why not register and let us lay it on the table?

Mr. Speaker, I just urge that we defeat this particular amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak about the amendment, but I think that the debate has gone off the line. When we require the registration of a lobbyist, we are requiring the registration of a person who may unduly and secretly affect the course of legislation, and that is the evil against which we are supposed to be legislating. Sometimes the reason that business or governmental officials are selected or elected is to influence the course of legislation.

I think in our enthusiasm for reform we go too far when we oppose this amendment. I do not think there is anything in the closet in any administration. Any legislator knows to whom he is speaking when he is speaking to a member of the executive branch.

I would urge that we support this amendment, because if we do not, we are certainly going to unduly burden the lobbyist bill. It may make headlines for us back home, but it will be practically meaningless as far as enforcement is concerned. I urge that you support this amendment.

### QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Northumberland, Mr. Bradley.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRADLEY. I wish that my name be added to the master roll call, and that it be noted that I voted in the affirmative on Senate bill No. 30 and the amendment to House bill No. 3.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's remarks will be spread upon the record.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. COWELL and MANDERINO and were as follows:

YEAS—65

Abraham	Giammarco	McGraw	Rieger
Barber	Gillespie	McIntyre	Romanelli
Bellomint	Gillette	McLane	Ross

Bennett	Gleeson	Menhorn	Ruggiero
Berlin	Green	Milanovich	Schmitt
Berson	Greenfield	Milliron	Schweder
Bonetto	Halverson	Halverson	Shelton
Cole	Irvis	Mrkonic	Stout
Cowell	Itkin	Musto	Sweeney
DeMedio	Johnson, J.	Myers	Toll
Dombrowski	Kelly, A. P.	Novak	Vann
Englehart	Kernick	Oliver	Wargo
Fee	Kowalyszyn	Pievsky	Wojdak
Flaherty	Laudadio	Pratt	
Gallagher	Lederer	Prendergast	Fineman,
Garzia	Manderino	Rappaport	Speaker
George	McCall	Richardson	

NAYS—116

Anderson, J. H.	Geisler	Miller, M. E.	Shuman
Arthurs	Goodman	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Shupnik
Beren	Grieco	Moehlmann	Sirianni
Bittle	Gring	Morris	Smith, E.
Bradley	Hamilton, J. H.	Mullen, M. P.	Smith, L.
Brunner	Hayes, D. S.	Mullen	Spencer
Burns	Hayes, S. E.	Noye	Stapleton
Butera	Hepford	O'Brien	Taddonio
Caputo	Hill	O'Connell	Taylor
Cessar	Hopkins	O'Donnell	Tayoun
Cimini	Hutchinson, A.	O'Keefe	Thomas
Crawford	Hutchinson, W.	Pancoast	Trello
Cumberland	Katz	Parker, H. S.	Turner
Davies	Kistler	Perri	Ustynoski
Davis, D. M.	Klingaman	Petrarca	Vroon
Deverter	Knepper	Pitts	Wagner
Dicarlo	Kolter	Polite	Wansacz
Dietz	Kusse	Pyles	Weidner
Dorr	Laughlin	Reed	Westerberg
Doyle	Lehr	Renninger	Whittlesey
Eckensberger	Letterman	Renwick	Wilson
Fawcett	Levi	Ritter	Wilt, R. W.
Fischer	Lincoln	Ryan	Wilt, W. W.
Fisher	Lynch	Salvatore	Worrilow
Foster, A.	Manmiller	Scheaffer	Wright
Foster, W.	McClatchy	Scirica	Yahner
Fryer	McCue	Seltzer	Yohn
Gallen	McGinnis	Shane	Zeller
Geesey	Mebus	Shelhamer	Zwikl

NOT VOTING—22

Blackwell	Gleason	Perry	Valicenti
Brandt	Hammock	Rhodes	Walsh, T. P.
Cohen	Hasay	Saloom	Whelan
DiDonato	Haskell	Stahl	Zearfoss
Dininni	Kelly, J. B.	Sullivan	Zord
Dreibelbis	LaMarca		

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

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill as amended on third consideration?

Mr. WAGNER requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 7), page 3, line 17, by inserting after "SOURCES": and amounts

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montour. Mr. Wagner.

Mr. WAGNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment is quite simple. It amends on page 3, line 17, right after "sources" of income, and also puts in "and amounts" of income. If the lobbyist has to tell us where he is going to get the money, I think we should also know how much he is getting.

It is really two-fold thinking here, Mr. Speaker. We must do the same thing on our own campaign financing reports. We must tell where we get our money and how much we get.

The other reason here is that they should be no dif-

ferent. They are affecting legislation; they are attempting to pass it; and I think it would be wise if we would know how much they are getting from various sources.

The other thing here is to provide a dual check. If the lobbyist is disclosing how much he spends, I think it would be a good check, to balance the books, to know that it matches up with his income.

Thank you.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. WAGNER and MANDERINO and were as follows:

YEAS—173

Abraham	Gillespie	McIntyre	Scirica
Anderson, J. H.	Gillette	McLane	Seltzer
Arthurs	Gleeson	Mebus	Shane
Barber	Goodman	Milanovich	Shelhamer
Bellomini	Green	Miller, M. E.	Shelton
Bennett	Greenfield	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Shuman
Beren	Grieco	Milliron	Shupnik
Berlin	Gring	Miscevich	Sirianni
Bittle	Halverson	Moehlmann	Smith, E.
Bonetto	Hamilton, J. H.	Morris	Smith, L.
Bradley	Haskell	Mrkonic	Spencer
Brunner	Hayes, D. S.	Mullen	Stapleton
Burns	Hayes, S.E.	Mullen, M. P.	Stout
Butera	Hepford	Musto	Sweeney
Caputo	Hill	Myers	Taddonio
Cessar	Hopkins	Novak	Taylor
Cimini	Hutchinson, A.	Noye	Tayoun
Cole	Hutchinson, W.	O'Brien	Thomas
Cowell	Irvis	O'Connell	Toll
Crawford	Itkin	O'Donnell	Trello
Cumberland	Johnson, J.	O'Keefe	Turner
Davies	Katz	Pancoast	Ustynoski
Davis, D. M.	Kelly, A. P.	Parker, H. S.	Vann
DeMedio	Kernick	Perri	Vroon
Deverter	Kistler	Petrarca	Wagner
Dicarlo	Klingaman	Pievsky	Wansacz
Dietz	Knepper	Pitts	Wargo
Dorr	Kolter	Polite	Weidner
Doyle	Kowalyszyn	Pratt	Westerberg
Eckensberger	Kusse	Prendergast	Whittlesey
Fawcett	Laudadio	Pyles	Wilson
Fee	Laughlin	Rappaport	Wilt, R. W.
Fischer	Lederer	Reed	Wilt, W. W.
Fisher	Lehr	Renninger	Wojdak
Flaherty	Letterman	Renwick	Worrilow
Foster, A.	Levi	Richardson	Wright
Foster, W.	Lincoln	Rieger	Yahner
Fryer	Lynch	Romanelli	Yohn
Gallagher	Manmiller	Ross	Zeller
Gallen	McCall	Ruggiero	Zwikl
Geesey	McClatchy	Salvatore	
Geisler	McCue	Scheaffer	Fineman,
George	McGinnis	Schmitt	Speaker
Giammarco	McGraw	Schweder	

NAYS—7

Berson	Englehart	Manderino	Ritter
Dombrowski	Garzia	Oliver	

NOT VOTING—23

Blackwell	Gleason	Perry	Valicenti
Brandt	Hammock	Rhodes	Walsh, T. P.
Cohen	Hasay	Ryan	Whelan
DiDonato	Kelly, J. B.	Saloom	Zearfoss
Dininni	LaMarca	Stahl	Zord
Dreibelbis	Menhorn	Sullivan	

So the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendment was agreed to.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill as amended on third consideration?

Mr. M. E. MILLER requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 2, page 3, lines 23 through 30, page 4, lines

1 through 9, by striking out all of said lines and inserting: Section 7.1. Contingent Compensation Forbidden.—No person, partnership, committee, association, corporation or any other organization shall retain or employ any person to advocate the passage or defeat of any legislation for compensation contingent in whole or in part upon the passage or defeat of any such legislation, and no person shall accept any such employment for compensation contingent upon such passage or defeat.

Section 7.2. Gifts and Services Prohibited.—No lobbyist shall give or provide any gift, service, meal or any other thing of value to a member of the General Assembly or to any employe of the executive branch of government.

Section 7.3. Penalty.—Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, shall be disqualified to act as a lobbyist for a period of three years from the date of conviction and shall be sentenced to pay a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars (\$1,000) or to undergo imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both. Any association or corporation violating any of the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, shall be sentenced to pay a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars (\$1,000).

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. M. E. MILLER. This amendment I call "the lobbyists liberation amendment" because it liberates lobbyists from feeling as though they ought to furnish us with gifts and services that we are well able to pay for ourselves.

The guts of the amendment is section 7.2 that says: "Gifts and Services Prohibited.—No lobbyist shall give or provide any gift, service, meal or any other thing of value to a member of the General Assembly or to any employe of the executive branch of government."

I believe one of the great reasons we have lost respect as legislators is the idea that the general public has that just because somebody gives us a \$5 meal or a buck-and-a-half drink that it influences our decision on legislative matters. I know it does not and you know it does not.

I think that this practice serves no useful purpose and it erodes the public confidence in the legislative process. Further, if the lobbyists are going to have to report on whom they spend money on and how much, I think it does a disservice to incumbents.

I would urge you to support this amendment because it will be meaningful reform; it will not be just the appearance of reform.

Thank you very much.

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

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Lancaster consent to a brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Lancaster, Mr. Miller, consent to interrogation?

Mr. M. E. MILLER. I will.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman inform the House as to how his amendment would affect the following circumstances: It could very well be that a member of the House or the Senate is a personal friend of someone who is a lobbyist, perhaps an ex-member, perhaps a social

friend, perhaps his neighbor. Would this amendment absolutely prohibit the lobbyist from inviting the member to his home for dinner after the member has invited the lobbyist to his home for dinner?

Mr. M. E. MILLER. Not in my judgment, Mr. Speaker. Surely the courts have well established the rule of reason and the rule of reason of friendship or neighborliness certainly could not be construed to be a violation, in my judgment.

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could go one step further. This lobbyist comes to Harrisburg in the usual course of his duties, and he is still a neighbor of mine, and while here he invites me to have dinner with him and, after we fight over the check, he picks it up. Would this be a violation of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. M. E. MILLER. I would suggest that as your constituent, Mr. Speaker, you had best treat him.

Mr. RAPPAPORT. I am sorry, I did not hear the gentleman's answer.

Mr. M. E. MILLER. I would suggest that as your constituent you had best treat him. I would hope you win the fight.

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Mr. Speaker, how about if he is not a constituent of mine? We come from very small geographical districts in the city, and I have many friends who live in other districts besides my own.

Mr. M. E. MILLER. Again, the rule of reason would prevail. If you could establish friendship, surely a court, were this case to go to a jury, could establish the rule of reason.

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentleman and would ask to be recognized for a moment.

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

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why the rule of reason should not apply to the General Assembly as well as to the courts. While I am a member of the bar of two states, my experience has shown me that sometimes we put too much faith in the courts when we expect them to apply the rule of reason when we, ourselves, do not. They merely interpret what we do and sometimes with a great amount of glee.

Mr. Speaker, lobbyists are not evil beings who are constantly, like Satan, tugging at our coattails in attempting to seduce us from the straight and narrow. They should be regulated; they should be reasonably regulated; and we should have the confidence and the courage to regulate them reasonably. We are not going to legislate morality. What we have to do is set up guidelines that reasonable and honorable people can follow. There are many lobbyists whose function is to give us information and who do it well. I am personally acquainted with a number who live in my own district and have never offered anything improper, nor would they, anymore than I would accept it.

But I think by spelling out these kinds of details, we are asking for the very type of New England puritanism and inquisition that is definitely not needed in the legislative process. We have required that lobbyists register. That is proper. We are going further and requiring that they account for their expenses. That is proper.

I, frankly, see nothing wrong with a lobbyist buying



a drink or even buying dinner. If any member of this House is going to be seduced by a dinner, they are rather easy and perhaps their district is getting what they deserve.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blair, Mr. Wilt.

Mr. W. W. WILT. Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question of Mr. Miller, please?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Lancaster, Mr. Miller, consent to interrogation?

Mr. M. E. MILLER. I shall, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. W. W. WILT. Mr. Speaker, if this amendment should be adopted, would a registered lobbyist be permitted, or could he legally, give another member of my family a gift of some kind?

Mr. M. E. MILLER. I am reading merely the language of it, and apparently they could, yes, under the terms of this language. Perhaps that is a deficiency in the amendment itself.

Mr. W. W. WILT. In other words, the amendment is useless then in that case?

Mr. M. E. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, may I respond?

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

Mr. M. E. MILLER. I do not regard the amendment as useless. I regard it as simply a meaningful way to say to the public that do not really believe that just because somebody buys us a dinner that we are influenced. I believe it will serve that purpose.

May I now respond, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Rappaport?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. M. E. MILLER. Lobbyists do serve a useful function and they are fine people, and you must remember that the environment under which we operate has changed. At one time lobbyists could not appear before our committee meetings. Now they may come in and present their points of view. At one time our schedule was total chaos and about the only time a lobbyist could even catch a member was over dinner, and so they would sit down and have dinner and the lobbyist would feel obliged to pick up the bill. But under our new openness, lobbyists may come into our very committee rooms and present their points of view and there is no need for the buying of dinner or for the giving of gifts and services.

Thank you.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. RITTER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RITTER. Can this amendment be divided by considering section 7.1 by itself, which is about "Contingent Compensation Forbidden" as opposed to section 7.2, which is about "Gifts and Services Prohibited"?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is advised that the material of sections 7.1 and 7.3 are already in the act and that the only new additional language is in 7.2. This is merely a restructuring of the order in which they appear in the bill. The question is not capable of division.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, what you are saying is that the only thing really before us, then, is section 7.2, which is "Gifts and Services Prohibited"?

Mr. SPEAKER. In terms of new language, that is correct.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, then I rise to oppose the amendment offered by Mr. Miller on the basis that—and in addition to what Mr. Wilt said—I think the amendment is sufficient in that if it had the language "to influence the passage or defeat of legislation" in connection with the buying of a meal or any other thing of value, such as a drink, it would make much more sense. For instance, I have a person on my bowling team who is a lobbyist or who could be considered a lobbyist. If, in the course of the evening, he buys me a drink, I just do not think that that really is a matter of him trying to influence legislation. So I think if the language would say that in the course of buying a meal or buying a drink or whatever, he is attempting to influence the passage or defeat of legislation, then the amendment would make much more sense. But without that restriction in there, I think it just opens the door to a very bad situation.

I think we should defeat the amendment and go along with what the gentleman, Mr. Rappaport, said, we have some faith in the ability of those of us in this legislature and those who are lobbying that most, if not all, of us are honorable people. I think we ought to defeat the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Luzerne, Mr. O'Connell.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment and just with one simple statement: I cannot live with it. I do not want to be a hypocrite. I do not want to travel around Harrisburg or the Commonwealth under any kind of a shroud or become a slinky kind of a guy who is not willing to sit down to dinner with a lobbyist and enjoy a drink that he might buy. I simply cannot live with it and I would ask for the defeat of the amendment.

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

Mr. RENNINGER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the gentleman, Mr. Miller, consent to interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Would the gentleman, Mr. Miller, consent to interrogation?

Mr. M. E. MILLER. I shall, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. RENNINGER. Would the speaker comment on whether, under his amendment, the Pennsylvania Farmers Association or the AFL-CIO, or, in addition, the Saturday football at Penn State would come under the prohibition of your amendment?

Mr. M. E. MILLER. My judgment, Mr. Speaker, is that if the invitation is extended by a registered lobbyist, then perhaps, yes, it would.

Mr. RENNINGER. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think you may have a problem, if I may make a comment or a suggestion here, that this particular amendment, if it becomes part of the law, changes, in a sense, what a lobbyist is, and I have that reservation about the amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.



The SPEAKER. If Frank O'Connell cannot live with this amendment, that is good enough for me.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. M. E. MILLER and RAPPAPORT and were as follows:

YEAS—28

Abraham	Gring	Kolter	Reed
Davies	Halverson	Laughlin	Renninger
Eckensberger	Haskell	Miller, M. E.	Salvatore
Fischer	Hayes, D. S.	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Wagner
Geesey	Hutchinson, A.	O'Donnell	Wilson
Gillette	Kernick	Pitts	Wilt, R. W.
Greenfield	Knepper	Pyles	Yohn

NAYS—155

Anderson, J. H.	Geisler	Mebus	Setrica
Arthurs	George	Menhorn	Seltzer
Barber	Giammarco	Milanovich	Shane
Bellomini	Gillespie	Milliron	Shelhamer
Bennett	Gleeson	Miscevich	Shelton
Beren	Goodman	Moehlmann	Shuman
Berlin	Green	Morris	Shupnik
Berson	Griceo	Mrkonje	Sirianni
Bittle	Hamilton, J. H.	Mullen	Smith, E.
Bonetto	Hayes, S. E.	Mullen, M. P.	Smith, L.
Brunner	Hepford	Musto	Spencer
Burns	Hill	Myers	Stapleton
Eutera	Hopkins	Novak	Stout
Caputo	Hutchinson, W.	Noye	Sweeney
Cessar	Irvis	O'Brien	Taddonio
Cimini	Itkin	O'Connell	Taylor
Cole	Johnson, J.	O'Keefe	Tayoun
Cowell	Katz	Oliver	Thomas
Crawford	Kelly, A. P.	Pancoast	Toll
Cumberland	Kistler	Parker, H. S.	Trello
Davis, D. M.	Klingaman	Petri	Turner
DeMedio	Kowalshyn	Petrarca	Ustynoski
Deverter	Kusse	Pievsky	Vann
Dicarlo	Laudadio	Polite	Vroon
DiDonato	Lederer	Pratt	Wansacz
Dietz	Lehr	Prendergast	Wargo
Dombrowski	Letterman	Rappaport	Weidner
Dorr	Levi	Renwick	Westerberg
Doyle	Lincoln	Rhodes	Whittlesey
Englehart	Lynch	Richardson	Wilt, W. W.
Fawcett	Manderino	Rieger	Wojdak
Fee	Manmiller	Ritter	Worrilow
Fisher	McCall	Romanelli	Wright
Flaherty	McClatchy	Ross	Yahner
Foster, A.	McCue	Ruggiero	Zeller
Foster, W.	McGinnis	Ryan	Zwinkl
Fryer	McGraw	Scheaffer	
Gallagher	McIntyre	Schmitt	Fineman, Speaker
Gallen	McLane	Schweder	
Garzia			

NOT VOTING—20

Blackwell	Dreibelbis	LaMarca	Valicenti
Bradley	Gleason	Perry	Walsh, T. P.
Brandt	Hammock	Saloom	Whelan
Cohen	Hasay	Stahl	Zearfoss
Dininni	Kelly, J. B.	Sullivan	Zord

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

On the question recurring,  
Will the House agree to the bill as amended on third consideration?

Bill as amended was agreed to.

Ordered, that the bill as amended be prepared for final passage.

RECONSIDERATION OF VOTE ON SENATE BILL No. 30

Mr. RENNINGER moved that the vote by which SEN-

ATE BILL No. 30, printer's No. 507, was passed finally on this day be reconsidered.

Mr. MEBUS seconded the motion.

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

AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BILL No. 30 OFFERED

On the question recurring,  
Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?  
Mr. RENNINGER requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendments, which were read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1605.1), page 12, line 20, by inserting after "(A)": and subsection (c)

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1605.1), page 12, by inserting between lines 22 and 23: (c) All utilities subject to the regulation of the Public Utility Commission shall report by February 15th to the Secretary of the Commonwealth an itemized list of all contributions known to the entity by virtue of the knowledge possessed by every officer, director, associate, partner, limited partner, individual owner that has been made by (1) any officer, director, associate, partner, limited partner, individual owner or members of their immediate family and (2) any employee or members of his immediate family whose political contribution exceeded one thousand dollars (\$1,000) during the preceding year.

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1605.1), page 12, line 23, by striking out "(C)" and inserting: (d)

On the question,  
Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. RENNINGER. This amendment, Mr. Speaker, I think, merely adds to the bill an oversight.

I am sorry I was not here when we opened this morning, but I planned to fly and you can observe the weather. I appreciate the Chair and the other side permitting me to offer this amendment now.

It adds what I think is an oversight and something I think should be covered, and that is, that "All utilities subject to the regulation of the Public Utility Commission shall report by February 15th to the Secretary of the Commonwealth an itemized list of all contributions . . ." and it goes on with details explaining that.

I would urge the support of this. I think the people have some question about the actions of the public utilities and I think this question should be removed from their minds. The public should have a right to know of this kind of expenditure in political activities.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. BERSON. Mr. Speaker, while I am not familiar with the gentleman's amendment, I am familiar with the bill in its present form.

Our intention, frankly, was simply to postpone the effective date of the act for a period of time to give all of us an opportunity to look at the statute and to examine what faults are in it.

The question regarding public utilities, Lord knows, is a problem: are they a business entity, do they hold no-bid contracts, and so forth. But I would suggest that those kinds of substantive amendments be withheld for

the time being until we can get a look at the act and pull a revised act together which would incorporate all of our thinking about what the act should contain.

To amend it piecemeal now, it seems to me, is not the right way to go about it. What we ought to do now is simply pass this bill over to the Senate, which would do nothing more than postpone the effective date until October and give us a chance to really study this thing in some depth. So I would suggest the defeat of the amendment.

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

Mr. RENNINGER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In response, I would suggest, if it is going over to the Senate for study, I think this is one thing the Senate ought to study. I do not want to make any comments about the Senate, but I do think this should be a part of their consideration.

I think the public expects something here. The public is very concerned about whether their public utilities—and that is, who owns them—are functioning properly or not.

I think the public has an appropriate right to inquire and to be told what these people are doing with their money in political campaigns.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I urge support of the amendment.

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

Mr. BEREN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Berson. The purpose of this amendment to Senate bill No. 30 is to postpone the effective date for those people who have not as yet filed under the act.

We have tried to do this for several months and have been unable to do so. If this amendment were to go on or any other amendment of the number of confusing matters were to be tacked on, this bill would never pass in the fashion that it is.

There is study required as to the substance of the act. That will come after the passage of this bill. Currently the act is effective. There have been a great number of filings under it. These, I assume, will be published shortly. So I would ask that the amendment be defeated.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. RENNINGER and BERSON and were as follows:

YEAS—77

Table listing names of members who voted 'YEAS' (77 total), including Abraham, Anderson, J. H., Arthurs, Bellomini, Bradley, Burns, Cimmini, Cumberland, Davies, Deverter, Dicarlio, Dorr, Doyle, Eckensberger, Fischer, Foster, A., Gallen, Gillette, Gleeson, Greenfield, Gring, Halverson, Haskell, Hayes, D. S., Hayes, S. E., Hepford, Hopkins, Hutchinson, A., Hutchinson, W., Itkin, Kelly, A. P., Klingaman, Kolter, Kusse, Lehr, Levi, McCue, McIntyre, Menhorn, Miller, M. E., Miller, M. E., Jr., Moehlmann, Morris, O'Connell, Pievsky, Pitts, Pyles, Reed, Renninger, Rieger, Ritter, Shane, Shelton, Smith, L., Spencer, Stapleton, Taddonio, Taylor, Ustynoski, Vroon, Wargo, Whittlsey, Wilson, Wilt, R. W., Wright, and Zwickl.

Table listing names of members who were present but did not vote: Gecsey, Giammarco, Gillespie, Laudadio, Laughlin, Lederer, Romanelli, Schmitt, Schweder, Fineman, Speaker.

NAYS—103

Table listing names of members who voted 'NAYS' (103 total), including Barber, Bennett, Beren, Berlin, Berson, Bittle, Blackwell, Bonetto, Brunner, Butera, Cessar, Cole, Cowell, Crawford, Davis, D. M., DeMedio, Dietz, Dombrowski, Dreibelbis, Englehart, Fawcett, Fee, Fisher, Flaherty, Foster, W., Fryer, Gallagher, Garzia, Geisler, George, Goodman, Green, Grieco, Hamilton, J. H., Hill, Irvis, Johnson, J., Katz, Kernick, Kistler, Krepper, Kowalshyn, Letterman, Lynch, Manderino, Manmiller, McCall, McClatchy, McGinnis, McGraw, McLane, Mebus, Milanovich, Milliron, Miscovich, Mrkonic, Mullen, M. P., Musto, Myers, Novak, Noye, O'Brien, O'Donnell, O'Keefe, Oliver, Pancoast, Parker, H. S., Perri, Petrarca, Polite, Pratt, Prendergast, Rappaport, Renwick, Rhodes, Richardson, Ross, Ruggiero, Ryan, Salvatore, Schaeffer, Scirica, Seltzer, Shelhamer, Shuman, Shupnik, Sirianni, Smith, E., Sweeney, Thomas, Toll, Trello, Turner, Vann, Wansacz, Westerberg, Wilt, W. W., Wojdak, Worrlow, Yahner, Yohn, and Zeller.

NOT VOTING—23

Table listing names of members who did not vote: Brandt, Caputo, Cohen, DiDonato, Dininni, Gleason, Hammock, Hasay, Kelly, J. B., LaMarca, Lincoln, Perry, Saloom, Stahl, Stout, Sullivan, Valicenti, Wagner, Walsh, T. P., Weidner, Whelan, Zearfoss, and Zord.

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

On the question recurring, Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration? Bill was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS—183

Table listing names of members who voted 'YEAS' (183 total), including Abraham, Anderson, J. H., Arthurs, Barber, Bellomini, Bennett, Beren, Berlin, Berson, Bittle, Blackwell, Bonetto, Bradley, Brunner, Burns, Butera, Cessar, Cimmini, Cole, Cowell, Crawford, Cumberland, Davies, Davis, D. M., DeMedio, Deverter, Dicarlio, Doyle, Eckensberger, Fischer, Foster, A., Gallen, George, Giammarco, Gillespie, Gillette, Gleeson, Goodman, Green, Greenfield, Grieco, Gring, Halverson, Hamilton, J. H., Haskell, Hayes, S. E., Hayes, D. S., Hepford, Hill, Hopkins, Hutchinson, A., Hutchinson, W., Irvis, Itkin, Johnson, J., Katz, Kelly, A. P., Kernick, Kistler, Klingaman, Knepper, Kolter, Kowalshyn, McGraw, McIntyre, McLane, Mebus, Menhorn, Milanovich, Miller, M. E., Miller, M. E., Jr., Milliron, Miscovich, Moehlmann, Morris, Mrkonic, Mullen, M. P., Mullen, Musto, Myers, Novak, Noye, O'Brien, O'Connell, O'Donnell, O'Keefe, Oliver, Pancoast, Parker, H. S., Perri, Petrarca, Pievsky, Pitts, Polite, Salvatore, Schaeffer, Schmitt, Scirica, Seltzer, Shane, Shelhamer, Shelton, Shuman, Shupnik, Sirianni, Smith, E., Smith, L., Spencer, Stapleton, Stout, Sweeney, Taddonio, Taylor, Tayoun, Thomas, Toll, Trello, Turner, Ustynoski, Vann, Vroon, Wagner, Wansacz, Wargo, and Weidner.

Dreibelbis	Kusse	Pratt	Westerberg
Eckensberger	Laudadio	Prendergast	Whittlesey
Englehart	Laughlin	Pyles	Wilson
Fawcett	Lederer	Rappaport	Wilt, R. W.
Fee	Lehr	Reed	Wilt, W. W.
Fischer	Letterman	Renninger	Wojdak
Fisher	Levi	Renwick	Worrilow
Flaherty	Lincoln	Rhodes	Wright
Foster, A.	Lynch	Richardson	Yahner
Foster, W.	Manderino	Rieger	Yohn
Fryer	Manmiller	Ritter	Zeller
Gallagher	McCall	Romanelli	Zwilk
Gallen	McClatchy	Ross	
Garzia	McCue	Ruggiero	Fineman.
Geesey	McGinnis	Ryan	Speaker
Geisler			

NAYS—1

Schweder

NOT VOTING—19

Brandt	Gleason	Perry	Walsh, T. P.
Caputo	Hammock	Saloom	Whelan
Cohen	Hasay	Stahl	Zearfoss
DiDonato	Kelly, J. B.	Sullivan	Zord
Dininni	LaMarca	Valicenti	

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

Ordered, That the clerk return the same to the Senate with information that the House has passed the same with amendments in which the concurrence of the Senate is requested.

GAME AND FISHERIES BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of House bill No. 37, printer's No. 1053, entitled:

An Act amending "The Game Law," approved June 3, 1937 (P. L. 1225, No. 316), changing certain requirements relating to possession of game.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. RENWICK requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 701), page 1, line 19, by inserting after "FIRST": of the

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. RENWICK. Mr. Speaker, these are simply correctional amendments. When the bill was printed, two words were left out and we are reinserting those two words—"of the."

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment? Amendment was agreed to.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill as amended on third consideration?

Bill as amended was agreed to.

Ordered, that the bill as amended be prepared for final passage.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. This amendment is a simple amendment. There is no rule which precludes us from voting on this bill now. The amendment is in print and the bill is in print. I would call for the final vote on this bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS—182

Abraham	Geesey	McGinnis	Ryan
Anderson, J. H.	Geisler	McGraw	Salvatore
Arthurs	George	McIntyre	Schmitt
Barber	Giammarco	McLane	Scheaffer
Bellomini	Gillespie	Mebus	Schweder
Bennett	Gillette	Menhorn	Scirica
Beren	Gleeson	Milanovich	Seltzer
Berlin	Goodman	Miller, M. E.	Shane
Berson	Green	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Shelhamer
Bittle	Greenfield	Milliron	Shelton
Blackwell	Gricco	Miscevich	Shuman
Bonetto	Gring	Moehlmann	Shupnik
Bradley	Halverson	Morris	Sirianni
Brunner	Hamilton, J. H.	Mrkonic	Smith, E.
Burns	Haskell	Mullen, M. P.	Smith, L.
Butera	Hayes, D. S.	Mullen	Spencer
Caputo	Hayes, S. E.	Musto	Stapleton
Cessar	Hepford	Myers	Stout
Cimini	Hill	Novak	Sweeney
Cole	Hopkins	Noye	Taddonio
Cowell	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien	Taylor
Crawford	Hutchinson, W.	O'Connell	Thomas
Cumberland	Irvis	O'Donnell	Toll
Davies	Itkin	O'Keefe	Trello
Davis, D. M.	Katz	Oliver	Turner
DeMedio	Kelly, A. P.	Pancoast	Ustynoski
Deverter	Kernick	Parker, H. S.	Vann
Dicarlo	Kistler	Perri	Vroon
Dietz	Klingaman	Petrarca	Wagner
Dombrowski	Knepper	Pievsky	Wansacz
Dorr	Kolter	Pitts	Wargo
Doyle	Kowalshyn	Polite	Weidner
Dreibelbis	Kusse	Pratt	Westerberg
Eckensberger	Laudadio	Prendergast	Whittlesey
Englehart	Laughlin	Pyles	Wilson
Fawcett	Lederer	Rappaport	Wilt, R. W.
Fee	Lehr	Reed	Wilt, W. W.
Fischer	Letterman	Renninger	Worrilow
Fisher	Levi	Renwick	Wright
Flaherty	Lincoln	Rhodes	Yahner
Foster, A.	Lynch	Richardson	Yohn
Foster, W.	Manderino	Rieger	Zeller
Fryer	Manmiller	Ritter	Zwilk
Gallagher	McCall	Romanelli	
Gallen	McClatchy	Ross	Fineman,
Garzia	McCue	Ruggiero	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—21

Brandt	Hasay	Saloom	Walsh, T. P.
Cohen	Johnson, J.	Stahl	Whelan
DiDonato	Kelly, J. B.	Sullivan	Wojdak
Dininni	LaMarca	Tayoun	Zearfoss
Gleason	Perry	Valicenti	Zord
Hammock			

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

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of House bill No. 671, printer's No. 753, entitled:

An Act amending "The Game Law," approved June 3, 1937 (P. L. 1225, No. 316), providing further for hunting by minors.

On the question,  
Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?  
Bill was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS—184

- |                 |                 |                    |             |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Abraham         | Geisler         | McGraw             | Salvatore   |
| Anderson, J. H. | George          | McIntyre           | Scheaffer   |
| Arthurs         | Giammarco       | McLane             | Schmitt     |
| Barber          | Gillespie       | Mebus              | Schweder    |
| Beilomini       | Gillette        | Menhorn            | Scirica     |
| Bennett         | Gleeson         | Milanovich         | Seltzer     |
| Beren           | Goodman         | Miller, M. E.      | Shane       |
| Berlin          | Green           | Miller, M. E., Jr. | Shelhamer   |
| Berson          | Greenfield      | Milliron           | Shelton     |
| Bittle          | Grieco          | Miscevich          | Shuman      |
| Blackwell       | Gring           | Moehlmann          | Shupnik     |
| Bonetto         | Halverson       | Morris             | Sirianni    |
| Bradley         | Hamilton, J. H. | Mrkonic            | Smith, E.   |
| Brunner         | Haskell         | Mullen, M. P.      | Smith, L.   |
| Burns           | Hayes, D. S.    | Mullen             | Spencer     |
| Butera          | Hayes, S. E.    | Musto              | Stapleton   |
| Caputo          | Hepford         | Myers              | Stout       |
| Cessar          | Hill            | Novak              | Sweeney     |
| Cimini          | Hopkins         | Noye               | Taddonio    |
| Cole            | Hutchinson, A.  | O'Brien            | Taylor      |
| Cowell          | Hutchinson, W.  | O'Connell          | Thomas      |
| Crawford        | Irvis           | O'Donnell          | Toll        |
| Cumberland      | Itkin           | O'Keefe            | Trello      |
| Davies          | Johnson, J.     | Oliver             | Turner      |
| Davis, D. M.    | Katz            | Pancoast           | Ustynoski   |
| DeMedio         | Kelly, A. P.    | Parker, H. S.      | Vann        |
| Deverter        | Kernick         | Ferri              | Vroon       |
| Dicarlo         | Kistler         | Petrarca           | Wagner      |
| Dietz           | Klingaman       | Pievsky            | Wansacz     |
| Dombrowski      | Knepper         | Pitts              | Wargo       |
| Dorr            | Kolter          | Polite             | Weidner     |
| Doyle           | Kowalyszyn      | Pratt              | Westerberg  |
| Dreibelbis      | Kusse           | Prendergast        | Whittlesey  |
| Eckensberger    | Laudadio        | Pyles              | Wilson      |
| Englehart       | Laughlin        | Rappaport          | Wilt, R. W. |
| Fawcett         | Lederer         | Reed               | Wilt, W. W. |
| Fee             | Lehr            | Renninger          | Wojdak      |
| Fischer         | Letterman       | Renwick            | Worrilow    |
| Fisher          | Levi            | Rhodes             | Wright      |
| Flaherty        | Lincoln         | Richardson         | Yahner      |
| Foster, A.      | Lynch           | Rieger             | Yohn        |
| Foster, W.      | Manderino       | Ritter             | Zeller      |
| Fryer           | Manmiller       | Romanelli          | Zwikel      |
| Gallagher       | McCall          | Ross               |             |
| Gallen          | McClatchy       | Ruggiero           | Fineman,    |
| Garzia          | McCue           | Ryan               | Speaker     |
| Geesey          | McGinnis        |                    |             |

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—19

- |          |              |           |              |
|----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| Brandt   | Hammock      | Saloom    | Walsh, T. P. |
| Cohen    | Hasay        | Stahl     | Whelan       |
| DiDonato | Kelly, J. B. | Sullivan  | Zearfoss     |
| Dininni  | LaMarca      | Tayoun    | Zord         |
| Gleason  | Perry        | Valicenti |              |

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

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

RECONSIDERATION OF VOTE ON HOUSE BILL No. 62

Mr. IRVIS moved that the vote by which HOUSE BILL No. 62, printer's No. 797, entitled:

An Act amending Title 2 (Administrative Law and Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, adding revised, codified and compiled provisions relating to administrative law and procedure.

was agreed to on second consideration on Monday, April 14, 1975, be reconsidered.

Mr. MANDERINO seconded the motion.

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

On the question recurring,  
Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

HOUSE BILL No. 62 RECOMMENDED

Mr. IRVIS moved that HOUSE BILL No. 62, printer's No. 797, be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

CONSERVATION BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

Agreeable to order,  
The House proceeded to third consideration of House bill No. 470, printer's No. 519, entitled:

An Act providing for flood plain maps.

On the question,  
Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?  
Bill was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS—180

- |                 |                 |                    |             |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Abraham         | Geesey          | McGinnis           | Salvatore   |
| Anderson, J. H. | Geisler         | McGraw             | Scheaffer   |
| Arthurs         | George          | McIntyre           | Schmitt     |
| Barber          | Giammarco       | McLane             | Schweder    |
| Beilomini       | Mebus           | Mebus              | Scirica     |
| Bennett         | Gillette        | Menhorn            | Seltzer     |
| Beren           | Gleeson         | Milanovich         | Shane       |
| Berlin          | Goodman         | Miller, M. E.      | Shelhamer   |
| Berson          | Green           | Miller, M. E., Jr. | Shelton     |
| Bittle          | Greenfield      | Milliron           | Shuman      |
| Blackwell       | Grieco          | Miscevich          | Shupnik     |
| Bonetto         | Gring           | Moehlmann          | Sirianni    |
| Bradley         | Halverson       | Morris             | Smith, E.   |
| Brunner         | Hamilton, J. H. | Mrkonic            | Smith, L.   |
| Burns           | Haskell         | Mullen, M. P.      | Spencer     |
| Butera          | Hayes, D. S.    | Musto              | Stapleton   |
| Caputo          | Hayes, S. E.    | Myers              | Stout       |
| Cessar          | Hepford         | Novak              | Sweeney     |
| Cimini          | Hill            | Noye               | Taddonio    |
| Cole            | Hopkins         | O'Brien            | Taylor      |
| Cowell          | Hutchinson, W.  | O'Connell          | Thomas      |
| Crawford        | Irvis           | O'Keefe            | Toll        |
| Cumberland      | Itkin           | Oliver             | Trello      |
| Davies          | Johnson, J.     | Pancoast           | Turner      |
| Davis, D. M.    | Katz            | Parker, H. S.      | Ustynoski   |
| DeMedio         | Kelly, A. P.    | Ferri              | Vann        |
| Deverter        | Kernick         | Petrarca           | Vroon       |
| Dicarlo         | Kistler         | Pievsky            | Wagner      |
| DiDonato        | Klingaman       | Pitts              | Wansacz     |
| Dietz           | Knepper         | Polite             | Wargo       |
| Dombrowski      | Kolter          | Pratt              | Weidner     |
| Dorr            | Kowalyszyn      | Prendergast        | Westerberg  |
| Doyle           | Kusse           | Pyles              | Whittlesey  |
| Dreibelbis      | Laudadio        | Rappaport          | Wilson      |
| Eckensberger    | Laughlin        | Reed               | Wilt, R. W. |
| Englehart       | Lederer         | Renninger          | Wilt, W. W. |
| Fawcett         | Lehr            | Renwick            | Wojdak      |

Fee	Letterman	Rhodes	Worrilow
Fischer	Levi	Richardson	Wright
Fisher	Lincoln	Rieger	Yahner
Flaherty	Lynch	Ritter	Zeller
Foster, A.	Manderino	Romanelli	Zwikel
Foster, W.	Manmiller	Ross	
Fryer	McCall	Ruggiero	Fineman,
Gallagher	McClatchy	Ryan	Speaker
Gallen	McCue		

NAYS—1

Garzia

NOT VOTING—22

Brandt	Hutchinson, A.	Saloom	Walsh, T. P.
Cohen	Kelly, J. B.	Stahl	Whelan
Dininni	LaMarca	Sullivan	Yohn
Gleason	Mullen	Tayoun	Zearfoss
Hammock	O'Donnell	Valicenti	Zord
Hasay	Perry		

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

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of **House bill No. 796, printer's No. 899, entitled:**

An Act amending "The Land and Water Conservation and Reclamation Act," approved January 19, 1968 (1967, P. L. 996, No. 443), granting the Secretary of Environmental Resources the right to enter certain premises for the purpose of conserving and reclaiming land and water resources; providing for liens upon such land; and providing for rights of recovery for abatement of emergency conditions.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration? Bill was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS—172

Abraham	Geesey	McIntyre	Ruggiero
Anderson, J. H.	Geisler	McLane	Ryan
Arthurs	Giammarco	Mebus	Saloom
Barber	Gillespie	Menhorn	Salvatore
Bellomini	Gillette	Milanovich	Schmitt
Bennett	Gleeson	Miller, M. E.	Schweder
Beren	Goodman	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Scirica
Berlin	Green	Milliron	Seltzer
Berson	Greenfield	Miscevich	Shane
Bittle	Grieco	Mochlmann	Shelhamer
Blackwell	Gring	Morris	Shelton
Bonetto	Halverson	Mrkonic	Shupnik
Bradley	Hamilton, J. H.	Mullen	Sirianni
Brunner	Haskell	Mullen, M. P.	Smith, E.
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	Musto	Smith, L.
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	Myers	Spencer
Caputo	Hepford	Novak	Stapleton
Cessar	Hill	Noye	Stout
Cole	Hopkins	O'Brien	Sweeney
Cowell	Hutchinson, A.	O'Connell	Taddonio
Crawford	Irvis	O'Donnell	Taylor
Cumberland	Itkin	O'Keefe	Thomas
Davies	Johnson, J.	Oliver	Toll
Davis, D. M.	Katz	Pancoast	Trello
DeMedio	Kelly, A. P.	Parker, H. S.	Ustynoski
Deverter	Kernick	Perri	Vann
Dicarlo	Kistler	Petrarca	Wagner
Dietz	Kolter	Pievsky	Wansacz
Dombrowski	Kowalshyn	Pitts	Wargo
Doyle	Kusse	Polite	Westerberg
Dreibelbis	Laudadio	Pratt	Whittlesey

Eckensberger	Laughlin	Prendergast	Wilt, R. W.
Englehart	Lederer	Pyles	Wilt, W. W.
Fawcett	Lchr	Rappaport	Wojdak
Fee	Letterman	Reed	Worrilow
Fischer	Levi	Renninger	Wright
Fisher	Lincoln	Renwick	Yahner
Flaherty	Lynch	Rhodes	Yohn
Foster, A.	Manmiller	Richardson	Zeller
Foster, W.	McCall	Rieger	Zwikel
Fryer	McClatchy	Ritter	
Gallagher	McCue	Romanelli	Fineman,
Gallen	McGinnis	Ross	Speaker
Garzia	McGraw		

NAYS—11

Cimini	Klingaman	Shuman	Weidner
Dorr	Knepper	Turner	Wilson
Hutchinson, W.	Scheaffer	Vroon	

NOT VOTING—20

Brandt	Gleason	Manderino	Valicenti
Cohen	Hammock	Perry	Walsh, T. P.
DiDonato	Hasay	Stahl	Whelan
Diminni	Kelly, J. B.	Sullivan	Zearfoss
George	LaMarca	Tayoun	Zord

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

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

### VETERANS AFFAIRS BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of **House bill No. 26, printer's No. 26, entitled:**

An Act amending the "Civil Service Act," approved August 5, 1941 (P. L. 752, No. 286), changing the provisions relating to qualifications of veterans for certain positions.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration? Bill was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS—184

Abraham	Geisler	McIntyre	Salvatore
Anderson, J. H.	George	McLane	Scheaffer
Arthurs	Giammarco	Mebus	Schmitt
Barber	Gillespie	Menhorn	Schweder
Bellomini	Gillette	Milanovich	Scirica
Bennett	Gleeson	Miller, M. E.	Seltzer
Beren	Goodman	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Shane
Berlin	Green	Milliron	Shelhamer
Berson	Greenfield	Miscevich	Shelton
Bittle	Grieco	Mochlmann	Shuman
Blackwell	Gring	Morris	Shupnik
Bonetto	Halverson	Mrkonic	Sirianni
Bradley	Hamilton, J. H.	Mullen	Smith, E.
Brunner	Haskell	Mullen, M. P.	Smith, L.
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	Musto	Spencer
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	Myers	Stapleton
Caputo	Hepford	Novak	Stout
Cessar	Hill	Noye	Sweeney
Cole	Hopkins	O'Brien	Taddonio
Cowell	Hutchinson, A.	O'Connell	Taylor
Crawford	Irvis	O'Donnell	Thomas
Cumberland	Itkin	O'Keefe	Toll
Davies	Johnson, J.	Oliver	Trello
Davis, D. M.	Katz	Pancoast	Turner
DeMedio	Kelly, A. P.	Parker, H. S.	Ustynoski
		Perri	Vann

Deverter	Kernick	Petrarca	Vroon
Dicarlo	Kistler	Pievsky	Wagner
Dietz	Klingaman	Pitts	Wansacz
Dombrowski	Kolter	Polite	Wargo
Dorr	Kowalyshyn	Pratt	Weidner
Doyle	Kusse	Prendergast	Westerberg
Dreibelbis	Laudadio	Pyles	Whittlesey
Eckensberger	Laughlin	Rappaport	Wilson
Englehart	Lederer	Reed	Wilt, R. W.
Fawcett	Lehr	Renninger	Wilt, W. W.
Fee	Letterman	Renwick	Wojdak
Fischer	Levi	Rhodes	Worrihow
Fisher	Lincoln	Richardson	Wright
Flaherty	Lynch	Rieger	Yahner
Foster, A.	Manderino	Ritter	Yohn
Foster, W.	Manmiller	Romanelli	Zeller
Fryer	McCall	Ross	Zwinkl
Gallagher	McClatchy	Ruggiero	Fineman,
Gallen	McCue	Ryan	Speaker
Garzia	McGinnis	Saloom	
Geesey	McGraw		

Davis, D. M.	Kelly, A. P.	Perri	Ustynoski
DeMedio	Kernick	Petrarca	Vann
Dicarlo	Kistler	Pievsky	Wagner
Dietz	Klingaman	Pitts	Wansacz
Dombrowski	Knepper	Polite	Wargo
Doyle	Kolter	Pratt	Weidner
Dreibelbis	Kowalyshyn	Prendergast	Westerberg
Eckensberger	Kusse	Pyles	Whittlesey
Englehart	Laudadio	Rappaport	Wilson
Fawcett	Laughlin	Reed	Wilt, R. W.
Fee	Lederer	Renninger	Wilt, W. W.
Fischer	Lehr	Renwick	Wojdak
Fisher	Letterman	Rhodes	Worrihow
Flaherty	Levi	Richardson	Wright
Foster, A.	Lincoln	Rieger	Yahner
Foster, W.	Lynch	Ritter	Yohn
Fryer	Manderino	Romanelli	Zeller
Gallagher	Manmiller	Ross	Zwinkl
Gallen	McCall	Ruggiero	Fineman,
Garzia	McClatchy	Ryan	Speaker
Geesey	McCue	Saloom	
Geisler	McGinnis		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—19

Brandt	Hammock	Perry	Walsh, T. P.
Cohen	Hasay	Stahl	Whelan
DiDonato	Kelly, J. B.	Sullivan	Zearfoss
Dininni	Knepper	Tayoun	Zord
Gleason	LaMarca	Valicenti	

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

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

TAX BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of House bill No. 503, printer's No. 557, entitled:

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.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration? Bill was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS—180

Abraham	George	McGraw	Salvatore
Anderson, J. H.	Giammarco	McIntyre	Scheaffer
Arthurs	Gillespie	McLane	Schmitt
Barber	Gillette	Mebus	Schweder
Bellomini	Gleeson	Menhorn	Scirica
Bennett	Goodman	Milanovich	Seltzer
Beren	Green	Miller, M. E.	Shane
Berlin	Greenfield	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Shelhamer
Berson	Grieco	Milliron	Shelton
Bittle	Gring	Miscevich	Shuman
Blackwell	Halverson	Moehlmann	Shupnik
Bonetto	Hamilton, J. H.	Morris	Sirianni
Bradley	Hayes, S. E.	Mullen	Smith, E.
Brunner	Haskell	Mullen, M. P.	Smith, L.
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	Musto	Spencer
Butera	Hepford	Myers	Stapleton
Caputo	Hill	Novak	Stout
Cessar	Hopkins	Noye	Sweeney
Cimini	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien	Taddonio
Cole	Hutchinson, W.	O'Connell	Taylor
Cowell	Irvis	O'Keefe	Thomas
Crawford	Itkin	Oliver	Toll
Cumberland	Johnson, J.	Pancoast	Trello
Davies	Katz	Parker, H. S.	Turner

NAYS—3

NOT VOTING—20

Deverter	Dorr	Vroon	
Brandt	Hammock	O'Donnell	Valicenti
Cohen	Hasay	Perry	Walsh, T. P.
DiDonato	Kelly, J. B.	Stahl	Whelan
Dininni	LaMarca	Sullivan	Zearfoss
Gleason	Mrkonic	Tayoun	Zord

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

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

CHILD WELFARE BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of House bill No. 572, printer's No. 798, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 14, 1857 (P. L. 507, No. 567), entitled "An act to Legitimate Children Born out of Lawful Wedlock," providing that all children born in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are legitimate.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. WAGNER requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendments, which were read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1), page 2, line 6, by striking out "one of"

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1), page 2, line 6, by striking out "ways:" and inserting: way:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1), page 2, line 7, by striking out "(1)"

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1), page 2, lines 9 and 10, by striking out both of said lines

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montour, Mr. Wagner.

Mr. WAGNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is quite simple. It deletes the provision which says that if, in a court case, it is decided that a man is the father of the child, that child shall come into his inheritance.

Mr. Speaker, the present law provides for support in paternity cases. This does not affect that at all. If a man is found to be the father, then he shall provide support.

The problem we have here is with the man's inheritance. You have to realize that a man may have five—and I hate to use the term legitimate, but I think I will use it for purposes here because you might understand it—children born in wedlock, and he goes out on a Saturday night someplace and, you know, philanders a little bit. Five years later, the man may come in to draw a will and he is hit with a paternity suit, whatever his name is—we will say it is Joe—and Joe says, I do not know; I could have been the father. How do I prove it? I do not know. This gal did this or that. It is a very serious matter when it comes to inheritance.

If the woman wants to hit him with a paternity suit and make him support that child, that is fine. But for a man's inheritance, you are saying that is his legal heir. He can go around and say, that is my brother over there; that is my half brother; I can inherit from him.

There is also the problem here involving wills. If a man writes a will and takes care of all his children born to his wife, let us say, in wedlock, and a child is born outside wedlock, that child inherits an equal share. If a fellow comes into my law office, I have to tell Mary, you stay out in the front room here. I call him aside and I say, now listen, Ralph, the will is dated today, but if you go out and philander a little bit here, you are going to have to change your will. He says, well, how do I know? You do not know. Whenever you are sued, if there is a verdict brought in against you, then you have to change your will. It is a practical problem, Mr. Speaker. It is not just a problem here of supporting the child.

If we could prove by 100 percent that that child is a legal heir, then I could support this measure. But I do not think there is any way, through a blood test or any other way, unless the man admits it—and that is covered in here—that you could prove 100 percent that that is his legal heir.

I ask support, Mr. Speaker, for this. Just remember, the mother of the child here is protected by the present support laws.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say that I think the amendment is drawn up incorrectly. Maybe I understand the intent of it, but I am still opposed to it.

It says: "Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1), page 2, line 6". Line 6 of the bill is already struck out. There is no "one of" on that line.

The second amendment amends section 1, page 2, line 6, by striking out "ways." There is no "ways" on line 6 of page 2. Then the amendment to section 1, page 2, line 7, strikes out subsection (1). There is no subsection (1) on line 7. I would say that this particular amendment does not address itself to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman for bringing the errors to the attention of the Chair.

The Chair would advise the gentleman, Mr. Wagner, that his amendment is drawn to printer's number 631, rather than to printer's number 798, which is the bill before the House at the moment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montour, Mr. Wagner.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House on this.

I do feel this is very important.

HOUSE BILL No. 572 PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

Mr. WAGNER. I would ask that House bill No. 572 be passed over temporarily.

The SPEAKER. The bill is passed over temporarily.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Richardson.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If there are other amendments, can we entertain them now or do we have to wait for his amendment to be drawn?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to hear the gentleman clearly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I said, since there are other amendments to this particular bill, is it possible that they may be entertained now or does the whole bill have to be passed over?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would prefer that all amendments be passed over temporarily. We will consider them at one time.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL  
ON THIRD CONSIDERATION**

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of **House bill No. 141, printer's No. 687**, entitled:

An Act amending "The Borough Code," approved February 1, 1966 (1965, P. L. 1656, No. 581), providing for appropriations for building and maintaining hospitals.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage.

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS—185

Abraham	Geisler	McGraw	Scheaffer
Anderson, J. H.	George	McIntyre	Schmitt
Arthurs	Giammarco	McLane	Schweder
Barber	Gillespie	Mebus	Scirica
Bellomint	Gillette	Menhorn	Seltzer
Bennett	Gleeson	Milanovich	Shane
Beren	Goodman	Miller, M. E.	Shelhamer
Berlin	Green	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Shelton
Berson	Greenfield	Milliron	Shuman
Blackwell	Grieco	Miscevich	Shupnik
Bonetto	Gring	Moehlmann	Sirianni
Bradley	Halverson	Morris	Smith, E.
Brunner	Hamilton, J. H.	Mrkonic	Smith, L.
Burns	Haskell	Mullen	Spencer
Butera	Hayes, D. S.	Mullen, M. P.	Stapleton
Caputo	Hayes, S. E.	Musto	Stout
Cessar	Hepford	Myers	Sweeney
Ciminl	Hill	Novak	Taddonio
Cole	Hopkins	Noye	Taylor
Cowell	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien	Thomas
Crawford	Hutchinson, W.	O'Connell	Toll
Cumberland	Irvs	O'Donnell	Trello
Davies	Itkin	O'Keefe	Turner
Davis, D. M.	Johnson, J.	Oliver	Ustynoski
DeMedio	Katz	Pancoast	Vann
Deverter	Kelly, A. P.	Parker, H. S.	Vroon
Dicarlo	Kernick	Perri	Wagner
DiDonato	Kistler	Petrarca	Walsh, T. P.
Dietz	Klingaman	Pievsky	Wansacz
Dombrowski	Knepper	Pitts	Wargo



Dorr	Kolter	Polite	Weidner
Doyle	Kowalyshyn	Pratt	Westerberg
Dreibelbis	Kusse	Pyics	Whittlesey
Eckensberger	Laudadio	Rappaport	Wilson
Englehart	Laughlin	Reed	Wilt, R. W.
Fawcett	Lederer	Renninger	Wilt, W. W.
Fee	Lehr	Renwick	Wojdak
Fischer	Letterman	Rhodes	Worrilow
Fisher	Levi	Richardson	Wright
Flaherty	Lincoln	Rieger	Yahner
Foster, A.	Lynch	Ritter	Yohn
Foster, W.	Manderino	Romanelli	Zeller
Fryer	Manmiller	Ross	Zwinkl
Gallagher	McCall	Ruggiero	
Gallen	McClatchy	Ryan	Fineman,
Garzia	McCue	Saloom	Speaker
Geesey	McGinnis	Salvatore	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—18

Bittle	Hammock	Prendergast	Valicenti
Brandt	Hasay	Stahl	Whelan
Cohen	Kelly, J. B.	Sullivan	Zearfoss
Dininni	LaMarca	Tayoun	Zord
Gleason	Perry		

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

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CIMINI. Mr. Speaker, on House bill No. 796, I voted in error. I would like to be recorded as voting "yes."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's remarks will be noted for the record.

TRANSPORTATION BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of House bill No. 496, printer's No. 550, entitled:

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.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage.

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS—178

Abraham	Geisler	McIntyre	Salvatore
Anderson, J. H.	George	McLane	Scheaffer
Arthurs	Giammarco	Mebus	Schmitt
Barber	Gillespie	Menhorn	Schweder
Bellomini	Gillette	Milanovich	Scirica
Bennett	Gleeson	Miller, M. E.	Seltzer
Beren	Goodman	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Shane
Berlin	Green	Milliron	Shelhamer
Berson	Greenfield	Miscevich	Shelton

Blackwell	Grisco	Moehlmann	Shuman
Bonetto	Gring	Morris	Shupnik
Bradley	Hamilton, J. H.	Mrkonic	Smith, E.
Brunner	Hayes, D. S.	Mullen, M. P.	Smith, L.
Burns	Hayes, S. E.	Mullen	Spencer
Butera	Hepford	Musto	Stapleton
Caputo	Hill	Myers	Stout
Cessar	Hopkins	Novak	Sweeney
Cimini	Hutchinson, A.	Noye	Taddonio
Cole	Hutchinson, W.	O'Brien	Taylor
Cowell	Irvis	O'Donnell	Thomas
Crawford	Itkin	O'Donnell	Toll
Cumberland	Johnson, J.	O'Keefe	Trello
Davies	Katz	Oliver	Turner
Davis, D. M.	Kelly, A. P.	Pancoast	Ustynoski
DeMedio	Kernick	Parker, H. S.	Vann
Deverter	Kistler	Parker	Vron
Dicarlo	Knepper	Petrarca	Wagner
Dietz	Kolter	Pievsky	Walsh, T. P.
Dombrowski	Kowalyshyn	Pitts	Wansacz
Dorr	Kusse	Polite	Wargo
Doyle	Laudadio	Pratt	Weidner
Dreibelbis	Laughlin	Prendergast	Westerberg
Eckensberger	Lederer	Pyles	Whittlesey
Englehart	Lehr	Rappaport	Wilson
Fawcett	Letterman	Renninger	Wilt, R. W.
Fee	Levi	Renwick	Wilt, W. W.
Fischer	Lincoln	Rhodes	Wojdak
Fisher	Lynch	Richardson	Worrilow
Flaherty	Manderino	Rieger	Wright
Foster, W.	Manmiller	Ritter	Yahner
Fryer	McCall	Romanelli	Yohn
Gallagher	McClatchy	Ross	Zeller
Gallen	McCue	Ruggiero	
Garzia	McGinnis	Ryan	Fineman,
Geesey	McGraw	Saloom	Speaker

NAYS—4

Foster, A.	Halverson	Haskell	Klingaman
------------	-----------	---------	-----------

NOT VOTING—21

Bittle	Hammock	Reed	Valicenti
Brandt	Hasay	Sirianni	Whelan
Cohen	Kelly, J. B.	Stahl	Zearfoss
DiDonato	LaMarca	Sullivan	Zord
Dininni	Perry	Tayoun	Zwinkl
Gleason			

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

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of House bill No. 142, printer's No. 688, entitled:

An Act amending "The Second Class Township Code," approved May 1, 1933 (P. L. 103, No. 69), providing for appropriation for building hospitals.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage.

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS—184

Abraham	George	Manderino	Scheaffer
Anderson, J. H.	Giammarco	Manmiller	Schmitt
Arthurs	Gillespie	Mebus	Schweder
Barber	Gillette	Menhorn	Scirica
Bellomini	Gleeson	Milanovich	Seltzer
Bennett	Goodman	Miller, M. E.	Shane

Beren	Green	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Shelhamer
Berlin	Greenfield	Milliron	Shelton
Berson	Grieco	Miscevich	Shuman
Blackwell	Gring	Moehlmann	Shupnik
Bonetto	Halverson	Morris	Sirianni
Bradley	Hamilton, J. H.	Mrkonic	Smith, E.
Brunner	Haskell	Mullen, M. P.	Smith, L.
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	Mullen	Spencer
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	Musto	Stapleton
Caputo	Hepford	Myers	Stout
Cessar	Hill	Novak	Sweeney
Cimini	Hopkins	Noye	Taddonio
Cole	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien	Taylor
Cowell	Hutchinson, W.	O'Connell	Thomas
Crawford	Irvis	O'Keefe	Toll
Cumberland	Itkin	Oliver	Trello
Davies	Johnson, J.	Pancoast	Turner
Davis, D. M.	Katz	Parker, H. S.	Ustynoski
DeMedio	Kelly, A. P.	Perri	Vann
Deverter	Kernick	Petrarca	Vroon
Dicarlo	Kistler	Pjevsky	Wagner
Dietz	Klingaman	Pitts	Walsh, T. P.
Dombrowski	Knepper	Polite	Wansacz
Dorr	Kolter	Pratt	Wargo
Doyle	Kowalyszyn	Prendergast	Weidner
Dreibelbis	Kusse	Pyles	Westerberg
Eckensberger	Laudadio	Rappaport	Whittlesey
Englehart	Laughlin	Rood	Wilson
Fawcett	Lederer	Renninger	Wilt, R. W.
Fee	Lehr	Renwick	Wilt, W. W.
Fischer	Letterman	Rhodes	Wojdak
Fisher	Levi	Richardson	WorriLOW
Flaherty	Lincoln	Rieger	Wright
Foster, A.	Lynch	Ritter	Yahner
Foster, W.	McCall	Romanelli	Yohn
Fryer	McClatchy	Ross	Zeller
Gallagher	McCue	Ruggiero	Zwikk
Gallen	McGinnis	Ryan	
Garzia	McGraw	Saloom	Fineman,
Geesey	McIntyre	Salvatore	Speaker
Geisler	McLane		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—19

Bittle	Gleason	O'Donnell	Valicenti
Brandt	Hammock	Perry	Whelan
Cohen	Hasay	Stahl	Zearfoss
DiDonato	Kelly, J. B.	Sullivan	Zord
Dininni	LaMarca	Tayoun	

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

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of **House bill No. 387, printer's No. 784**, entitled:

An Act amending "The Second Class Township Code," approved May 1, 1933 (P. L. 103, No. 69), increasing amount of levy permitted for fire protection.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration? Bill was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS—185

Abraham	George	McIntyre	Scheaffer
Anderson, J. H.	Giammarco	McLane	Schmitt
Arthurs	Gillespie	Mebus	Schweder
Barber	Gillette	Menhorn	Scirica
Bellomini	Gleason	Milanovich	Seltzer
Bennett	Goodman	Miller, M. E.	Shane
Beren	Green	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Shelhamer
Berlin	Greenfield	Milliron	Shelton

Berson	Grieco	Miscevich	Shuman
Blackwell	Gring	Moehlmann	Shupnik
Bonetto	Halverson	Morris	Sirianni
Bradley	Hamilton, J. H.	Mrkonic	Smith, E.
Brunner	Haskell	Mullen, M. P.	Smith, L.
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	Mullen	Spencer
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	Musto	Stapleton
Caputo	Hepford	Myers	Stout
Cessar	Hill	Novak	Sweeney
Cimini	Hopkins	Noye	Taddonio
Cole	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien	Taylor
Cowell	Hutchinson, W.	O'Connell	Thomas
Crawford	Irvis	O'Donnell	Toll
Cumberland	Itkin	O'Keefe	Trello
Davies	Johnson, J.	Oliver	Turner
Davis, D. M.	Katz	Pancoast	Ustynoski
DeMedio	Kelly, A. P.	Parker, H. S.	Vann
Deverter	Kernick	Perri	Vroon
Dicarlo	Kistler	Petrarca	Wagner
Dietz	Klingaman	Pjevsky	Walsh, T. P.
Dombrowski	Knepper	Pitts	Wansacz
Dorr	Kolter	Polite	Wargo
Doyle	Kowalyszyn	Pratt	Weidner
Dreibelbis	Kusse	Prendergast	Westerberg
Eckensberger	Laudadio	Pyles	Whittlesey
Englehart	Laughlin	Rappaport	Wilson
Fawcett	Lederer	Reed	Wilt, R. W.
Fee	Lehr	Renninger	Wilt, W. W.
Fischer	Letterman	Renwick	Wojdak
Fisher	Levi	Rhodes	WorriLOW
Flaherty	Lincoln	Richardson	Wright
Foster, A.	Lynch	Rieger	Yahner
Foster, W.	McCall	Ritter	Yohn
Fryer	McClatchy	Romanelli	Zeller
Gallagher	McCue	Ross	Zwikk
Gallen	McGinnis	Ruggiero	
Garzia	McGraw	Ryan	Fineman,
Geesey	McIntyre	Saloom	Speaker
Geisler	McLane	Salvatore	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—18

Bittle	Gleason	Perry	Valicenti
Brandt	Hammock	Stahl	Whelan
Cohen	Hasay	Sullivan	Zearfoss
DiDonato	Kelly, J. B.	Tayoun	Zord
Dininni	LaMarca		

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

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of **House bill No. 722, printer's No. 819**, entitled:

An Act amending "The First Class Township Code," approved June 24, 1931 (P. L. 1206, No. 331), further providing for remedies for violations of building and housing sanitation regulations.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration? Bill was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage. The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS—184

Abraham	Giammarco	McLane	Scheaffer
Anderson, J. H.	Gillespie	Mebus	Schmitt
Arthurs	Gillette	Menhorn	Schweder
Barber	Gleason	Miller, M. E.	Scirica
Bellomini	Goodman	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Seltzer
Bennett	Green	Milanovich	Shane
Beren	Greenfield	Milliron	Shelhamer
Berlin	Grieco	Miscevich	Shelton
Berson	Gring	Moehlmann	Shuman

Bonetto	Halverson	Morris	Shupnik
Bradley	Hamilton, J. H.	Mrkonie	Sirianni
Brunner	Haskell	Mullen, M. P.	Smith, E.
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	Mullen	Smith, L.
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	Musto	Spencer
Caputo	Hepford	Myers	Stapleton
Cessar	Hill	Novak	Stout
Cimini	Hopkins	Noye	Sweeney
Cole	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien	Taddonio
Cowell	Hutchinson, W.	O'Connell	Taylor
Crawford	Irvis	O'Donnell	Thomas
Cumberland	Itkin	O'Keefe	Toll
Davies	Johnson, J.	Oliver	Trello
Davis, D. M.	Katz	Pancoast	Turner
DeMedio	Kelly, A. P.	Parker, H. S.	Ustynoski
Deverter	Kernick	Perri	Vann
Dicarlo	Kistler	Petrarca	Vroon
Dietz	Klingaman	Pievsky	Wagner
Dombrowski	Knepper	Pitts	Walsh, T. P.
Dorr	Kolter	Polite	Wansacz
Doyle	Kowalshyn	Pratt	Wargo
Dreibelbis	Kusse	Prendergast	Weidner
Eckensberger	Laudadio	Pyles	Westerberg
Englehart	Laughlin	Rappaport	Whittlesey
Fawcett	Lederer	Reed	Wilson
Fee	Lehr	Renninger	Wilt, R. W.
Fischer	Letterman	Renwick	Wilt, W. W.
Fisher	Levi	Rhodes	Wojdak
Flaherty	Lincoln	Richardson	Worriow
Foster, A.	Lynch	Rieger	Wright
Foster, W.	Manderino	Ritter	Yahner
Fryer	Manmiller	Romanelli	Yohn
Gallagher	McCall	Ross	Zeller
Gallen	McClatchy	Ruggiero	Zwilk
Garzia	McCue	Ryan	
Geesey	McGinnis	Saloom	Fineman,
Geisler	McGraw	Salvatore	Speaker
George	McIntyre		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—19

Bittle	Dininni	LaMarca	Valicenti
Blackwell	Gleason	Perry	Whelan
Brandt	Hammock	Stahl	Zearfoss
Cohen	Hasay	Sullivan	Zord
DiDonato	Kelly, J. B.	Tayoun	

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

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

**BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION**

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of **House bill No. 682, printer's No. 766**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 3, 1933 (P. L. 242, No. 86), referred to as the Beauty Culture Law, permitting demonstrations of beauty culture techniques without additional fees; further providing for supervision and providing for temporary certification of beauty shops and certain students who have taken the examination.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

**BILL RECOMMENDED**

Mr. IRVIS moved that House bill No. 682 be recommended to the Committee on Professional Licensure.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to second consideration of **House bill No. 290, printer's No. 321**, entitled:

An Act naming a bridge over the Susquehanna River the Wright's Ferry Bridge.

And said bill having been considered the second time and agreed to,

Ordered, to be transcribed for third consideration.

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to second consideration of **House bill No. 348, printer's No. 385**, entitled:

An Act designating a section of Route 56 (Legislative Route 188) as the "Paul W. Mahady Drive."

And said bill having been considered the second time and agreed to,

Ordered, to be transcribed for third consideration.

**JUDICIARY BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to second consideration of **House bill No. 491, printer's No. 543**, entitled:

An Act implementing the provisions of section 6 of Article I of the Constitution of Pennsylvania by providing that a verdict may be rendered by five-sixths of the jury in a civil case.

And said bill having been considered the second time and agreed to,

Ordered, to be transcribed for third consideration.

**HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 13 ADOPTED**

Mr. IRVIS called up **HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 13, printer's No. 190**, entitled:

House Bipartisan Committee to investigate causes of pollution of Lake Erie.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

Resolution was adopted.

**HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 47 ADOPTED**

Mr. IRVIS called up **HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 47, printer's No. 1001**, entitled:

House Bipartisan Committee to investigate problems connected with the imprisonment and incarceration of youthful offenders.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution as amended?

**RECONSIDERATION OF VOTE ON AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 47**

Mr. RICHARDSON moved that the vote by which the Ritter amendment to House resolution No. 47, printer's No. 1007, was agreed to on Thursday, March 20, 1975, be reconsidered.

Mr. ROSS seconded the motion.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

Mr. RITTER requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend first "Resolved" clause, page 1, lines 12 to 14, by striking out "Speaker of the House of Representatives" in line 12, all of line 13 and "majority party and four from the minority party, to" in line 14 and inserting: Subcommittee on Corrections and Rehabilitation of the House Standing Committee on Judiciary

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

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

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, House resolution No. 47 is one which we had debated at great length on two previous occasions. Again, the amendment before us now is that we would remove the language which says that the Speaker shall appoint a bipartisan committee of nine members, et cetera, five from the majority and four from the minority, and substitute instead that the "Subcommittee on Corrections and Rehabilitation of the House Standing Committee on Judiciary," and then that committee is empowered by subpoena power to investigate the problems connected with imprisonment and incarceration.

It is the same argument and the same resolution that we discussed on two previous occasions. I ask again for an affirmative vote on the amendment. I think the amendment to this resolution, as well as to the others which we had accepted, strengthens the committee system. It puts the power in a House standing committee or a House standing subcommittee, which, it seems to me, is the purpose of these committees. The only thing that this resolution does that the standing committees do not have the power to do now is the subpoena power.

I think that it is a very good amendment and makes a great deal of sense. The merits of the resolution itself or the problems that it hopes to correct are really of little moment when you determine whether it is going to be a special committee to do the work or a standing House committee or a standing subcommittee.

We have that subcommittee now, and that is why I ask for an affirmative vote on the amendment to let a standing subcommittee do the job.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to oppose the amendment.

The reason for the reintroduction was the fact that in the lengthy debates that we did have on House resolution No. 47, which called for the immediate investigation of all these institutions across the entire state, the Speaker of the House of Representatives was given the power to appoint a special investigatory committee to investigate the problems inside these youth institutions.

On the first day, which was March 19, this House did pass that resolution in its original form, without the amendment. The next day it was reconsidered, as you might remember, by the gentleman, Mr. Kelly. Then it took a turn for the worse, and it was then decided by this House that the amendment would carry and that the Subcommittee on Corrections should hold this investigation of the youth institutions across the entire state.

There was a subsequent meeting on the night the vote was taken on House resolution No. 47, at which time the gentleman, Mr. Rhodes, said he met with others who felt that it would be impossible for me—making it a per-

sonal thing—to be appointed as the chairman of this particular committee. At that time I raised the question as to why that should be brought up. It was not a personal thing, but that the fact was that the young people across this Commonwealth are being mistreated.

As we look at Camp Hill and we look at other particular institutions, we find that there is definitely a degrading, a dehumanizing process being continued. In light of those situations and in light of the fact that there is a problem in youth institutions across this entire state, I feel that unless we begin to investigate those things with a special committee, we are going to endanger ourselves by not taking the bull by the horns or taking the initiative to move in such a direction.

The other point, as it relates to the Subcommittee on Corrections, is that presently, as the Subcommittee on Corrections stands now, they do not have subpoena power. This enables them to have subpoena power on just this one particular issue.

There are several other things that we have discussed that the Subcommittee on Corrections can also be doing along with it. We feel that many investigations are needed in this particular light. The fact of the matter is that we are constantly bombarded with calls from persons in this Commonwealth, that there are problems in these youth institutions and the youth have not become a top priority for us to examine.

I would hope that the members here would recall March 19 and vote the resolution in its original form and vote against the amendment now introduced by the gentleman, Mr. Ritter.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the position advanced by my colleague, Mr. Ritter. I agree with him wholeheartedly that the committee system should function properly. The proper function of a committee is to investigate the problems that arise in this Commonwealth.

On the same day that we voted on House resolution No. 47, this House voted on House resolution No. 50. I want to inform the members of this House that by the adoption of House resolution No. 50, a subcommittee of the Committee on Business and Commerce is performing a function, that of investigating the mortgage market.

That subcommittee has been formed, Mr. Speaker, under the able direction of Mr. Kowalshyn. That subcommittee has met already with appropriate members of the business community, will meet with—

#### POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. O'Donnell. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. O'DONNELL. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'DONNELL. I am not sure exactly how to frame this, but is Mr. Bennett speaking on the amendment of Mr. Ritter to House resolution No. 47 which has been reconsidered by the House?

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman raising an objection?

Mr. O'DONNELL. I am raising an objection on relevance.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Bennett, will

endeavor to confine his remarks to the question before the House, which is the amendment offered by the gentleman, Mr. Ritter.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Bennett.

Mr. BENNETT. The point, Mr. Speaker, that I am attempting to make is that the subcommittee that was alluded to in House resolution No. 50 is doing its job, and it would appear to me that the—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Richardson, rise?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I object to the line of interrogation that the gentleman, Mr. Bennett, is going into because it does not deal with House resolution No. 47.

The SPEAKER. The objection is not well taken.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, not to belabor the issue, then I rise to support Mr. Ritter in his contention that the subcommittees of this House are functioning and are properly doing so and should be continued.

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

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me correctly, this session of the legislature is the first session that has a subcommittee under the Judiciary Committee. This is the first session of the legislature that has a Subcommittee on Corrections and Rehabilitation, is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. RITTER. This was the Speaker's idea last session and he created this subcommittee this session. It seems to me that this subcommittee is a proper subcommittee to conduct the investigation because the subject matter of the resolution falls directly under the purview of that subcommittee. The gentleman, Mr. Richardson, is a member of that subcommittee; the gentleman, Mr. Hammock, who is chairman of that subcommittee, is a cosponsor of House resolution No. 47. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, it is just a proper function of this House to ask that that subcommittee investigate this situation as soon as possible, as the resolution directs, and give that subcommittee the subpoena power.

I again ask for an affirmative vote on my amendment which simply takes the resolution and puts it in a newly created standing subcommittee whose function is to do just what the resolution directs it to do.

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

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this amendment. It happens, Mr. Speaker, that on many occasions members of this House, for various reasons, become interested in a certain issue and become rather knowledgeable about it, and yet, for reasons beyond their control, they are not members of the substantive committee, the standing committee, that has jurisdiction over that problem.

One of the traditional ways of using that member's expertise in solving or investigating a particular problem is the creation of a special subcommittee. In that way we get members who are interested in this very problem and who are ready to work on it and do a job. This has been the function of the special committee.

I might say in this regard, Mr. Speaker, we had a very serious problem at our Youth Study Center in

Philadelphia. I heard the problem downgraded at meetings of the Philadelphia Advisory Council of the Governor's Justice Commission, and we were told that there is no problem and it was repeated over and over again. Were it not for the efforts of Representatives Richardson and Blackwell, the problems would still be there.

I might say that a number of guards have been arrested and are awaiting trial now for homosexual abuse of the juveniles who were incarcerated there.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Will those who are taking the floor try to endeavor to confine their remarks to precisely the issue that is before the House?

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We are now, with this resolution, attempting to get the most qualified people in this House to work on this problem, and, therefore, I would oppose the amendment of Mr. Ritter and ask the members to support the creation of the special committee.

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I think that we are in a bit of confusion. The amendment, if I understand it correctly, is Mr. Richardson's amendment.

The SPEAKER. The amendment before the House is the amendment of the gentleman, Mr. Ritter, to direct that this investigation be conducted by the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. The original resolution called for the appointment of a special committee by the Speaker.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dauphin, Mr. Reed.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for Mr. Richardson or anyone else who might be able to answer it. It has to do with whether or not, since the passage of Resolution No. 47 as it was amended by Mr. Ritter on a previous occasion, that particular standing subcommittee has already begun its deliberations and study of this particular problem?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The answer to your question is "no."

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, that is what I was afraid was going to be the answer. This legislative body has a great many varied issues, of course, that we have to consider because of the divergent interests of the Commonwealth and the effect that we have on them. The standing committees and their subcommittees do have a great deal of work, particularly some of the more major committees.

I am voting against the Ritter amendment which would cause the House resolution No. 47 to be continually handled by a standing subcommittee, so that by voting against it, we may have, in effect, creation of a special committee for the purpose of getting about the business that House Resolution No. 47 is supposed to do. I think it is urgently needed. It certainly is applicable to my district and I think to most other districts in the state.

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

Mr. VANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against the amendment because these types of amendments that have been coming before us are taking away the au-

thority to investigate from the people who are knowledgeable on the subject.

There is not a more classical example that I can give this body than a resolution sponsored by Mr. Berson and myself on another matter. Then a Ritter amendment came through and this body decided to turn the investigation over to the Health and Welfare Committee. The Health and Welfare Committee turned it over to a subcommittee, and they, in turn, investigated it, but no one in this body had the knowledge to contact Mr. Berson and myself on the subject. We were knowledgeable; we had been meeting with people within the community. Subsequently they found out that their theory was altogether incorrect, which Mr. Berson and I could have told them.

So the idea or the theory that the members of the subcommittees are better than those legislators who are knowledgeable on the issue does not hold, and I use that as an example. I rise to oppose the Ritter amendment.

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I think before we vote on this amendment again, we ought to review some of the facts raised in debate. I know we have been through this twice now and the members are probably tired hearing it again, but let us just briefly do it. I apologize for having to go over this again and I guarantee the House I will not belabor this point, but there are just a couple facts I think ought to be made clear.

First of all, in reply to Mr. Rappaport's comments about how an individual who is personally involved in an issue should not be hampered from pursuing a special investigation, it should be pointed out and the House should know that the chief sponsor and the major sponsors of this resolution are on the Subcommittee on Corrections, and there never was any prohibition or any attempt to exclude them from actively participating on the subcommittee. This resolution, without the amendment, would simply set up part of the subcommittee as a whole new committee, basically.

Secondly, I think Mr. Reed's question requires an additional answer. I also serve on that subcommittee. The chairman is not here today to speak for the subcommittee, but I think the committee has tried to implement the resolution, but there is a basic fact involved that the House ought to know about. We have not been able to start the active investigation embodied in the resolution because we are unable to convince the main sponsor of this resolution to become chairman of the task force within the subcommittee. This is the main reason we have not been able to move ahead. The subcommittee did not want to preclude the main sponsor from the act of leadership with this investigation, I suppose, because the feeling was that if we had this reconsideration today, you might reverse your last action of setting up this new special committee and therefore there would be no need for him to be chairman of the task force. I do not think there is any feeling in the subcommittee that anyone else should be chairman other than the chief sponsor of this resolution. I, for one, would vote for him and I think the other subcommittee members would also. But this is the reason we have been unable to move ahead, because he has not accepted the chairmanship of the task force.

I think it is a good amendment; the committee is already working in this area. We have lots of bills to deal with in terms of youth. I do not back away from my position on the subcommittee which is that the chief sponsor of this resolution should be chairman of this task force and have the subpoena power to go ahead within the framework of our standing committee. There is no need to create this special, select, separate committee. You voted overwhelmingly the last time that we should do it this way. Mr. Ritter's amendment is a good one. We should adopt it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. BENNETT. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House of Representatives, if a member votes in the negative, is he then, in effect, supporting the position advanced by Mr. Ritter?

The SPEAKER. No. If a member votes in the affirmative, he is supporting the position of Mr. Ritter. If a member votes in the negative, he is supporting the position of Mr. Richardson.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. RITTER and RICHARDSON and were as follows:

YEAS—126

Abraham	Gallagher	McGinnis	Schmitt
Anderson, J. H.	Garzia	McGraw	Schweder
Bellomini	Geesey	Mebus	Scirica
Bennett	Geisler	Milanovich	Shelhamer
Berlin	Giammarco	Miller, M. E.	Sirianni
Bittle	Goodman	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Smith, E.
Bonetto	Gring	Milliron	Smith, L.
Bradley	Haskell	Miscevich	Spencer
Brunner	Hayes, D. S.	Mullen	Stout
Caputo	Hayes, S. E.	Musto	Sweeney
Cessar	Hepford	Novak	Taddonio
Cole	Hill	Nove	Taylor
Cowell	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien	Thomas
Crawford	Hutchinson, W.	O'Connell	Trello
Cumberland	Itkin	Pancoast	Vroon
Davies	Kelly, A. P.	Parker, H. S.	Wagner
Davis, D. M.	Kernick	Petrarca	Walsh, T. P.
Deverter	Kistler	Pievsky	Weidner
Dietz	Klingaman	Pitts	Westerberg
Dombrowski	Knepper	Polite	Whittlesey
Dorr	Kolter	Pratt	Wilson
Doyle	Kowalshyn	Prendergast	Wilt, R. W.
Dreibelbis	Kusse	Fyles	Wilt, W. W.
Eckensberger	Laudadio	Renninger	Wojdak
Englehart	Laughlin	Renwick	Worrilow
Fawcett	Lederer	Rhodes	Yahner
Fischer	Lehr	Ritter	Yohn
Fisher	Letterman	Romanelli	Zeller
Flaherty	Levi	Ruggiero	Zwilk
Foster, A.	Lynch	Ryan	
Foster, W.	Manmiller	Saloom	Fineman,
Fryer	McCall	Scheaffer	Speaker

NAYS—60

Arthurs	Gleeson	McLane	Ross
Barber	Green	Menhorn	Salvatore
Beren	Greenfield	Moehlmann	Seltzer
Berson	Grieco	Morris	Shane
Burns	Halverson	Mrkonic	Shelton
Butera	Hamilton, J. H.	Mullen, M. P.	Shuman
Cimini	Hopkins	Myers	Shupnik
DeMedio	Irvis	O'Donnell	Stapleton

Dicarlo	Katz	O'Keefe	Toll
DiDonato	LaMarca	Oliver	Turner
Fee	Lincoln	Perry	Ustynoski
Gallen	Manderino	Rappaport	Vann
George	McClatchy	Reed	Wansacz
Gillespie	McCue	Richardson	Wargo
Gillette	McIntyre	Rieger	Wright

NOT VOTING—17

Blackwell	Hammock	Perri	Valicenti
Brandt	Hasay	Stahl	Whelan
Cohen	Johnson, J.	Sullivan	Zearfoss
Dininni	Kelly, J. B.	Tayoun	Zord
Gleason			

So the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendment was agreed to.

On the question recurring,  
Will the House adopt the resolution as amended?  
Resolution as amended was adopted.

WELCOME

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome 40 members of the Community Club of Collegeville, under the leadership of Mrs. James Lorah, president.

The ladies are here as guests of Mr. Pancoast of Montgomery County.

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 72 ADOPTED

Mr. IRVIS called up HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 72, printer's No. 948, entitled:

House petitioning the Pennsylvania congressional delegation to favorably consider programs for part-time employment of retired senior citizens.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?  
Resolution was adopted.

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 78 ADOPTED

Mr. IRVIS called up HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 78, printer's No. 1049, entitled:

House urging the Governor to convince the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare to have a veterans' home at the Old Valley Forge General Hospital site.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?  
Resolution was adopted.

BILL REPORTED AS AMENDED AND CONSIDERED FIRST TIME AND TABLED

SENATE BILL No. 115 By Mr. BRUNNER

An Act reenacting and amending the act of March 11, 1971 (P. L. 104, No. 3), entitled, as amended, "Senior Citizens Property Tax Assistance Act," eliminating references to "assistance".

Reported from Committee on Finance.

SENATE MESSAGE

SENATE RESOLUTION FOR CONCURRENCE

TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, presented the

following extract from the Journal of the Senate, which was read:

In the Senate, April 14, 1975

RESOLVED, (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate adjourns this week it reconvene on Monday, April 21, 1975, and when the House of Representatives adjourns this week it reconvene on Monday, April 21, 1975.

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the House of Representatives for its concurrence.

On the question,  
Will the House concur in the resolution of the Senate?  
Resolution was concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

WELCOME

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to welcome Anna Mary McShane, who is the wife of Assistant Chief Clerk Patrick McShane. She is accompanied by Mrs. Jean Brown.

The ladies are here as the guests of the gentleman, Mr. Manderino.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. HEPFORD. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEPFORD. Mr. Speaker, you mentioned reorganization plans which had been submitted by the Governor, which appear on the calendar today.

For the benefit of the new members of this session, this is the first time this has appeared on the calendar.

I have a parliamentary inquiry. First, for the benefit of all members: What is the effect of our rules with respect to a fiscal note if it is involved in the question of reorganization? And, secondly, what is the status with respect to the number of legislative days that these questions appear on the calendar when, in fact, if not acted upon, they become approved or denied?

The SPEAKER. Well, as the Chair best recollects at the moment, taking your second question first, unless the bills are acted upon within a course of 21 days in the negative, they affirmatively become part of law.

As to your first question, the rules are silent on the question of fiscal notes on the matter of reorganization plans.

CONSERVATION BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of House bill No. 594, printer's No. 1097, entitled:

An Act amending the "Pennsylvania Solid Waste Management Act," approved July 31, 1968 (P. L. 788, No. 241), providing for alternative plans for solid waste disposal.

On the question,  
Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?  
Mr. ABRAHAM requested and obtained unanimous



consent to offer the following amendments, which were read:

Amend Title, page 1, line 13, by striking out "and" and inserting a comma

Amend Title, page 1, line 13, by inserting after "to": and conferring certain duties upon

Amend Sec. 2 (Sec. 6), page 2, line 11, by striking out "municipalities or authorities" and inserting: counties

Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 7.2), page 2, line 22, by inserting after "operation": and the municipality which is adjoining or abutting the proposed landfill

Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 7.2), page 2, line 25, by striking out "said" where it appears the first time and inserting: either

Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 7.2), page 2, line 27, by striking out "the" and inserting: either

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, this bill, like so many treating environmental issues, serves a commendable purpose, and, hopefully, the objective of the bill can, in some measure, be obtained.

However, it is usual in the case of bills of this nature that the question of where the responsibility lies or should lie becomes paramount.

The proposed act, of course, places this on local municipalities. The fixing of the responsibility with local municipalities bothers me in two respects. First, with the budgetary problems presently facing all those in local government, I would question whether sufficient funds would be devoted to develop a really effective plan. More realistically, I think local governments would develop only minimal plans to comply with the act. The cost factor I do not think can be overlooked, and basically the act should include some means of funding. I think Mr. Fryer is going to look into that.

The two amendments that I have here, Mr. Speaker—primarily the first part of the amendment does away with municipalities or authorities, and counties is written in in place of municipalities or authorities. What that does is allow for the study to be done on a regional basis rather than on a local level. Realistically, it would be almost impossible for a good solid waste program, especially recycling, to be done on a small regional basis, such as local government.

Back in Allegheny County where the density is so high now, it would be almost impossible to again go into municipalities and require those local governments there to come up with a realistic recycling program.

The second part of the amendment is that the municipality adjoining or abutting the proposed landfill be allowed the same rights or privileges as the municipality that is creating the landfill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Snyder, Mr. Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Did I understand Mr. Abraham to say he has two amendments?

Mr. ABRAHAM. No; it is one amendment. I just gave it in sections; that is all.

Mr. THOMAS. I was not aware of this amendment until this morning and I did not have time to study it in depth. But I would like to say this to the members of

the House: It is of an urgent matter that this bill get to the Senate so we can take care of a problem in the White Deer Valley area, if you remember my comments from 3 or 4 weeks ago before we recessed for 2 weeks.

I do not know what impact this amendment will have on the solid waste disposal program of the Commonwealth and I would certainly like to have some more time to study an amendment as far reaching as this one. I will guarantee the sponsor of this amendment that I will so do and work with anyone if we get this bill over to the Senate to get it amended effectively over there to do what he wants done, if it is feasible so to do.

I would urge that we do not pass this amendment at this particular time but get on with the passage of the bill and correct it in the Senate in whatever fashion we need to.

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, again, we in the House have that responsibility and I think it is the responsibility of the House members to amend the bill here and not hope that the Senate does our job. That is my personal feeling. I think that we have a job to do here and I think it can be done here as well as in the Senate where it may get bottled up.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland, Mr. Laudadio.

Mr. LAUDADIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if this amendment could be subdivided and the first section taken separately from the second section of the amendment.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend?

Where does the gentleman propose to divide the amendment?

Mr. LAUDADIO. "Amend Sec. 2 (Sec. 6), page 2, line 11, by striking out 'municipalities or authorities' and inserting: counties". Separate that from the second section, "Amend Sec. 3 (Sec. 7.2), page 2, . . ."

The SPEAKER. The Chair believes that the amendment is divisible at that point.

Mr. LAUDADIO. Is Mr. Abraham satisfied to vote on these separately?

Mr. ABRAHAM. Yes; I am in agreement.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Abraham, on that portion of the amendment ending with the word "counties".

Mr. ABRAHAM. Correct.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman address himself to that portion of the amendment only at this time? That will be the amendment that will be before the House.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield for the purpose of a motion for recommittal that is going to be offered by the gentleman, Mr. Wojdak? If the motion for recommittal carries, then there will be no need to discuss the amendments because the motion takes precedence over the amendments.

#### HOUSE BILL No. 594 RECOMMENDED

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, I am moving to recom- mit this bill for several reasons.

In the Appropriations Committee meeting last week the bill was amended. In fact, I amended it at the re- quest of Mr. Thomas and Mr. Laudadio. The amendment was to the effect that the bill would only be applicable to those municipalities that had plans in process. I was informed that the fiscal impact would be negligible and I so informed the committee.

Subsequent to the committee meeting, I checked into it again and determined that the fiscal impact would not be negligible. In fact, it would be the same as is out- lined in the fiscal note that everyone has. So the fiscal impact is the same. Now, the committee voted on the basis of my statement that the fiscal impact would be negligible. That is not the case.

Secondly, there are going to be additional amendments offered which have a fiscal impact, and I am moving at this time, Mr. Speaker, to recommit that bill to Appro- priations.

On the question,  
Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Snyder, Mr. Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I agree in part with what the chairman of the Appropriations Committee related.

We discussed this bill and its amendment after I was presented with the fiscal note, which I now hold in my hand, calling for \$4 million in each of the next 4 years and \$3.8 million the following year.

Then someone called my attention to the fact that technically we were wrong in requiring all municipalities or authorities to submit alternate plans, so we had the amendment prepared which called for only those munici- palities considering solid waste disposal plans to submit alternate plans.

Now I would like to ask the Appropriations Committee chairman, Mr. Wojdak, how in the world, when we re- quired every municipality to submit solid waste disposal alternate plans and the cost was \$4 million, it still re- mains \$4 million when we require only a small fraction of those which are applying for permission to dispose of solid waste?

I want you to keep in mind that there are something like 1,200 townships besides the other municipal gov- ernments, and when we reduce that to perhaps 50, some- one is way off in the calculation of the fiscal note.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not want to interrupt the gentleman, but the Chair would request again that the speakers on the floor try to confine their remarks to the recommittal motion.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the gen- tleman's statement, he is questioning the \$4 million.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that the committee voted in using and considering a statement that I made that was incorrect, and I think the bill should be recommitted so that that can be clarified so that the committee has the full facts in front of it. I think the committee did vote using my statement as a basis, and it was incorrect.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. WOJDAK and ABRAHAM and were as follows:

YEAS—133

Table listing names of members who voted 'YEAS' (133 total). Includes names like Abraham, Geisler, McLane, Ross, etc.

NAYS—51

Table listing names of members who voted 'NAYS' (51 total). Includes names like Anderson, J. H., Geesey, McClatchy, Smith, L., etc.

NOT VOTING—19

Table listing names of members who did not vote (19 total). Includes names like Cohen, Hasay, O'Brien, Valicenti, etc.

So the question was determined in the affirmative and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill and amendments are so re- committed.

QUESTIONS OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCUE. Mr. Speaker, my switch was locked. I would have voted in the affirmative on the motion to recommit House bill No. 594.

The SPEAKER. The remarks of the gentleman will be noted in the record.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Kistler.

Mr. KISTLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded in the affirmative on the recommittal of House bill No. 594.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's remarks will be noted in the record.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. SHELHAMER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHELHAMER. As I read the rules and as I listened to Mr. Wojdak on the floor a little while ago, if I understood him correctly, he said that the Appropriations Committee had amended this bill. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Wojdak, respond to that?

Mr. WOJDAK. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SHELHAMER. Mr. Speaker, might I refer the gentleman to rule 19 (a) and see whether or not what took place in the Appropriations Committee was correct.

I would be glad to read it to him, if he would like.

Mr. WOJDAK. No; I am aware of the rule, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SHELHAMER. If the rule I have is correct, it says: "The Appropriations Committee"—and this is referring to fiscal notes and these are the notes presented to us by the majority leader—"shall be limited in its consideration of any such bill"—which, of course, is referred to it for a fiscal basis—"to the fiscal aspects of the bill and shall not consider the substantive merits of the bill nor refuse to report any such bill from committee for reasons other than fiscal aspects."

What I am rising to find out, Mr. Speaker, is—not on this particular bill but on bills that are going to go there in the future—whether or not the Appropriations Committee acted in its proper function in amending that bill?

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, we amended a portion that spoke to the fiscal impact of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Appropriations Committee would be within its prerogative under the rules to amend the bill dealing with the financial impact of the bill.

Mr. SHELHAMER. Do I understand the committee chairman to say then that you amended only that section limiting it or expanding the fiscal impact of the bill?

Mr. WOJDAK. As I recall, that is all the amendment spoke to. I do not have a copy of the amendment in front of me.

Mr. SHELHAMER. Well, which way was it, up or down?

Mr. WOJDAK. Well, we only amended that portion that spoke to the fiscal implications, and that was up.

Mr. SHELHAMER. Up?

Mr. WOJDAK. I assume you mean by up that—

Mr. SHELHAMER. Costing more money to the municipality.

Mr. WOJDAK. The amendment that we inserted really did not change the fiscal impact.

We were under the assumption when we voted the bill that it did change the fiscal impact and made the cost

negligible. That is not the case, and we discovered that subsequent to the meeting. That is the basis of my reasoning for moving to recommit the bill.

Mr. SHELHAMER. Well, okay; I do not want to belabor the point. My point in calling this to the attention of the House is so that the Appropriations Committee does not function as a super-committee and that no meaningful amendments be placed in it. That is all.

The SPEAKER. There have been all kinds of references to super-committees this year. The fears and apprehensions that were expressed have never come to fruition, and I am sure that they will not for the balance of the term of the General Assembly.

#### WELCOME

The SPEAKER. The Chair wants to recognize Mr. Samuel Rinella, legislative chairman of the Disabled American Veterans, and Mr. William Soriano, who is the state commander of the AMVETS.

These gentlemen are here as the guests of Messrs. Novak, Abraham, Misceovich, Mrkoncic and Petrarca.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lebanon, Mr. Seltzer.

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the action which the committee took 2 weeks ago.

The rule which speaks to a substantive part of the bill talks not to the financial aspects of the bill but to what the bill intends to do. It would be my interpretation of the rule that if the bill before us would cost \$20 million, the Appropriations Committee, in their wisdom, could change that \$20 million to \$40 million or reduce it to \$2 million.

We could not change the intent or the import of the bill, but we could, in our wisdom, change the amount of money which it would cost the Commonwealth to support the legislation.

#### CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL NO. 572 RESUMED

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. WAGNER requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendments, which were read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1), page 2, lines 11 and 12, by striking out both of said lines

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1), page 2, line 13, by striking out "(3)" and inserting: (2)

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendments offered by the gentleman, Mr. Wagner, and say that the attempt of Mr. Wagner is to strike out lines 11 and 12 on page 2 which deals with paternity—that it should be determined by law during the lifetime of the reputed father.

It seems to me that the particular seriousness of this particular piece of legislation as it deals with inheritance is that we find that persons who might be the father of a child—now they have court proceedings which deal

with paternity cases and which deal also with the case that involves a mother who takes a father to court for support. Those matters are covered by law in this Commonwealth.

I do not feel, personally, that this particular amendment should be inserted in this particular piece of legislation, because I do have it covered in the bill on page 2, that for purposes of paternal inheritance of children born out of wedlock, the identity of the father may be determined by one of three ways, and one of those ways is to deal with the court proceedings during the lifetime of the reputed father. I therefore ask the members of the House to vote the amendment down and to proceed with the bill.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. WAGNER and RICHARDSON as were as follows:

YEAS—88

Anderson, J. H.	Geesey	Manmiller	Seltzer
Beren	Gillette	McClatchy	Shelhamer
Bittle	Grieco	McCue	Shuman
Brandt	Gring	McGinnis	Sirianni
Burns	Halverson	Mebus	Smith, E.
Butera	Hamilton, J. H.	Miller, M. E.	Smith, L.
Cessar	Haskell	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Spencer
Cimini	Hayes, S. E.	Milliron	Taddonio
Cumberland	Hepford	Moehlmann	Thomas
Davies	Hill	Noye	Turner
Davis, D. M.	Hopkins	O'Connell	Ustynoski
Deverter	Hutchinson, W.	Pancoast	Vroon
Dicarlo	Katz	Parker, H. S.	Wagner
Dietz	Kistler	Perri	Weidner
Dorr	Klingaman	Pitts	Westerberg
Dreibelbis	Knepper	Polite	Whittlesey
Fawcett	Kowalyszyn	Pyles	Wilson
Fischer	Kusse	Renninger	Wilt, R. W.
Foster, A.	Lehr	Ryan	Wilt, W. W.
Foster, W.	Levi	Salvatore	Worriow
Fryer	Lincoln	Scheaffer	Wright
Gallen	Lynch	Scirica	Zeller

NAYS—100

Abraham	George	Miscevich	Ruggiero
Arthurs	Giammarco	Morris	Saloom
Barber	Gillespie	Mrkonje	Schmitt
Bellomint	Gleeson	Mullen, M. P.	Schweder
Bennett	Goodman	Mullen	Shane
Berlin	Green	Musto	Shelton
Berson	Greenfield	Myers	Shupnik
Bonetto	Hayes, D. S.	Novak	Stapleton
Bradley	Hutchinson, A.	O'Donnell	Stout
Brunner	Irvis	O'Keefe	Sweeney
Caputo	Itkin	Oliver	Taylor
Cole	Johnson, J.	Perry	Tayoun
Cowell	Kelly, A. P.	Petrarca	Toll
Crawford	Kernick	Pievsky	Trello
DeMedio	Kolter	Pratt	Vann
DiDonato	LaMarca	Prendergast	Walsh, T. P.
Dombrowski	Laudadio	Rappaport	Wansacz
Doyle	Laughlin	Reed	Wargo
Eckensberger	Lederer	Renwick	Wojdak
Englebart	Letterman	Rhodes	Yahner
Fee	Manderino	Richardson	Yohn
Fisher	McCall	Rieger	Zwinkl
Flaherty	McGraw	Ritter	
Gallagher	McIntyre	Romanelli	Fineman,
Garzia	McLane	Ross	Speaker
Geister	Menhorn		

NOT VOTING—15

Blackwell	Hammock	O'Brien	Whelan
Cohen	Hasay	Stahl	Zearfoss
Dininni	Kelly, J. B.	Sullivan	Zord
Gleason	Milanovich	Valicenti	

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

On the question recurring,  
Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?  
Mr. HEPFORD requested and obtained unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which was read:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1), page 2, line 12, by removing the semicolon after "father" and inserting: provided the issue is presented to the court within two years of the birth of the child or within two years of the reputed father contributing to the support of the child;

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dauphin, Mr. Hepford.

Mr. HEPFORD. Mr. Speaker, in reading the bill on page 2, section (2), the statement appears—and which would become law in Pennsylvania if you passed this bill—that "The paternity may be determined by law during the lifetime of the reputed father." There is no offense nor charge in Pennsylvania that would have a similar statute of limitations, except the crime of murder which has none. Even a bank robber after 6 years is free, or 7.

Now if you are going to have the law determine paternity, then I think the time limit within which—and you must realize this bill relates only to paternal inheritance, has nothing to do with other or maternal, but as you find on line 4, paternal inheritance of the child. If you are going to have the law determine that paternal issue, then the same statute of limitations should apply that applies in the law now with respect to paternity suits; that is, that the suit must be instituted within 2 years of the birth of the child or within 2 years from a payment made by the reputed father. I think this is a reasonable request, and even with this amendment in the bill, I will have some comment on the bill when the bill comes before the House for final passage.

I urge you to support this amendment so that you would not have the entire lifetime of the father. This amendment would have no effect if the father consents. All he needs to do is not oppose it, or make a contribution for the child's support, and that will resolve the statute. He can do it when he is 91 years old, if he is so inclined.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment.

On the question recurring,  
Will the House agree to the amendment?  
Amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Richardson, rise?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, are there any more amendments on this bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not advised that there are any more amendments.

The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, I do have an amendment here from Mr. McCue, I thought.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was not advised of any amendments by the gentleman. Apparently he has none. The amendments have been withdrawn.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill as amended on third consideration?

Bill as amended was agreed to.

Ordered, that the bill as amended be prepared for final passage.

### QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VALICENTI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be recorded as voting in the affirmative on the following:

Cowell amendment No. 1 to House bill No. 3;

Cowell amendment No. 2 to House bill No. 3;

Wagner amendment to House bill No. 3;

House bill No. 26;

House bill No. 37;

House resolution No. 47;

House bill No. 141;

House bill No. 142;

House bill No. 387;

House bill No. 470;

House bill No. 496;

House bill No. 503;

House bill No. 594; and

House bill No. 671.

I wish to be recorded in the negative on the following:

Miller amendment to House bill No. 3;

House bill No. 572;

House bill No. 722;

House bill No. 796;

Renninger amendment to Senate bill No. 30; and

Senate bill No. 30.

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

### ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, I have an announcement.

Mrs. Fawcett has passed along two amendments to a bill which appears on the calendar but does not appear to be amended. That bill is House bill No. 608.

I would suggest to the House, Mr. Speaker, that we consider the amendments to be offered by the lady today. In the event that they are adopted, that will permit us to run House bill No. 608 tomorrow on schedule.

### HEALTH BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of **House bill No. 608, printer's No. 810**, entitled:

An Act requiring advice of the need of a cytology

(Papanicolaou) test for uterine cancer detection to any woman receiving hospital care for the purpose of detecting uterine cancer early and reducing the morbidity and mortality therefrom.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

### HOUSE BILL No. 608 RECOMMITTED

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

Mr. DiCARLO. Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression from the prime sponsor of this legislation and the chairman of the Health and Welfare Committee that she would like to move to recommit this legislation back to the Committee on Health and Welfare. I would like to entertain that motion at this time.

The SPEAKER. There is a motion before the House to recommit House bill No. 608, printer's No. 810, to the Committee on Health and Welfare.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

### STATEMENT BY MAJORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, several things have gone wrong in the session today and I will not list all of them. But I would take it as a courtesy in the future, if the members have amendments which they expect us to consider, that they let me know in advance of the scheduling of the House. This business of running up to me on the floor of the House with amendments will have to stop if we are going to have an orderly procession for this House.

I would likewise take it as a courtesy if motions are to be made from this floor for recommitment, that I be advised prior to the motion so that I may mark the agenda of this House correctly.

I apologize to the members for the fact that we have been hopping back and forth on this agenda, but I apologize for those members who have caused us to be hopping back and forth. We would not have done so had we followed the agenda as listed.

I would hope that in future sessions we will settle down to following the agenda as printed, without all the changes being made at the last minute. If we do not do that, we will have destroyed our newer system and we will have destroyed the orderly processes of the House.

I anticipate, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow that it will be a brief session. There will be votes; we cannot vote them this afternoon because some bills have just been moved to third consideration and others have been amended.

But I would ask that if there be any other amendments to be offered to any bill on this calendar tomorrow, that that amendment be filed with me today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dauphin, Mr. Hepford.

Mr. HEPFORD. Mr. Speaker, I might also ask the majority leader with respect to the distribution of

amendments: My amendments were delivered, and the difficulty seems to be that during the week that we are in for roll calls, they distribute amendments on the desks and then they disappear and the members do not have them. Could we request that amendments for distribution, when presented to the clerk, be held until the week that we are in voting session?

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, I intend to have a few comments in private with those people who have the responsibility for distribution on the floor of this House. I do not want to put that into the record as what I intend to say to them.

Mr. HEPFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### MOTION TO REFER REORGANIZATION PLANS

Mr. HEPFORD. Mr. Speaker, on another subject: I raised earlier the question of whether or not a fiscal note was needed in connection with the reorganization plans as submitted by the Governor which now appear on the calendar.

If I am in order, I would like to make a motion with respect to Reorganization Plan No. 1, which on its face reads that the function of the Department of Revenue with regard to litigation of taxation matters as now exercised by the Tax Litigation Unit of the Department of Revenue shall be transferred to the Department of Justice. The second section refers to all funds, personnel, and other records.

I respectfully move that this plan be referred to the Committee on Appropriations for a fiscal note with respect to Reorganization Plan No. 1, and I also would suggest this with respect to Reorganization Plan No. 2, so that the members of the House may have that information while the plans remain on the calendar for the required number of days for action.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman withdraw his motion for today? We are going to be in session tomorrow. We have not had an opportunity to study the substance of his motion, and I would appreciate it if you would delay your motion until tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HEPFORD. No objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. IRVIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. HEPFORD. I withdraw the motion.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Before the Chair reads this announcement, the Chair would ask the members who have guests coming to the House and who are submitting slips of paper to the Speaker to advise him about the guests and requesting the Speaker to announce their presence, that instead of writing, they print the name of the guest. It is virtually impossible for the Speaker to read much of the information that is placed upon his desk. As a consequence, we do a disservice to the guests by mispronouncing their names. I am not sure I will pronounce it right anyway even if you write it legibly, but I have more of a shot at doing it if you print it than if you write it.

### RURAL VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL WELCOMED

The SPEAKER. With that background, I welcome the Rural Valley Borough Council members—Grant Davidson, Lou Labino and John McConnell.

They are here as the guests of the gentleman from Armstrong, Mr. McCue.

### ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Speaker also wants to make an announcement on behalf of Mr. Weidner. A large file folder marked plainly "amendments" was delivered to a sergeant at arms for delivery to Mr. Weidner. Apparently Mr. Weidner never got the file. If anyone has received this folder in error, will you please make sure—after you have examined it carefully—that you have got it delivered over to Mr. Weidner?

### QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DORR. Mr. Speaker, had I been in my seat this morning for the first vote on Senate bill No. 30, I would have voted in the affirmative, and on the first Cowell amendment to House bill No. 3 I would have voted in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's remarks will be noted for the record.

### REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Mr. YOHN. Mr. Speaker, I would like unanimous consent to submit these remarks for the record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send the remarks to the desk.

Mr. YOHN presented the following remarks for the Legislative Journal:

Mr. Speaker, the new scheduling system under which we have been working this year contains some good features and some bad features. Certainly, the work which this House produced during the week of March 17, 1975, when we held uninterrupted floor sessions was a credit to this body.

However, there is one feature of the new system which has met with almost universal criticism. That, Mr. Speaker, is the requirement for master roll calls on those days when the House is only in token session and various committee meetings are scheduled. Initially, the master roll call takes at least one-half hour of every member's time merely to record his presence in Harrisburg, when, in fact, that presence has already been noted in the committee meetings, and the record of attendance in the committee meetings is thereafter set forth in the House Journal.

Secondly, if the member does not happen to have a committee meeting at the exact time of the master roll call, it means that the member will waste an even greater amount of time by having to wait from the time of the

master roll call to the time of his committee meeting, or he will miss the master roll call and thus appear to outsiders not to have been in attendance in Harrisburg.

I found myself in that situation, Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1975, when the only committee meeting I had was scheduled for 3:30 p.m. whereas the master roll call was at 9:30 a.m. It was easy for me to decide that I could much better serve my constituents doing other things prior to the 3:30 meeting rather than coming to Harrisburg at 9:30 in the morning merely to record my presence.

Similarly, on February 17, 1975, and February 24, 1975, I had no committee meetings scheduled at all during the day. For that reason I did not come to Harrisburg since there were many other legislative duties which I could attend to at home without wasting the time in driving back and forth each day, which would have taken approximately 3 hours each time. Again, however, although this was much more efficient and I better served my constituents, it does reflect on the members' attendance records.

I make these remarks, Mr. Speaker, so that perhaps the system can be improved. The addition of the second master roll call later in the day has helped to achieve that purpose, although I am still unclear why it is necessary to record attendance on the House floor when the committee chairmen are doing so at their meetings. My second purpose for entering these remarks is, of course, to explain to any constituents the reason for the number of absences which I have had on these and other days since I have always endeavored to be in attendance at almost each and every House session.

Thank you for the opportunity to make these remarks, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that they will be productive in improving the present system.

#### QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, two quick points: First, on House bill No. 496, had I been able to vote on that, I would have been voting in the negative. I would like that spread upon the record.

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 Dauphin, Mr. Reed.

Mr. REED. One other item: I am introducing today—and make mention for other members in the event that they wish to join myself and some of my colleagues in cosponsorship—legislation to enact, if passed, a very short three-section code of ethics for the Public Utility Commission.

You will recall that 2 months ago the Public Utility Commission, by a vote of three negatives and two affirmatives, refused to adopt a code of ethics that would have required an annual submission to the secretary of the PUC of the income of the members of the commission as well as the top appointed staff as well as a listing of their assets and the value of those assets, as well as a requirement that no member of the commission nor its top appointed staff would participate in any matter in which they have any financial or other interest. Such a code of ethics would take effect immediately.

It is a very short bill, Mr. Speaker. If any members are interested in cosponsoring the same, I have it here for submission later today.

Thank you.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MRKONIC moved that this House do now adjourn until Wednesday, April 16, 1975, at 9:30 a.m., e.d.t.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and (at 12:01 p.m., e.d.t.) the House adjourned.