

Legislative Journal

THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 1975

Session of 1975

159th of the General Assembly

Vol. 1, No. 49

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:

Gracious Father, we draw near to Thee at the beginning of this day's labor as we invoke Thy blessing upon the deliberations of this hour. We humbly pray that Thou wilt quicken the spirit of these workmen of Thine, so that Thou mayest work in and through them to the honor and glory of Thy precious name. We beseech Thee to fill these stewards of Thine with the abundance of Thy love, so that they may carry Thy truth out into the daily stream of life's associations. We seek the benefit of Thy counsel and direction in the affairs which come before these legislators, so that all may be done to the complete satisfaction of Thy will and way. Amen.

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, approval of the Journal for Wednesday, June 11, 1975, will be postponed until printed.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority whip.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, I request leave of absence for Mr. RAPPAPORT for today's session.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I request leave of absence for Mr. GRING for today's session.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, leaves are granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. The Chair is about to take today's master roll call. Only those members in their seats are permitted to be recorded.

Members will proceed to vote.

The roll was taken and was as follows:

YEAS—193

Abraham	George	McIntyre	Scriva
Anderson, J. H.	Giammarco	McLane	Seltzer
Arthurs	Gillespie	Mebus	Snane
Barber	Gillette	Menhorn	Shelhamer

Bellomini	Gleason	Milanovich	Shelton
Bennett	Goodman	Miller, M. E.	Shuman
Beren	Green	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Shupnik
Berlin	Greenfield	Milliron	Sirianni
Berson	Grieco	Miscevich	Smith, E.
Bittle	Halverson	Moehlmann	Smith, L.
Blackwell	Hamilton, J. H.	Morris	Spencer
Bonetto	Hammock	Mrkonic	Stahl
Bradley	Hasay	Mullen	Stapleton
Brandt	Haskell	Mullen, M. P.	Stout
Brunner	Hayes, D. S.	Musto	Sullivan
Burns	Hayes, S. E.	Myers	Taddonio
Butera	Hepford	Novak	Taylor
Cessar	Hill	Noye	Tayoun
Cimini	Hopkins	O'Brien	Toll
Cohen	Hutchinson, A.	O'Connell	Trelio
Cole	Hutchinson, W.	O'Donnell	Turner
Cowell	Irvis	O'Keefe	Ustynoski
Crawford	Itkin	Oliver	Valicenti
Cumberland	Johnson, J.	Pancoast	Vann
Davies	Katz	Parker, H. S.	Vroon
Davis, D. M.	Kelly, A. P.	Perri	Wagner
DeMedio	Kelly, J. B.	Perry	Walsh, T. P.
Deverter	Kernick	Petrarca	Wansacz
Dicarlo	Kistler	Pievscky	Wargo
DiDonato	Klingaman	Pitts	Weidner
Dietz	Knepper	Polite	Westerberg
Dombrowski	Kolter	Pratt	Whelan
Dorr	Kowalyszyn	Prendergast	Whittlesey
Doyle	Kusse	Pyles	Wilson
Dreibelbis	LaMarca	Reed	Wilt, R. W.
Eckensberger	Laughlin	Renninger	Wilt, W. W.
Englehart	Lederer	Renwick	Wojdak
Fee	Lehr	Richardson	Worrilow
Fischer	Letterman	Rieger	Wright
Fisher	Levi	Ritter	Yahner
Flaherty	Lincoln	Romanelli	Yohn
Foster, A.	Lynch	Ross	Zearfoss
Foster, W.	Manderino	Ruggiero	Zeller
Fryer	Manmiller	Ryan	Zord
Gallagher	McCall	Saloom	Zwilk
Gallen	McClatchy	Salvatore	
Garzia	McCue	Scheaffer	
Geesey	McGinnis	Schmitt	Fineman,
Geisler	McGraw	Schweder	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—10

Caputo	Gleeson	Rappaport	Sweeney
Dininni	Gring	Rhodes	Thomas
Fawcett	Laudadio		

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

BILLS REFERRED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair will refer bills at this time.

The Chair hears no objection.

The Speaker refers the following bills which the clerk will read:

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

By Messrs. TAYOUN, JOHNSON, GIAMMARCO, VANN, MYERS, COHEN, LEDERER and ROSS

HOUSE BILL No. 1442

An Act amending the "Liquor Code," approved April 12, 1951 (P. L. 90, No. 21), providing for additional appellants from certain actions of the board, and making an editorial correction.

Referred to Committee on Liquor Control.

By Messrs. BARBER, RICHARDSON, VANN and OLIVER
HOUSE BILL No. 1443

An Act amending the "Public Welfare Code," approved June 13, 1967 (P. L. 31, No. 21), further regulating the availability of information.

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare.

By Messrs. BARBER, RICHARDSON, VANN and OLIVER
HOUSE BILL No. 1444

An Act amending the "Public Welfare Code," approved June 13, 1967 (P. L. 31, No. 21), providing for rent security deposits for recipients.

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare.

By Messrs. BARBER, RICHARDSON, VANN and OLIVER
HOUSE BILL No. 1445

An Act amending the "Public Welfare Code," approved June 13, 1967 (P. L. 31, No. 21), further providing for time in which benefits are to be paid and establishing requirements for a hearing.

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare.

By Messrs. BARBER, RICHARDSON, OLIVER and ROSS
HOUSE BILL No. 1446

An Act amending "The Support Law," approved June 24, 1937 (P. L. 2045, No. 397), providing that no lien shall be imposed against the property of persons receiving assistance and exempting certain monetary recoveries.

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare.

By Messrs. BARBER, RICHARDSON, OLIVER, VANN and ROSS
HOUSE BILL No. 1447

An Act amending the "Public Welfare Code," approved June 13, 1967 (P. L. 31, No. 21), further regulating eligibility requirements.

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare.

By Messrs. BARBER, RICHARDSON, OLIVER, VANN and ROSS
HOUSE BILL No. 1448

An Act amending "The Support Law," approved June 24, 1937 (P. L. 2045, No. 397), further providing for relatives responsible for support and providing for adjustments in amount.

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare.

By Messrs. BARBER, RICHARDSON, VANN, OLIVER and ROSS
HOUSE BILL No. 1449

An Act amending the "Public Welfare Code," approved June 13, 1967 (P. L. 31, No. 21), providing an employment priority program.

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare.

By Messrs. BARBER, RICHARDSON, VANN, ROSS and OLIVER
HOUSE BILL No. 1450

An Act amending the "Public Welfare Code," approved June 13, 1967 (P. L. 31, No. 21), establishing assistance standards.

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare.

By Messrs. BARBER, RICHARDSON, OLIVER, VANN and ROSS
HOUSE BILL No. 1451

An Act amending the "Public Welfare Code," approved June 13, 1967 (P. L. 31, No. 21), regulating utility deposits and providing a penalty.

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare.

By Messrs. BARBER, RICHARDSON, VANN, ROSS and OLIVER
HOUSE BILL No. 1452

An Act amending the "Public Welfare Code," approved June 13, 1967 (P. L. 31, No. 21), requiring the department to make known the programs available.

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare.

By Messrs. BARBER, RICHARDSON, VANN and ROSS
HOUSE BILL No. 1453

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

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare.

By Messrs. FINEMAN, BUTERA, BERSON, WOJDAK, RAPPAPORT and BONETTO
HOUSE BILL No. 1454

An Act relating to the abandonment of railroad rights-of-way; establishing criteria to determine abandonment; defining terms; granting certain options to the Commonwealth and its political subdivisions; providing for the devolution of land involved in abandoned railroad rights-of-way; establishing certain rights for adjacent landowners; making repeals and providing for prospective application.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

By Messrs. RENWICK, LETTERMAN and GEORGE
HOUSE BILL No. 1455

An Act amending "The County Code," approved August 9, 1955 (P. L. 323, No. 130), further providing for aid to fire fighting departments and companies.

Referred to Committee on Local Government.

By Messrs. RENWICK, LETTERMAN, GEORGE, SHELHAMER and NOYE
HOUSE BILL No. 1456

An Act amending the "Second Class County Code," approved July 28, 1953 (P. L. 723, No. 230), authorizing certain aid to fire fighting departments and companies.

Referred to Committee on Local Government.

By Messrs. RENWICK, LAUDADIO and LETTERMAN
HOUSE BILL No. 1457

An Act amending the "Surface Mining Conservation and Reclamation Act," approved May 31, 1945 (P. L. 1198, No. 418), imposing a tax on the severance of minerals by the method of surface mining.

Referred to Committee on Mines and Energy Management.

By Messrs. REED, SCHWEDER, GEORGE, TAYOUN, PRATT, MILLIRON, BERLIN and KOWALYSHYN
HOUSE BILL No. 1458

An Act amending the "Elevator Regulation Law," approved May 2, 1929 (P. L. 1518, No. 452), changing certificate of operation and inspection fees for certain elevators.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

By Messrs. REED, ECKENSBERGER and PRATT
HOUSE BILL No. 1459

An Act requiring the protection of certain firearms from theft by the use of an alarm or detection system.

Referred to Committee on Law and Justice.

By Messrs. RENWICK, LETTERMAN, NOYE,
HALVERSON and McCLATCHY

HOUSE BILL No. 1460

An Act granting certain authority to the Pennsylvania Fish Commission.

Referred to Committee on Game and Fisheries.

By Messrs. RENWICK, NOYE, PITTS, KLINGAMAN,
E. H. SMITH and McCLATCHY

HOUSE BILL No. 1461

An Act amending "The Game Law," approved June 3, 1937 (P. L. 1225, No. 316), increasing the fees for replacement hunting licenses and providing penalty for giving false statement.

Referred to Committee on Game and Fisheries.

By Messrs. RENWICK, LETTERMAN, HALVERSON,
NOYE, KLINGAMAN, E. H. SMITH and
McCLATCHY

HOUSE BILL No. 1462

An Act repealing the act of October 25, 1967 (P. L. 478, No. 227), entitled "An act relating to maximum capacity of certain vessels and boats; providing for capacity plates; prescribing powers and duties of the Pennsylvania Fish Commission and prescribing penalties.

Referred to Committee on Game and Fisheries.

By Messrs. RENWICK, LETTERMAN, HALVERSON,
NOYE, KLINGAMAN, PITTS, E. H. SMITH and
McCLATCHY

HOUSE BILL No. 1463

An Act repealing the act of April 24, 1929 (P. L. 653, No. 279), entitled "An act regulating the operation of certain boats upon lakes wholly within the Commonwealth, by requiring the use of lights on all boats at certain hours."

Referred to Committee on Transportation.

By Mr. BRUNNER

HOUSE BILL No. 1464

An Act amending the act of June 1, 1933 (P. L. 1172, No. 290), entitled "An act establishing certain streets in boroughs and incorporated towns as State highways, and providing for their construction and maintenance at the expense of the Commonwealth," deleting a route in Hookstown Borough, Beaver County.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

By Mr. BRUNNER

HOUSE BILL No. 1465

An Act amending the act of June 22, 1931 (P. L. 594, No. 203), entitled "An act establishing certain township roads as State highways; * * * deleting Route 04052 in Beaver County.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

By Messrs. YAHNER, W. W. WILT and HASKELL

HOUSE BILL No. 1466

An Act amending "The Administrative Code of 1929," approved April 9, 1929 (P. L. 177, No. 175), providing for certification of certain laboratories.

Referred to Committee on Conservation.

SENATE MESSAGE

BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SENATE BILL No. 1

An Act providing for the regulation of land and water use for flood control purposes, imposing duties and conferring powers on the Department of Environmental Resources, the Environmental Quality Board, the Department of Community Affairs, municipalities and counties, providing for enforcement and penalties, and making an appropriation.

Referred to Committee on Conservation.

SENATE BILL No. 269

An Act amending the act of June 11, 1968 (P. L. 149, No. 84), entitled "Volunteer Firemen's Relief Association Act," providing for coverage to paid firemen when acting as volunteer firemen during off-duty hours.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

SENATE BILL No. 505

An Act amending the act of May 3, 1933 (P. L. 242, No. 86), entitled, as amended, "Beauty Culture Law," providing for changes in examination times and increasing certain registration fees.

Referred to Committee on Professional Licensure.

CITATIONS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, and for the benefit of the members, the House at this time will take citations.

The Chair hears no objection.

The Chair recognizes the lady, Mrs. Kernick, who reports the following citations, which the clerk will read:

**REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON
LEGISLATIVE CITATIONS**

Mrs. KERNICK, chairperson of Select Committee on Legislative Citations, presented without objection, the following citations, which were read, considered and adopted:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Earl Root celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by one daughter, four grandchildren, and one great-grandchild. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Root, nee Anna Bicer, and Mr. Root were married April 11, 1925 in Pottstown by the late Reverend Irvin Kurtz.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Earl Root on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Earl Root, 415 Bridge Street, Spring City, Pennsylvania 19475.

G. SIEBER PANCOAST

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. C. Merrill Buckman celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by two children, seven grandchildren, and one great-grandchild. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. The couple was married March 10, 1925 in Hatboro.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes

and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. C. Merrill Buckman on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. C. Merrill Buckman, Salfordville Road, Schwenksville, Pennsylvania 19473.

G. SIEBER PANCOAST

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Donald Kohler, sixteen, has earned the Eagle award in Scouting. This is the highest award that Boy Scouts can bestow and as such represents great sacrifice and tremendous effort on the part of this young man. His Eagle project was making a one-half mile gravel path behind the cemetery at St. Mary Church. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Kohler of Allison Park, and is a member of Troop 169. Donald is a sophomore at Shaler Area High School where he is an honor student. In addition to the Eagle Award, he has also earned the Ad Altare Dei and the Order of the Arrow.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Donald Kohler on the occasion of his being honored with the Eagle Scout Award, commends him on the outstanding work he has done to earn this coveted honor, and wishes him continued success in the future;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Donald Kohler, 2516 College Park Road, Allison Park, Pennsylvania 15101.

RICHARD J. CESSAR

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mrs. Bessie Sosnowski of Erie celebrated her one hundredth birthday in May, 1975; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Sosnowski, who is an outstanding citizen representing the finest in American life, has been a devoted mother, grandmother, great-grandmother and great-great-grandmother, and has been active in her community for many years.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania heartily congratulates Mrs. Bessie Sosnowski of Erie on the occasion of her one hundredth birthday and wishes her the best of health and further appreciation from all who have come to know and therefore respect her;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mrs. Bessie Sosnowski, 222 East 25th Street, Erie, Pennsylvania 16503.

DAVID S. HAYES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Dr. Ben L. Agresti, D.O., won the Distinguished Service Award of the Pennsylvania Osteopathic Medical Association; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Ben L. Agresti, elected president of the American Association of Osteopathic Examiners, has served as chairman of the Pennsylvania State Board of Osteopathic Examiners.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Dr. Ben L. Agresti, D.O., as recipient of the Distinguished Service Award and commends him for his dedicated leadership and service to his community, State and profession, and wishes him continued success in his future endeavors;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Dr. Ben L. Agresti, D.O., 2905 Greengarden Boulevard, Erie, Pennsylvania 16508.

DAVID S. HAYES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Edmund L. Thomas was the winner of the Erie County Bar Association's Liberty Bell Award; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Thomas is an individual who has given community service in order to strengthen the effectiveness of the American system of freedom under the law.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pauses in its deliberations to congratulate Edmund L. Thomas on his outstanding community service record, and wishes him continued success in his future endeavors;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Edmund L. Thomas, 3847 Eliot Road, Erie Pennsylvania 16508.

DAVID S. HAYES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, The Eddystone Fire Company No. 1 of Eddystone, Pennsylvania, is celebrating its seventy-fifth anniversary; and

WHEREAS, The Eddystone Fire Company No. 1, has faithfully and diligently served the surrounding community.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Eddystone Fire Company No. 1 on reaching a milestone in community service and commends the company for their dedication and devotion to Eddystone;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Eddystone Fire Company No. 1, Eddystone Pennsylvania 19013.

PETER J. O'KEEFE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Elmer W. Berg celebrated their fifty-fifth wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by four children, seven grandchildren, and one great-grandchild. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Berg, nee Mary Keim, and Mr. Berg were married May 8, 1920 in Reading.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Elmer W. Berg on their fifty-fifth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Elmer W. Berg, R. D. 3, College Hill, Kutztown, Pennsylvania 19530.

JOHN S. DAVIES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Charles C. Stricker celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by nine children, and twenty-two grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Stricker, nee Mabe C. Noecker, and Mr. Stricker were married May 9, 1925 by Reverend J. Kershner at Reading.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Charles C. Stricker on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Charles C. Stricker, R. D. 1 Mohrsville, Pennsylvania 19541.

JOHN S. DAVIES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Reverend and Mrs. Edwin L. Thomas celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. Their

happy union has been blessed by five children, seventeen grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Thomas, nee Buchhofer, and Mr. Thomas were married April 15, 1925 by Reverend Hyde.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Reverend and Mrs. Edwin L. Thomas on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Reverend and Mrs. Edwin L. Thomas, 1169 Lowell Avenue, Andalusia, Pennsylvania 19020.

EDWARD F. BURNS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Reverend and Mrs. Darcy Lloyd Abbott celebrated their silver wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by five children. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Abbott, nee Doris Ola Jewell, and Mr. Abbott were married May 16, 1950 by Reverend C. J. Abbott, father of the groom, at Seaford, Delaware.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Reverend and Mrs. Darcy Lloyd Abbott on their twenty-fifth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Reverend and Mrs. Darcy Lloyd Abbott, R. D. 2, Waynesburg, Pennsylvania 15370.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Slagle celebrated their sixtieth wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by four children, thirteen grandchildren, and seven great-grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Slagle, nee Ethel Brand, and Mr. Slagle were married June 5, 1915 by Reverend Clarence Moore.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Slagle on their sixtieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Slagle, R. D. 1, Fredericktown, Pennsylvania 15333.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. A. Warren Plymire celebrated their silver wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by two children. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Plymire, nee Barbara Primm and Mr. Plymire were married June 3, 1950 by Reverend Martin Hughes in the immaculate Conception Church.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. A. Warren Plymire on their twenty-fifth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. A. Warren Plymire, 750 Sara Drive, Washington, Pennsylvania 15301.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. John F. Gruden celebrated their silver wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by four children. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. The couple was married May 13, 1950 in Our Lady of the Miraculous Medal Church.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. John F. Gruden on their twenty-fifth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. John F. Gruden, Meadow Lands, Pennsylvania 15347.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Whipkey celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by one daughter, two grandchildren, and one great-grandson. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Whipkey, nee Naomi McClellan, and Mr. Whipkey were married May 13, 1925 by Reverend C. A. Parson in the McClellan home.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Paul Whipkey on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Paul Whipkey, R. D., Wind Ridge, Pennsylvania 15380.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph H. Miller, Sr., celebrated their fifty-fifth wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by six children, fourteen grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Miller, nee Yorty, and Mr. Miller were married April 14, 1920, by Reverend Cuthbert in the First Methodist Church parsonage.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Joseph H. Miller, Sr., on their fifty-fifth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Joseph H. Miller, Sr., R. D. 1, Scenery Hill, Pennsylvania 15360.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Stewart G. Dever celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by one daughter, one granddaughter, and one great-grandson. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Dever, nee Chestnut, and Mr. Dever were married May 6, 1925 by Reverend Herman L. Cathey at Petersburg, West Virginia.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Stewart G. Dever

on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Stewart G. Dever, R. D. 4, Waynesburg, Pennsylvania 15370.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Fred G. Postlethwait celebrated their fifty-eighth wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by four children, seven grandchildren, and seven great-grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Postlethwait, nee Hazel Moore, and Mr. Postlethwait were married May 26, 1917 in the home of the late Reverend White.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Fred G. Postlethwait on their fifty-eighth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Fred G. Postlethwait, R. D. 6, Washington, Pennsylvania 15301.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. George M. Crockett celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Crockett, nee Byrdie McCurdy, and Mr. Crockett were married May 7, 1925 by Reverend Roy A. Smith in the Methodist Episcopal Church of Uniontown.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. George M. Crockett on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. George M. Crockett, 41 Shannon Avenue, Washington, Pennsylvania 15301.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Carl celebrated their silver wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by three children. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Harry Carl on their twenty-fifth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Harry Carl, R. D. 1, Avella, Pennsylvania 15312.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph E. Martin celebrated their silver wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by three children and one grandson. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Martin, nee Peggy Lou Simmons, and Mr. Martin were married May 30, 1950, by Reverend

Lew F. Johnson in Washington Street United Methodist parsonage.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Ralph E. Martin on their twenty-fifth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Ralph E. Martin, R. D. 1, Waynesburg, Pennsylvania 15370.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. James A. Grimm celebrated their sixtieth wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by four children, five grandchildren, and five great-grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Grimm, nee Elizabeth Russell, and Mr. Grimm were married May 8, 1915, by Reverend Purcell in Washington.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. James A. Grimm on their sixtieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. James A. Grimm, R. D. 7, Washington, Pennsylvania 15301.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mrs. Fannie Jefferson was honored at a banquet in the Ramada Inn, Washington, Pennsylvania by Washington Lodge No. 77 F & A.M. PHA and Washington Chapter No. 88, Order of Eastern Star PHA; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Fannie Jefferson was the organizer and director of the Senior Citizens Center in 1968, organizer of the Senior Citizens Center in Donora and Monongahela, member of the National Council of Aging, the National Council of Senior Citizen Centers, National Caucus of Black Aged on Minorities, the Governor's Western Region Council on Aging and the Pennsylvania Association of Older Persons.

Now therefore, The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Mrs. Fannie Jefferson for her commemorative banquet and commends her for her diligent assistance and service dedicated to her fellowman;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mrs. Fannie Jefferson, R. D. 1, Eighty Four Pennsylvania 15330.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Norman W. Lyon, honored for his work in developing the Citizens Library and Cultural Center received the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters at the one hundred seventy-sixth Commencement of Washington & Jefferson College; and

WHEREAS, Norman W. Lyon, a graduate of Dickinson College with a master's degree from Columbia University, followed a career in teaching, writing, and in administrative positions, as well as a community and church leader. Named as head librarian of the Citizen Library in 1959, Mr. Lyon retired as Executive Director of Citizens Library and Cultural Center in 1973.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Norma W. Lyon as recipient of an honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters and commends him for his tireless efforts in organizing and promoting the local library;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Norman W. Lyon, 405 East Maiden Street, Washington, Pennsylvania 15301.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Donna Collett of Cross Creek was chosen Prom Queen at the Avella Junior-Senior Prom; and

WHEREAS, This honor was bestowed upon Miss Collett on May 17, 1975 at the school gymnasium which was the site of the prom.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Donna Collett on her being chosen Prom Queen at the Avella Junior-Senior Prom,

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Donna Collett, Cross Creek, Pennsylvania 15021.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Russell Scott celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by six children, twenty grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Scott, nee Mary Margaret Morris, and Mr. Scott were married May 21, 1925 by Reverend William S. Hamilton at New Cumberland, West Virginia.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Russell Scott on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Russell Scott, North Richhill Street, Waynesburg, Pennsylvania 15370.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Erie County Pomona Grange No. 4 will observe its centennial celebration June 18, 1975; and

WHEREAS, Erie County Pomona Grange was organized on June 15, 1875 and has contributed greatly to the heritage of the Patrons of Husbandry; and

WHEREAS, Erie County Pomona Grange has been influential in serving the needs of the community in providing and developing leadership with its subordinate granges, and individual members; and

WHEREAS, Its continuous leadership has been a vital force in the promotion of agriculture and agricultural products. Its role in community and county programs has been outstanding, recognizing the importance of the project to all people of the community.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Erie County Pomona Grange No. 4 on its one hundredth anniversary and wishes its members many more years of continued success in their role as a county organization in further promoting the purposes of the organization

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Willard Campbell, Master of Erie County Pomona Grange No. 4, R. D. 1, North East, Pennsylvania 16428.

DAVID C. DiCARLO

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Harry C. Beck of Cressona, will celebrate his ninety-first birthday on July 3, 1975; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Beck, who is an outstanding citizen representing the finest in American life, has served

faithfully as postmaster of Cressona from May 18, 1935, to August 1, 1954. He is now retired but has been active in the community throughout his many years.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania heartily congratulates Harry C. Beck of Cressona on the occasion of his ninety-first birthday and wishes him the best of health and further appreciation from all who have come to know and therefore respect him;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Harry C. Beck, 23 North Sillyman Street, Cressona, Pennsylvania 17929.

WILLIAM D. HUTCHINSON

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. John Novich celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by one daughter and three grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. The couple was married May 11, 1925 in St. Stanislaus Roman Catholic Church.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. John Novich on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. John Novich, 654 Sixth Street, Whitehall, Pennsylvania 18052.

WILLIAM H. ECKENSBERGER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Miss Helen Maust of Berlin was named Somerset County Soil and Water Conservation Queen. Miss Maust, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Tom Maust, is a senior at Berlin Brothers Valley School. She is involved in many school and community activities, among these are: the 4-H County Council, the Ski Club, the Youth Education Association, the National Honor Society, Girls Athletic Association and Treasurer of the Student Council. During the competition, Miss Maust demonstrated the grace, charm and intelligence that led to her selection.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Miss Helen Maust on being named Somerset County Soil and Conservation Queen, and wishes her further success and happiness;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Miss Helen Maust, R. D. 3, Box 79, Berlin, Pennsylvania 15530.

KENNETH S. HALVERSON

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Miss Edith Perkins was presented with the first "Outstanding Woman Award" presented by the West Chester Business and Professional Women's Club; and

WHEREAS, The selection was made on the basis of giving of one's self and continual services to others without recognition; and

WHEREAS, Miss Perkins is a certified braille transcriber who serves the Pennsylvania Association for the Blind.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Miss Edith Perkins and commends her for the many years of unselfish and devoted service she has given to the blind, and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Miss Edith Perkins, West Chester, Pennsylvania 19380.

PATRICIA A. CRAWFORD

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Doctor E. D. Shacklett, M.D. is the Director of the Veteran's Administrative Hospital, Coatesville, Pennsylvania; and

WHEREAS, Doctor E. D. Shacklett has unhesitatingly devoted diligent service to Job Opportunity Day, to find jobs for veterans located in Chester and Lancaster Counties.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania commends Doctor Shacklett for his continued interest and assistance in this worthy program, and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Doctor E. D. Shacklett, Veteran's Administrative Hospital, Coatesville, Pennsylvania 19320.

SAMUEL W. MORRIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. Eugene J. Driscoll, Sr., Superintendent of City Parks and Public Property, retired recently after forty-five years of dedicated service to the City of Johnstown. Mr. Driscoll is a 1923 graduate of Johnstown High School. In May of 1930, he began working for the City of Johnstown as a laborer, he was named City gardener in 1939, assistant superintendent of the Department of City Parks and Public Property in 1946 and its superintendent in 1959; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Driscoll has long been active in Masonic affairs. He is a past grand tall cedar of the Allegheny Mountain Forest 127, Tall Cedars of Lebanon and president of the Officers and Past Officers Association of the Tall Cedars District 18. He is also a member of Cambria Lodge 278, F. & A.M. and Menoher Post 155, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Mr. Eugene J. Driscoll, Sr., on his retirement, commends him on his dedication and service and wishes him much enjoyment in his retirement; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. Eugene J. Driscoll, Sr., 606 Oak Street, Johnstown, Pennsylvania 15902.

PATRICK A. GLEASON

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, The "Thanks Badge," the highest award for an adult in girl scouting was bestowed upon Mrs. Ursula Harris on May 7, 1975; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Harris, leader of Cadette Troop 316, has devoted zealous energy to girl scouting. She marches in parades, decorates local store windows for Girl Scout Week, and goes on all camping trips with her troop.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania commends Mrs. Ursula Harris for her unselfish dedication and service to the community girl scouting programs and wishes her success in her future endeavors;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mrs. Ursula Harris, 408 Spring Street, Latrobe, Pennsylvania 15650.

JAMES O. WHELAN

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, William F. Schiffhauer, a senior at the University of Pittsburgh, served as President of the Student PSEA, the largest student professional association in the nation; and

WHEREAS, William F. Schiffhauer, appointed by Governor Milton J. Shapp to serve on the Professional Standards and Practices Commission, has dedicated mature, perceptive leadership as a responsible spokesman for young people preparing to teach.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates William F. Schiffhauer and commends him for his inspiring leadership as President of the Student PSEA;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to William F. Schiffhauer, 217 First Street, Aspinwall, Pennsylvania 15215.

RICHARD J. CESSAR

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin F. Weaver celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by four children, twelve grandchildren, and eight great-grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Weaver, nee Kurtz, and Mr. Weaver, were married May 13, 1925 by Reverend S. M. Wenrich of Saint James Lutheran Church.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin F. Weaver on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin F. Weaver, 647 East Market Street, Marietta, Pennsylvania 17547.

KENNETH E. BRANDT

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Brigadier General Edward M. Reilly passed away April 18, 1975. Active in the military as well as State government, General Reilly has served his country and fellowman with ardent dedication. This zealous patriot is survived by his wife, Susan, and a niece; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pauses in its deliberations to mourn the passing of Brigadier General Edward M. Reilly, and extends its heartfelt condolences to the wife and family of this outstanding gentleman; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be delivered to Mrs. Susan E. Reilly, 202 Leona Avenue, Huntingdon Valley, Pennsylvania 19006.

DANIEL E. BEREN
CHARLES F. MEBUS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. John Kerns celebrated their fifty-ninth wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by three daughters (two deceased), five grandchildren, and fifteen great-grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Kerns, nee Bosworth, and Mr. Kerns were married May 10, 1916 in Waynesburg.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. John Kerns on their fifty-ninth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. John Kerns, R. D. 3, Waynesburg, Pennsylvania 15370.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. J. Claude Maloy celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by two sons, four granddaughters and one great-granddaughter. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Maloy, nee Minnie Katherine Iams, and Mr. Maloy were married May 16, 1925 by Reverend Paul E. Blakney in Cumberland, Maryland.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. J. Claude Maloy on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. J. Claude Maloy, R. D. 7, Washington, Pennsylvania 15301.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, The Council of Churches of Greater Harrisburg has worked extensively in these last several years to extend the ministry of God to all peoples as well as to promote dialogue and closer communication and cooperation between all Christians and Jews; and

WHEREAS, In this last year, the Council's work has included co-sponsoring TELEGRAD, a five week series on Family Life, as well as developing a campus ministry at Harrisburg Area Community College. They have sponsored a Walk for the Hungry to raise funds to feed impoverished people and produced a weekly radio panel show, "Face the Issue." They have enlisted the use of trained volunteers for visitations to inmates at the Dauphin County Prison and initiated and have played a role in the Winter Crisis Response serving the poor and elderly. The Council has promoted the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity and supported Project Equality. It has scheduled worship services and Bible classes at seven institutions and maintained chaplains at three hospitals. It has co-sponsored seminars of the South Central Interreligious Council and represented Protestant, Anglican and Orthodox communions in relating to Roman Catholic and Jewish groups of the area.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pauses in its deliberations to convey to the Council of Churches of Greater Harrisburg its fervent hopes for continued work with appreciation and commendation for its achievements; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to the Council of Churches of Greater Harrisburg, 900 South Arlington Avenue, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17109.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Glenn Drees, fourteen, has earned the Eagle award in Scouting in ceremonies held May 28, 1975. This is the highest award that Boy Scouts can bestow and as such represents great sacrifice and tremendous effort on the part of this young man. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. R. Christopher Drees, of Harrisburg and is a member of Troop 8 of Keystone Area Council. Glenn is a student at Susquehanna High School.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, congratulates Glenn Drees on the occasion of his being honored with the Eagle Scout Award, commends him on the outstanding work he has done to earn this coveted honor, and wishes him continued success in the future; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Glenn Drees, 1513 Montfort Drive, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, William H. Manson received the Silver Beaver Award, bestowed upon him for his long standing Yeoman Service to Boyhood, by Allegheny Trails Council; and

WHEREAS, William H. Manson has diligently dedicated his tireless service as Cubmaster of Pack 400, Committee Chairman of Troop 337, and Assistant District Commissioner. A member of St. Joseph Catholic Church and Holy Name Society and Knights of Columbus Council 2555, Mr. Manson was honored in 1972 by the Pennsylvania Game Commission with the "Conservation and

Wildlife Award" in recognition of his keen interest in conservation.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates William H. Manson as recipient of the Silver Beaver Award and commends him for his devotion to scouting and community development;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to William H. Manson, 1356 Fourth Avenue, Coraopolis, Pennsylvania 15108.

FRED A. TRELLO

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Lester F. Baird celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by two children. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Baird, nee Margaret Newman, and Mr. Baird were married June 26, 1925 by Reverend Marshall C. Piper at the Methodist Church parsonage in Milesburg.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Lester F. Baird on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Lester F. Baird, Milesburg, Pennsylvania 16853.

RUSSELL P. LETTERMAN

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Harry E. Brower celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by three children, five grandchildren, and one great-grandchild. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Brower, nee Bender, and Mr. Brower were married April 25, 1925 by Reverend Charles Slinghoff at Tower City Reformed parsonage.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Harry E. Brower on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Harry E. Brower, Joliett, Pennsylvania 17981.

WILLIAM D. HUTCHINSON

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mitchell Birnbaum is celebrating his Bar Mitzvah June 14, 1975; and

WHEREAS, Mitchell Birnbaum, with his mother Gertrude, father Martin, and brothers Edward and Jack, joyously celebrated his attainment of manhood.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Mitchell Birnbaum in reaching a milestone in his life and extends its wishes for a prosperous and healthy life; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mitchell Birnbaum, 8809 Brous Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19152.

ALVIN KATZ

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. John Varhola celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by eight children, eighteen grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs.

Varhola, nee Gernat, and Mr. Varhola were married May 12, 1925 at St. Peter and Paul Byzantine Catholic Church.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. John Varhola on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. John Varhola, 207 East Eighth Avenue, Tarentum, Pennsylvania 15084.

HELEN D. GILLETTE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Polanosky celebrated their sixtieth wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by two children, nine grandchildren, and nine great-grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. The couple was married May 24, 1915.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Polanosky on their sixtieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Polanosky, 3984 Grand Avenue, Hampton, Pennsylvania 17330.

HELEN D. GILLETTE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Giel celebrated their sixty-fourth wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by fourteen children, (three deceased) fifty grandchildren, and ten great-grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Giel, nee Loretta Claus, and Mr. Giel were married May 3, 1911 at St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Robert Giel on their sixty-fourth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Robert Giel, 2632 Middle Road, Hampton, Pennsylvania.

HELEN D. GILLETTE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Stodolsky celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by two children and six grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. The couple was married April 25, 1925 in Madison.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Frank Stodolsky on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Frank Stodolsky, 119 Republic Avenue, Indianola, Pennsylvania 15051.

HELEN D. GILLETTE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Veiock celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by four children. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and ac-

quaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Veiock, nee Helen Burk, and Mr. Veiock were married April 23, 1925 at St. Peter Roman Catholic Church by Reverend Henry Duval.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Frank Veiock on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Frank Veiock, 1211 Arizona Avenue, Natrona Heights, Pennsylvania 15065.

HELEN D. GILLETTE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Joseph P. Baressi is retiring from coaching Little League Baseball in the City of Corry after twenty-three years of consecutive service; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Baressi started his Little League coaching career in 1951. In 1954, Mr. Baressi's team had the honor of competing at Williamsport. Though retired now, Mr. Baressi coaches basketball in the Parochial League in Corry.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania commends Joseph P. Baressi for his outstanding service to Little League Baseball in the City of Corry;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. Joseph P. Baressi, R. D. 2, Gamma Road, Corry, Pennsylvania 16407.

FOREST W. HOPKINS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mrs. Bertha Eberts of East Weissport has taught Sunday School for sixty years at the Jacobs United Church of Christ in Weissport. She was honored at a "This is Your Night" program and was presented with an orchid corsage by the church, a broach by the Sunday School and a rocking chair by the Rainbow Circle.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, commends Mrs. Bertha Eberts on her years of dedication and service to the Church and the community and extends their best wishes for her future happiness;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mrs. Bertha Eberts, East Weissport, Pennsylvania 18325.

THOMAS J. McCALL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Father Dennis L. Sullivan, T.O.R. of Fairless Hills is leaving Bishop Egan High School after serving as its principal for nine years. Father Sullivan has served his community well, and is a member of many fine organizations including the Executive Committee of the Boy Scouts of Bucks County, the Chaplain of the Monsignor Fenton Fitzpatrick Council of the Knights of Columbus, the Council of Priests in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, the Board of Governors of the Catholic League of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Board of Trustees of Saint Francis College, Loretto, and the Board of Directors of the Delaware Valley Philharmonic Orchestra.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Father Dennis L. Sullivan, T.O.R. on the occasion of his leaving Bishop Egan High School, commends him on his service and dedication to the school and community and wishes him continued success and happiness;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Father Dennis L. Sullivan, T.O.R., Bishop Egan High School, 611 Wistar Road, Fairless Hills, Pennsylvania 19030.

THEODORE BERLIN

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. James Zangaglia celebrated

their sixty-fifth wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by five children, nine grandchildren, and seventeen great-grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Zangaglia, nee Mary LaBarbera, and Mr. Zangaglia were married April 19, 1910 in Italy.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. James Zangaglia on their sixty-fifth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. James Zangaglia, 614 Oak Street, Johnstown, Pennsylvania 15902.

PATRICK A. GLEASON

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin Richard Barnes celebrated their sixtieth wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by three children, eleven grandchildren, and twenty-four great-grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Barnes, nee Anne Elizabeth Clark and Mr. Barnes were married May 17, 1915 in Cumberland, Maryland.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin Richard Barnes on their sixtieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin Richard Barnes, 535 Vickroy Avenue, Johnstown, Pennsylvania 15905.

PATRICK A. GLEASON

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Harry C. Vann celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by four children, eleven grandchildren, and eleven great-grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. The couple was married May 19, 1925 by Reverend M. C. Clemens at Christian and Missionary Alliance Church.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Harry C. Vann on their golden wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Harry C. Vann, 921 Bedford Street, Johnstown, Pennsylvania 15902.

PATRICK A. GLEASON

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Rocco Piscioneri has served voluntarily in the last six months as director of operations for the Legislative Services Center of Pennsylvania's one hundred third District and has coordinated, in that capacity, the staffing of those offices by citizen volunteers, thus effectively inaugurating the Capital City's first full-time legislative offices; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Piscioneri has served on the Volunteers Council to the State representative of the district and has helped organize and implement various programs and activities of service to the people of the City of Harrisburg and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Piscioneri, a graduate in Business Administration from Elizabethtown College and Harrisburg Area Community College, has been active in collegiate activities as an elected student body leader prior to his graduation and community activity.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pauses in its deliberations to salute the volunteer service of Rocco Piscioneri, noting his help in bringing closer to the people of the Capital City services, programs and a legislative office, and in expressing its appreciation;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Rocco Piscioneri, 533 South 19th Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17104.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Hyman Katzen has been designated "Man of the Year" by the Chisuk Emuna Congregation of Harrisburg, who honored him with such a designation and plaque in public ceremonies during the annual dinner-dance held Sunday, May 18, 1975; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Katzen's award was merited through outstanding accomplishments and continued service to both the synagogue and the community. This distinction is a coveted award that depicts special concern for other people as well as particular devotion to selfless service for the betterment of the City of Harrisburg and his religious congregation.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, pauses in its deliberations to pay tribute to Hyman Katzen for being selected Man of the Year and offers appreciation for his continued public and religious services with best wishes for continued achievement;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Hyman Katzen, 2751 North Fourth Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Timothy Roy Cox, a student in International Affairs at Pennsylvania State University's Capitol Campus in Middletown, has served voluntarily as Intern in the Legislative Offices serving the one hundred third District of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and

WHEREAS, During his internship in the Spring of 1975, Mr. Cox engaged in continuous research, planning and administrative activities. The calibre of performance during this internship has been exceptional and he has rendered invaluable service to the people of the City of Harrisburg and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Cox, a 1971 graduate of Harrisburg's Bishop McDevitt High School, was an elected student body leader at Harrisburg Area Community College from which he graduated in 1974. His extra-curricular activities have included playing championship basketball and football.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pauses in its deliberations to convey appreciation to Timothy Roy Cox for his services rendered for the public good and extends best wishes to this fine Pennsylvanian who exemplifies the finest traditions of volunteer public service and is a promising young leader;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Timothy Roy Cox, 414-D. Amherst Drive, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17109.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Gary Graham of Harrisburg has offered splendid and noteworthy service to the citizens of Central Pennsylvania as an organizer and planner of the highly successful 1975 March of Dimes Telethon for Central Pennsylvania; and

WHEREAS, Gary Graham, through his generous efforts and considerable skills, was an instrumental figure in the success of the 1975 March of Dimes Telethon which raised \$60,000 in public contributions and provided much needed information on the serious health problem of birth defects; and

WHEREAS, Gary Graham of Harrisburg truly deserves recognition and praise for his noble community spirit and selfless dedication to a worthy charitable cause.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pauses in its solemn deliberations to honor and pay tribute to Gary Graham of Harrisburg for his splendid service in planning and organizing the 1975 March of Dimes Telethon for Central Pennsylvania and to express its appreciation for his many contributions to his fellowman; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Gary Graham, Tri-County March of Dimes, 2930 Derry Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17111.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Brian P. Conrad, a Bishop McDevitt High School graduate, was ordained a Deacon of the Roman Catholic Church on May 31, 1975 in services at St. Patrick's Cathedral; and

WHEREAS, The son of Mr. and Mrs. Marlin J. Conrad, Brian P. Conrad has attended Mount Saint Mary's College in Emmitsburg, Maryland as well as Saint Mary's Seminar in Catonsville, Maryland. He is a theology student at Saint Vincent's Seminary at Latrobe; and

WHEREAS, Attaining Deacon represents the successful commitment toward academic and religious training that is commensurate with the highest ideals of humanitarian and Catholic traditions.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pauses in its deliberations to congratulate Brian P. Conrad on his achievement with best wishes for the completion of his work and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Brian P. Conrad, 2200 North Fifth Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Joseph K. Pierce graduated August 17, 1974 from the Oklahoma City University Law School and on April 23, 1975, was admitted to the practice of law before the Pennsylvania Supreme Court; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Pierce, a 1964 graduate of Bishop McDevitt High School and subsequently, the University of Dayton, was a political science student in college. In law school he was a member of the Phi Delta Phi legal fraternity and the Law Day Program Committee. He is a member of the Dauphin County Bar Association and has been a national, State and local leader of the Pennsylvania Young Democratic movement; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Pierce voluntarily serves as a liaison to the Harrisburg Redevelopment Authority and the Harritown Development Corporation for the Office of the State Representative for the City of Harrisburg's one hundred third legislative District and in that capacity also serves as a member of that office's Volunteer Council.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pauses in its deliberations to offer congratulations to Joseph K. Pierce for the successful completion of his legal training as well as recognition and appreciation for his community service activities. We offer him best wishes for continued success;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Joseph K. Pierce, 215 South 20th Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17104.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Paul Baker of Harrisburg has offered splendid and noteworthy service to the citizens of Central Pennsylvania as an organizer and planner of the highly successful 1975 March of Dimes Telethon for Central Pennsylvania; and

WHEREAS, Paul Baker, through his generous efforts and considerable skills, was an instrumental figure in the success of the 1975 March of Dimes Telethon which raised \$60,000 in public contributions and provided much needed information on the serious health problem of birth defects; and

WHEREAS, Paul Baker of Harrisburg truly deserves recognition and praise for his noble community spirit and selfless dedication to a worthy charitable cause.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pauses in its solemn deliberations to honor and pay tribute to Paul Baker of Harrisburg for his splendid service in planning and organizing the 1975 March of Dimes Telethon for Central Pennsylvania and to express its appreciation for his many contributions to his fellowman; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Paul Baker.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, John Stewart, fifteen, has earned the Eagle award in Scouting at ceremonies held May 28, 1975. This is the highest award that Boy Scouts can bestow and as such represents great sacrifice and tremendous effort on the part of this young man. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth M. Stewart of Harrisburg and is a member of Troop 8 of Keystone Area Council. John is a student at Central Dauphin East High School.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, congratulates John Stewart on the occasion of his being honored with the Eagle Scout Award, commends him on the outstanding work he has done to earn this coveted honor, and wishes him continued success in the future; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to John Stewart, 4501 Sequoia Drive, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17109.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Robert Hubbard of Harrisburg has offered splendid and noteworthy service to the citizens of Central Pennsylvania as an organizer and planner of the highly successful 1975 March of Dimes Telethon for Central Pennsylvania; and

WHEREAS, Robert Hubbard, through his generous efforts and considerable skills, was an instrumental figure in the success of the 1975 March of Dimes Telethon which raised \$60,000 in public contributions and provided much needed information on the serious health problem of birth defects; and

WHEREAS, Robert Hubbard of Harrisburg truly deserves recognition and praise for his noble community spirit and selfless dedication to a worthy charitable cause.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pauses in its solemn deliberations to honor and pay tribute to Robert Hubbard of Harrisburg for his splendid service in planning and organizing the 1975 March of Dimes Telethon for Central Pennsylvania and to express its appreciation for his many contributions to his fellowman; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Robert Hubbard.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, James Boyd Nesbit, a graduate of the Temple University School of Dentistry in 1974, returned this Spring, 1975 from serving as dental coordinator in Santarem, Brazil, serving thousands of persons who lived in impoverished conditions; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Nesbit has had previous experience working in the American Indian Health Project at Peach Springs, Arizona and as an international exchange student in Belgrade, Yugoslavia; and

WHEREAS, After graduating from Temple University in 1970 and Harrisburg Area Community College in 1968, he served, in dental school, on the task force to establish the Philadelphia High School's Community Dental Health and Education Project. In addition, he served as project director of Temple University's Dental and Pharmacy School's Relief Fund to aid East Pakistan. Dr. Nesbit served as minority recruitment co-chairman at Temple and is a member of the American Public Health Association and Health Alliance for Progress.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pauses in its deliberations to salute and commend Dr. James Nesbit for his work with best wishes for continued success; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to James Boyd Nesbit, 2203 Parkside Road, Camp Hill, Pennsylvania 17011.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Windsor School won the Brownson House Girls Basketball League Championship; and

WHEREAS, Windsor School displayed outstanding basketball skill in winning a three game playoff series over Seventh Ward, earning the distinction of League Champions.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania commends Windsor School and Coach Curt Koman for their achievement in basketball excellence;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Windsor School, 252 Cameron Road, Washington, Pennsylvania 15301.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Marty Drost was crowned the 1975 Prom Queen on Friday evening, May 9, 1975, during McGuffey High School's Junior-Senior Prom in the school gymnasium.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, heartily congratulates Marty Drost and wishes her health, happiness and success in the future;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Marty Drost, R. D. 1, Claysville, Pennsylvania 15323.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, William J. Shergy, a senior at Gateway Senior High School, was awarded First Place in the State Junior Academy of Science for his entry, "The Effects of Elevated Serum Calcium on the Medial Wall of the Laboratory Rat"; and

WHEREAS, William J. Shergy has displayed outstanding scientific skill in researching his project.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates William J. Shergy as recipient of the First Place award in the State Junior Academy of Science and commends him for his fortitude and tenacity in scientific research; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to William J. Shergy, 405 College Park Drive, Monroeville, Pennsylvania 15146.

LEE C. TADDONIO

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Christine Brotherton won First Place in the State Junior Academy of Science competition; and

WHEREAS, Miss Brotherton, a junior at Gateway Senior High School, submitted an entry which was entitled "The Effects of Prenatal Anxiety in Rats on the Anxiety Level of the Offspring".

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Christine Brotherton on her outstanding achievements as a first place winner in the State Junior Academy of Science competition, and commends her excellence in the field of science;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Christine Brotherton, 1249 Catalina Drive, Monroeville, Pennsylvania 15146.

LEE C. TADDONIO

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Angela Vavithes won First Place in the State Junior Academy of Science; and

WHEREAS, Angela Vavithes, a junior at Gateway Senior High School, entered her research project, "The Carcinogenic Effect of Coffee Tars on Pregnant Mice and Their Offspring," and was duly recognized for her outstanding scientific contribution.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Angela Vavithes for her achievement and commends her for her distinguished research project,

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Angela Vavithes, 2061 Haymaker Road, Monroeville, Pennsylvania 15146.

LEE C. TADDONIO

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. John Kulhamer, Sr., celebrated their golden wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by five children and nine grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. The couple was married May, 1925 in St. Andrew's Church, Catasauqua.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. John Kulhamer, Sr., on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. John Kulhamer, Sr., 567 Catasauqua Avenue, Whitehall, Pennsylvania 18052.

WILLIAM H. ECKENSBERGER, JR.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Officer Richard Smith of the Philadelphia Police Department's Narcotics Unit, served as a special undercover narcotics agent to the Lancaster City Police Department; and

WHEREAS, His diligent and professional performance in that assignment attributed to the largest single narcotics raid in Lancaster City's History; and

WHEREAS, All the citizens of Lancaster and their respective Law Enforcement Agencies are grateful and appreciative of Officer Smith's skilled performance as an undercover agent.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Officer Smith on his meritorious contribution to law enforcement while on special assignment to the Lancaster City Police Department and expresses its hope that his actions may serve as an example of dedicated law enforcement in the finest traditions of all Pennsylvania Police, and also wishes Officer Smith continued success in his law enforcement career;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Officer Smith of the Philadelphia Police Department, Special Narcotics Unit, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

MARVIN E. MILLER, JR.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Officer Carlos Aquino of the Philadelphia

Police Department's Narcotics Unit, served as a special undercover narcotics agent to the Lancaster City Police Department; and

WHEREAS, His diligent and professional performance in that assignment attributed to the largest single narcotics raid in Lancaster City's History; and

WHEREAS, All the citizens of Lancaster and their respective Law Enforcement Agencies are grateful and appreciative of Officer Aquino's skilled performance as an undercover agent.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Officer Aquino on his meritorious contribution to law enforcement while on special assignment to the Lancaster City Police Department and expresses its hope that his actions may serve as an example of dedicated law enforcement in the finest traditions of all Pennsylvania police and also wishes Officer Aquino continued success in his law enforcement career;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Officer Aquino of the Philadelphia Police Department, Special Narcotics Unit, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

MARVIN E. MILLER, JR.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Henry McCormick Gross has served his Nation and Commonwealth with distinction for decades. His service includes twenty-five years as Director of the Pennsylvania Selective Service System; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Gross is a Brigadier General with a noted military career and reputation. Honesty, brilliance, and zest for work and activity are his hallmarks as he celebrated his ninetieth birthday this 1975.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pauses in its deliberations to pay tribute to the long civic, professional and military career and contributions of Brigadier General Henry McCormick Gross, and extends many happy returns for the ensuing years of deserved and busy retirement;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Henry M. Gross, 2905 North Front Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Gabriel Geiger will celebrate their golden wedding anniversary September, 1975. Their happy union has been blessed by three children, six grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. The couple was married September 15, 1925 at the former St. John's Church in Steelton.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Gabriel Geiger on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Gabriel Geiger, 1205 South 19th Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17104.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Linda K. Newkirk has been chosen as "Miss Harrisburg" at the fourteenth Annual Pennsylvania State Laurel Festival to be held in Wellsboro, Tioga County, June 20-22, 1975; and

WHEREAS, Miss Newkirk is a Harrisburg High School senior and is a varsity cheerleader, band member, advertising editor of the school yearbook, homecoming queen for the school and an Honor Society member. After high school graduation, she plans to attend college as an elementary education major; and

WHEREAS, Miss Newkirk, daughter of Mrs. Emily Newkirk, has achieved leadership and success in her academic and extra-curricular activities and now has been chosen to represent her City of Harrisburg in Statewide competition.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pauses in its deliberations to congratulate Miss Harrisburg, Linda K. Newkirk, for her accomplishments thus far and extends to her best wishes for continued success;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Linda K. Newkirk, 78 Reservoir Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17103.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Frederic G. Antoun, Jr., obtained his Degree of Juris Doctor in Baccalaureate and Commencement Exercises of Ohio Northern University on Sunday, May 25, 1975; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Antoun, who has been active in community, academic, extra-curricular and legal pursuits, has therefore successfully completed his studies in the preparation for a career and profession as a practitioner of law and law counseling. His distinguishment in argument and advocacy in the Moot Court proceedings while in law school training has prepared him well as an articulate and competitive lawyer.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pauses in its deliberations to extend congratulations to this young Pennsylvanian who enters the profession of law with best wishes for continued success and leadership;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Frederic G. Antoun, Jr., 4910 Earl Drive, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17109.

STEPHEN R. REED

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Joseph P. Baressi is retiring from coaching Little League Baseball in the City of Corry after twenty-three years of consecutive service; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Baressi started his Little League coaching career in 1951. In 1954, Mr. Baressi's team had the honor of competing at Williamsport. Though retired now, Mr. Baressi coaches basketball in the Parochial League in Corry.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania commends Joseph P. Baressi for his outstanding service to Little League Baseball in the City of Corry;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. Joseph P. Baressi, R. D. 2, Gamma Road, Corry, Pennsylvania 16407.

FOREST W. HOPKINS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Bryan celebrated their sixtieth wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by three children, eight grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. The couple was married June 2, 1910.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Edward Bryan on their sixtieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Edward Bryan, 213 Fairview Road, Crum Lynne, Pennsylvania 19022.

PETER J. O'KEEFE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Robert L. Loughhead has been elected president of the Jessop Steel Company; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Loughhead has served as an officer of the specialty steelmaking company since 1959, and as executive vice president of operations since 1970; and

WHEREAS, He is a member of the American Iron and Steel Institute, the Steel Service Center Institute, the American Defense Preparedness Association, and serves on the advisory board of the Mellon Bank, N.A., Pittsburgh.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Mr. Robert L. Loughhead on his election as president of the Jessop Steel Company and extends to him best wishes for continued success in his future endeavors; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Robert L. Loughhead, President of Jessop Steel Company, Washington, Pennsylvania 15301.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Dr. Raymond M. Bell, a member of the Washington & Jefferson College faculty for thirty-eight years, will retire from active teaching; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Bell was professor of physics and chairman of the department at Washington & Jefferson for many years; he has been nationally acclaimed for his achievements in the fields of science and education; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Bell has been designated one of the Outstanding Educators in America.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Dr. Raymond M. Bell on his retirement after thirty-eight years at Washington & Jefferson College, and wishes him health and happiness in the years ahead;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Dr. Raymond M. Bell, c/o Washington & Jefferson College, Washington, Pennsylvania 15301.

ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Sheri Lynn Huth of Butler was elected "Junior Miss" of Butler County and in the State competition named "Junior Miss" of Pennsylvania. Throughout both competitions she demonstrated grace, charm and intelligence.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, congratulates Sheri Lynn Huth on the occasion of her being selected as "Junior Miss" of Butler County and Pennsylvania, commends her on winning these coveted honors and wishes her every success in her reign throughout 1975; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Sheri Lynn Huth, 200 Blue Grass Drive, Butler, Pennsylvania 16001.

JACK A. ARTHURS
JAMES A. GREEN

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Franklin D. Hillard, born July 7, 1910, has faithfully and diligently served his community and the fire company since 1935; and

WHEREAS, Franklin D. Hillard, who is retiring as Fire Chief of Kingston Borough, has devoted tireless service from his initial membership in 1935 in the Independent Fire Company to his present position as Fire Chief to which he has been appointed since 1963. A charter member of the Luzerne County Association of Fire Chiefs, Mr. Hillard is a charter member of the Kingston Community Improvement Association; and

WHEREAS, Franklin D. Hillard is commander of the West Side Mutual Aid, a member of the Keystone State Fire Chief's Association, Northeastern Association Fire-

men's Federation, International Association of Fire Chiefs; and Luzerne County Association of Fire Chiefs.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Franklin D. Hillard and commends this devoted gentleman for his dedicated community service and wishes him continued good health, happiness and success as he completes many dedicated years of service as Fire Chief of Kingston Borough;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Franklin D. Hillard, North Thomas Avenue, Kingston, Pennsylvania 18704.

FRANK J. O'CONNELL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Frank Edward Rutter has served the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for forty-two years as a member of the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Rutter's leadership and capable performance was a dominant force in the development of the State Liquor Store system, and he was a recipient of the Civil Service League Award.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Frank Edward Rutter on his forty-two years as a member of the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board, commends him on his leadership and capable performance as a public servant,

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Frank Edward Rutter, c/o The Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17124.

JOSEPH A. SULLIVAN
MAX PIEVSKY
PATRICK J. MCGINNIS
FRANK J. O'CONNELL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, The Honorable Reno H. Thomas of Beavertown was recently awarded an honorary membership in the fraternity of Alpha Zeta. The qualifications for membership in this organization are high, they include: high scholarship and leadership, outstanding achievement and sound character with the goal of improving the profession of agriculture; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Thomas has been a member of the House of Representatives since 1968 and serves as the Minority Vice Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. He is active in many agricultural organizations among them are: Past Director of the Pennsylvania Farmers Association, Pennsylvania Yorkshire Coop, Inc., Pennsylvania Livestock and Allied Industries Association, Eastern National Livestock Show, American Yorkshire Club, Inc., and the Farmers Home Association. In 1967 he received the National Ford Almanac Farm Efficiency Award and in 1964, the State Master Farmer Award.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates the Honorable Reno H. Thomas on being awarded an honorary membership in the fraternity of Alpha Zeta, commends him on his service to the agricultural profession and wishes him happiness and continued success; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to the Honorable Reno H. Thomas, R. D. 1, Beavertown, Pennsylvania 17813.

H. SHELDON PARKER, JR.
MATTHEW J. RYAN
ROBERT J. BUTERA

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, The Abraham Lincoln High School Chamber Choir is giving a concert in the Rotunda, June 24, 1975, to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Abraham Lincoln High School of Philadelphia; and

WHEREAS, The Chamber Choir was organized in 1967 by its present director, Mr. Jay Braman. The Choir

serves those students seeking choral experience which transcends the traditional high school offerings; and

WHEREAS, The Choir has appeared both nationally and internationally. In 1971 they appeared at the Music Educators Conference in Atlantic City. They were chosen from ninety-two groups as one of the sixteen finest in the country in 1972. During the summer of 1973 this outstanding group made a fourteen day singing tour of Vienna, Budapest and Prague.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania recognizes the Abraham Lincoln High School Chamber Choir for their outstanding achievements and wishes them continued success and happiness;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to the Abraham Lincoln High School, Rowland and Ryan Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19136.

STEPHEN R. WOJDAK

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Blanche Kinzer Harley of Millerstown celebrated her one hundredth birthday on June 6, 1975; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Harley, who is an outstanding citizen who represents the finest in American life, has been a devoted resident of Perry County for sixteen years and retired at the age of eighty-one after working in the East Salem Factory for thirty-five years and has been active in her community for many years; and

WHEREAS, Blanche Kinzer Harley, born June 6, 1875, in Juniata County near East Salem, married John Harley on June 30, 1903, and their union was blessed with one daughter, Mrs. Charles Mary Cameron, with whom she resides.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania heartily congratulates Blanche Kinzer Harley of Millerstown on her one hundredth birthday and wishes her the best of health and further appreciation from all who have come to know and therefore respect her;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Blanche Kinzer Harley, R. D. 2, Millerstown, Pennsylvania 17062.

FRED C. NOYE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Thomas L. Venable, president and founder of Spectrum Control, Inc., of Fairview, Pennsylvania, was honored as Small Businessman of the Year for Pennsylvania by the Small Business Administration; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Venable has been responsible for numerous outstanding achievements in the areas of National Security, Marketing, and Business Management.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Thomas L. Venable, commends him on his unique combination of technical business skill and community spirit, and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Thomas L. Venable, 4349 Feidler Drive, Erie, Pennsylvania 16506.

DAVID S. HAYES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Kathy Flickinger was crowned May Queen during the annual May Day program at Washington High School on May 16, 1975; and

WHEREAS, Miss Flickinger reigned at the Prom held in the Ballroom of the George Washington.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates Miss Kathy Flickinger on her selection as May Queen, wishes her success and happiness in the future;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Miss Kathy Flickinger, 15 West Katherine Avenue, Washington, Pennsylvania 15301.

ROBERT RAYMOND FISCHER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, John H. DeVitt has retired after fifty-three years of dedicated service to the Hammermill Paper Company as an important contributor to and a leader of Hammermill's Management Team; and

WHEREAS, Mr. DeVitt has served energetically and tirelessly in numerous business and community activities.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania congratulates John H. DeVitt on his well-earned retirement after fifty-three years of service, commends him on his outstanding achievements in business and community affairs, and wishes him continued happiness and success in his future endeavors;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to John H. DeVitt, 5275 Wolf Road, Erie, Pennsylvania 16505.

DAVID S. HAYES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Richard Wright has been accorded the honor of being named to the All-State Basketball Team of Pennsylvania; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Wright, for three years at Abington High School, consistently displayed such talent, sportsmanship, and determination on and off the court as to truly merit him a position on the All-State squad.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby congratulates Richard Wright and wishes him continued success in the future;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Richard Wright, 217 Ruscombe Avenue, North Hills, Pennsylvania 19038.

DANIEL E. BEREN

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Robert Harvey has been accorded the honor of being named to Pennsylvania's All-State Basketball Team; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Harvey has attended and played for Abington High School and has displayed extraordinary ability and sportsmanship which is necessary for selection to the All-State squad.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania heartily commends Robert Harvey and wishes him every success and happiness in the future;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Robert Harvey, 330 Tulpehocken Avenue, Elkins Park, Pennsylvania 19117.

DANIEL E. BEREN

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Raymond E. Wilt will celebrate their golden wedding anniversary July 1975. Their happy union has been blessed by five children, thirteen grandchildren, and one great-grandchild. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Wilt, nee Newman, and Mr. Wilt were married July 7, 1925 at Pittsburgh.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Raymond E. Wilt on their fiftieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Raymond E. Wilt, 131 Enger Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15214.

ROBERT J. BUTERA
K. LEROY IRVIS
MATTHEW J. RYAN
HERBERT FINEMAN

H. SHELDON PARKER, JR.
FRANK J. O'CONNELL
JOHN F. LAUDADIO, SR.
H. HARRISON HASKELL
ROY W. WILT
H. JACK SELTZER
L. EUGENE SMITH
VICTOR J. WESTERBERG
JOSEPH F. BONETTO
ROGER RAYMOND FISCHER
MARVIN E. MILLER
KENNETH S. HALVERSON

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mrs. Olivine McLeod McCoy of Philadelphia deserves the highest praise and commendation for her extraordinary dedication, zeal and leadership in transforming West Philadelphia's Lancaster Avenue from the worst example of urban decay into a developing and energetic community; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Olivine McLeod McCoy has admirably succeeded in uniting the merchants and residents of Lancaster Avenue in a cohesive and dynamic effort to bring a respectable and viable sense of community and common purpose to the people and institution of this once forgotten area; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Olivine McLeod McCoy now enjoys the distinction and status that success brings to those crusaders who overcome the tremendous barriers present in urban America.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania joins in saluting and commending the courageous Mrs. Olivine McLeod McCoy on her unparalleled success as a civic leader and booster of the Lancaster Avenue community and wishes her all the acclaim and reward which she so richly deserves; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mrs. Olivine McLeod McCoy.

JAMES D. BARBER
JOEL J. JOHNSON
FRANK LOUIS OLIVER

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. George Zober, Sr., celebrated their fortieth wedding anniversary recently. Their happy union has been blessed by three children, four grandsons and one foster daughter. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Zober, nee Bertha Marie Shupink, and Mr. Zober were married June 1, 1935 by Reverend James McKeever at Saint Thomas Aquinas Roman Catholic Church.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. George Zober, Sr., on their fortieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. George Zober, Sr., 228 Fifth Street, California, Pennsylvania 15419.

A. J. DeMEDIO

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Colacurcio celebrated their sixtieth wedding anniversary recently. These two people are highly respected by friends, neighbors and acquaintances as representing the finest in American life. Mrs. Colacurcio, nee Philamina Rega, and Mr. Colacurcio were married April 29, 1915 by the late Reverend N. Albanese at St. Bernardine's Church.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, extends its best wishes and congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Colacurcio on their sixtieth wedding anniversary and expresses its hope that they may long continue to enjoy their happy marriage;

and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Colacurcio, 397 Spruce Street, Mount Pleasant, Pennsylvania 15666.

EUGENE G. SALOOM
JOSEPH A. PETRARCA

QUESTION OF INFORMATION

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

Mr. RENNINGER. I rise to a question of information.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RENNINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the joint hearings on malpractice insurance and on the malpractice bills are going to be held at 10 o'clock this morning or not?

The SPEAKER. Those hearings have been canceled.

Mr. RENNINGER. It is a very important matter. I wanted to let my members know, because we do not know how we are going to be there twice.

The SPEAKER. The hearings which have been scheduled for this morning on the matter of medical malpractice have been canceled in view of the budget deliberations.

Mr. RENNINGER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. GEESEY. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GEESEY. Inasmuch as the content of this bill has been substantially changed from the time the original sponsor introduced the bill, I, as a sponsor, wrote a letter to the majority leader yesterday requesting that my name be withdrawn as a sponsor. I understand that the other two sponsors did likewise.

My question is: At what point are we going to consider the withdrawal of sponsors on this bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest that for purposes of a response to that inquiry, he consult with the majority leader, since it is the majority leader who must make the motion to waive the rules temporarily for the purpose of deleting and adding sponsors.

Mr. GEESEY. May I interrogate the majority leader, then, please?

The SPEAKER. Will the majority leader consent to interrogation?

Mr. IRVIS. Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GEESEY. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to respond to the question I posed to the Speaker of the House?

Mr. IRVIS. Yes, I will try.

I am sorry, I received only one letter; that is from Mr. Foster. I do not see any others. I was prepared to make the motion, frankly, before the calling up of House bill No. 1207 and that is the reason I rose to my feet to ask Mr. Mullen to yield so I could make that motion to remove Mr. Foster's name before we vote it.

But, if you tell me there are two other letters coming in—one from you and one from Mr. Anderson?

Mr. GEESEY. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. IRVIS. I do not have those letters.

Mr. GEESEY. To the best of my knowledge, mine was hand carried to your office yesterday afternoon.

Mr. IRVIS. Well, I certainly take your word for that.

Mr. GEESEY. Thank you.

Mr. IRVIS. Is Mr. Anderson present?

Mr. GEESEY. He is temporarily out of the hall, but he, likewise, sent the same letter.

Mr. IRVIS. All right, Mr. Speaker, may I ask that the House be at ease for about 2 minutes?

The SPEAKER. The House will be at ease.

RULES SUSPENDED TO ADD AND DELETE SPONSORS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. I have been requested to remove names from House bill No. 1207.

Mr. Speaker, it is necessary that we waive the rules of the House so that this may be done and I move that the House of Representatives suspend its rules to permit additions and deletions of sponsors to the following bill:

Additions:

House bill No. 1207—Messrs. Shane, Laudadio, Letterman, Gallagher and Irvis.

Deletions:

House bill No. 1207—Messrs. A. C. Foster, Geesey and Anderson.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

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

YEAS—179

- | | | | |
|--------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Abraham | Giammarco | McGinnis | Salvatore |
| Arthurs | Gillespie | McGraw | Scheaffer |
| Barber | Gillette | McIntyre | Schmitt |
| Bennett | Gleason | McLane | Schweder |
| Beren | Goodman | Mebus | Scirica |
| Berlin | Green | Menhorn | Shane |
| Berson | Greenfield | Milanovich | Shelhamer |
| Bittle | Grieco | Miller, M. E. | Shelton |
| Blackwell | Halverson | Miller, M. E., Jr. | Shuman |
| Bonetto | Hamilton, J. H. | Milliron | Shupnik |
| Bradley | Hammock | Miscevich | Sirianni |
| Burns | Hasay | Moehlmann | Smith, E. |
| Butera | Haskell | Morris | Smith, L. |
| Cessar | Hayes, D. S. | Mrkonic | Spencer |
| Cimint | Hayes, S. E. | Mullen | Stapleton |
| Cohen | Hepford | Mullen, M. P. | Stout |
| Cole | Hill | Musto | Sullivan |
| Cowell | Hopkins | Myers | Taddonio |
| Crawford | Hutchinson, A. | Novak | Taylor |
| Cumber'and | Hutchinson, W. | Noye | Tayoun |
| Davies | Irvis | O'Brien | Thomas |
| Davis, D. M. | Itkin | O'Connell | Toll |
| DeMedio | Johnson, J. | O'Donnell | Trello |
| Deverter | Katz | O'Keefe | Turner |
| Dicarlo | Kelly, A. P. | Oliver | Ustynoski |
| DiDonato | Kelly, J. B. | Pancoast | Vann |
| Dietz | Kernick | Parker, H. S. | Vroon |
| Dombrowaki | Kistler | Perri | Wagner |
| Dorr | Klingaman | Perry | Wansacz |
| Doyle | Knepper | Petrarca | Wargo |
| Dreibelbis | Kolter | Pitts | Weidner |
| Eckensberger | Kowalyshyn | Polite | Whittlesey |
| Englehart | Kuse | Pratt | Wilt, R. W. |
| Fee | LaMarca | Pyles | Wilt, W. W. |
| Fischer | Laughlin | Reed | Wojdak |
| Fisher | Lederer | Renninger | Worrilow |
| Flaherty | Lehr | Renwick | Wright |
| Foster, A. | Letterman | Richardson | Yahner |
| Foster, W. | Levi | Rieger | Yohn |
| Fryer | Lynch | Ritter | Zeller |
| Gallagher | Manderino | Romanelli | Zord |

- | | | | |
|---------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Gallen | Manmiller | Ross | Zwilk |
| Garzia | McCall | Ruggiero | |
| Geesey | McClatchy | Ryan | Fineman, |
| Geisler | McCue | Saloom | Speaker |
| George | | | |

NAYS—2

- | | |
|-------|--------|
| Stahl | Wilson |
|-------|--------|

NOT VOTING—22

- | | | | |
|-----------------|----------|-------------|--------------|
| Anderson, J. H. | Fawcett | Prendergast | Valicenti |
| Bellomini | Gleeson | Rappaport | Walsh, T. P. |
| Brandt | Gring | Rhodes | Westerberg |
| Brunner | Laudadio | Seltzer | Whelan |
| Caputo | Lincoln | Sweeney | Zearfoss |
| Dininni | Pievsky | | |

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. RUGGIERO. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUGGIERO. Is there a time limitation for the introduction of an amendment to the bill now under consideration?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not informed that there is a time limitation.

Mr. RUGGIERO. Can the Chair inform the member as to the schedule for this week? Will we be in session tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. We do not know that as yet.

Mr. RUGGIERO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. A. C. FOSTER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. A. C. FOSTER. I would like to inquire as to the status of House bill No. 1207. Inasmuch as the three sponsors have withdrawn sponsorship, has there been any name added as a sponsor?

The SPEAKER. Three additional sponsors have been added to the bill.

Mr. A. C. FOSTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

CALENDAR

**TAX BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION
SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of House bill No. 1207, printer's No. 1657, entitled:

An Act amending the "Pennsylvania Cigarette Tax Act," approved July 22, 1970 (P. L. 513, No. 178), changing provisions relating to payment of certain revenues.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

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

Amend Sec. 2 (Sec. 1202.1), page 2, line 2, by inserting after "FUND," except that \$120,000,000 in said fund shall remain there to be disposed of under existing statutes,

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. M. P. MULLEN. Mr. Speaker, before going into the amendment, I think everyone ought to know what his bill does, House bill No. 1207, the bill before them. This is a bill which the majority leadership says is necessary to balance the budget. What the bill does, of course, is transfer from the parent reimbursement fund \$169 million into the general fund.

What my amendment will do and what I am trying to do is set aside \$120 million of that money in the parent reimbursement fund and to keep it there in order to take care of the contingency if the court rules in favor of the parents in the case of Kennedy vs. Commonwealth.

I think you have to look at the background to understand what happened here. When we passed the parent reimbursement fund back in 1971, we set up this parent reimbursement fund for the purpose of making sure funds would be set aside to pay the parents under the parent reimbursement fund. That program was in existence for years before the Supreme Court found the bill unconstitutional, and up until May 15 of this year, we have accumulated \$137,500,000. It accumulates at the rate of 2 million a month, plus the interest and dividends on investments which amount to \$178,000 a week.

I say that it is wrong to take that money out of the fund, the amount of money that is necessary to pay the parents, which is \$120 million in case they win in court.

I realize fully that when the Supreme Court renders its decision it is final and we have to respect that decision. For that reason, I have no objection to taking the money over and above the \$120 million out of the fund, and this is the purpose of the amendment.

But I think you all must realize that the contingency of the court allowing this money to be paid to the parent is a real contingency, because we had an identical situation back in 1971 when the Supreme Court found the purchases of services bill unconstitutional. We had money set aside out of the same cigarette tax fund for that particular purpose, to pay the parents. And although the act was declared unconstitutional, schools that had entered into the contracts with the state brought an action which eventually reached the United States Supreme Court, and in the second Lemon v. Kurtzman case, the United States Supreme Court directed the State of Pennsylvania to pay to the schools \$24 million which was due them under the terms of the contract that they had entered into with the state prior to the Supreme Court decision.

And, as I stated yesterday on the floor, even though that particular act was unconstitutional, the schools were paid for 3 years under the contract terms they had with the state, \$5 million, \$18 million and \$24 million, and all that money came out of cigarette tax revenues.

What can happen here in Kennedy vs. Commonwealth, which is now presently before the Federal District Court or the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, is almost an identical case. The only thing is we are substituting parents for schools, because we passed a law and we told the parents that if they were to pay tuition to nonpublic schools, we in turn would reimburse them for part of

their tuition; \$75 for elementary students and \$150 for high school students. Those parents—and they number, in first year was 489,000 students involved and in the second year I think it was 450,000 students—acting on this law entered into a contract with their respective nonpublic schools and they paid tuition and made application for refund to the parent reimbursement authority, which we set up to administer this law. Of course, the law was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, and now the parents are doing what the schools did a few years ago. They are saying, okay, we know the act is unconstitutional, but we acted and relied on a law passed by the General Assembly of Pennsylvania and signed by the Governor; we fulfilled the part of our contract; we paid the tuition and we feel that in all justice and equity we are entitled to this money.

Now if we do not adopt my amendment, what we do is take all that money out of the fund, the parent reimbursement fund, place it into the general fund. We take away from the fund its only source of funding, which is a 10-percent revenue yield from the cigarette tax, and if the court should rule in our favor, we are faced with a terrible dilemma as to where we are going to get the money.

Certainly everybody realizes that we have a moral obligation to pay it if the court rules in the parents' favor. However, there is one thing being morally obligated to pay and there is another thing to get the money to pay it.

Now \$120,000,000 is a lot of money, and if the court should rule, say next September, and it will probably come up in September or October, that the parents are entitled to the money, those parents are going to be looking for that money, because they have a struggle now sending their children to nonpublic schools. And if we take the money out of the fund, if we do not adopt my amendment today, we are going to be left with a \$120-million deficit. This is the reason why it is necessary to adopt the amendment. I am not arguing about the \$49 million. We have no legitimate claim to that money. We no longer have any need for it in the fund, and I am agreeing, in the terms of my amendment, to transfer that to the general fund. But I say it is absolutely necessary to have that money ready and to pay to the parents that money if the court should rule in our favor.

We are not talking about the Pennsylvania Catholic Conference. I know all of you received a letter on your desks the other day from the Pennsylvania Catholic Conference in which they indicated that they no longer have any interest in that particular fund if they were to get the amendments which were inserted the other day. But we are not talking about their interest; they have no interest in this fund. This money belongs to the people back in your home district and mine. Some households, Mr. Speaker, will have as much as \$600 which will be due them if the court rules in their favor.

I think that sound fiscal responsibility, if nothing else, as well as a moral obligation, requires us to keep that fund segregated until we have a ruling from the Supreme Court or the Federal District Court, whichever it may be, because there may not be an appeal to the Supreme Court in the light of the Lemon v. Kurtzman case.

In other words, if next September or October the Federal District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, says that these parents are entitled to the money and directs the state to pay the money, I doubt whether

that is going to be appealed, because they are going to base their appeal on the second Lemon v. Kurtzman case which is a Supreme Court decision.

And if we want to pay that money next year, no way are we going to be able to do it, because we have mandated increases next year of \$350 million based on this. If we take this \$169 million—and \$150 million of that will be nonrecurring—and we spend that this year, we are going to be short that next year.

The only thing we are going to have in this fund next year is \$24 million. So we would be in no position next year to pay those parents and, certainly, it is inconceivable to me that any of you are going to be willing to vote for a tax increase next year to pay these parents. It is as simple as that. We are not talking about anything but the people back in your district; money which they are entitled to get.

Now, of course, the argument will be used that if this bill does not pass without my amendment, then the estimated revenue yield which we need to balance the budget will not be there and there may be need for new taxes. That may be true and it may not be true, depending upon how you set your priorities and allocate the budget.

But I think all of you ought to think of the serious obligation that you have to the parents back in your home district. They are going to be plenty mad if they do not get this money and have it set aside for them. This is what we intended when we set up the fund. We knew the difficulties of getting large sums of money from the legislature, because nearly every year we spend every dime we get. We purposely set up this fund for this purpose so we would not have that problem, and I think it is wrong to take it out and put it into the general fund.

So the purpose of my amendment, again I will reiterate and say no more, is that the effect of the amendment, if adopted, is to transfer the balance in the fund over and above the \$120 million, \$49 million, and it will keep the \$120 million in the fund until the Supreme Court renders a final decision as to whether the parents are entitled to it. Thank you.

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, most of what Mr. Mullen said is quite accurate and true, but the conclusion that he draws from those facts I disagree with. Mr. Mullen says that if we do not set aside this money now, if we do not keep it set aside, then later we are going to have to raise taxes in order to meet that obligation.

All right, the other side of that coin is, if we do not bring this money into the general fund now, then we are going to have to raise the taxes now. It is as simple as that.

Now the bill itself that the amendment seeks to amend does nothing more than transfer the funds. It does not touch the legislation that mandated and provided for the moneys to be paid to the parents. That will remain.

When the Supreme Court says that the moneys can be paid because of the hiatus, that the law was constitutional between the time it was passed and the time it was declared unconstitutional and the moneys during that period could be paid, the legal obligation of the Commonwealth will remain. We would have to provide for the funds at that time to provide that legal obligation.

The parents could bring suit to get the money. We will have to come up with the money at that time. But that does not derogate from the fact that when that time comes, we would have to act and the parents would be entitled to it. What I am saying is that nothing is changed except the funding for that legislation, and I am quite convinced that, when, as and if that occurs, the legislature will not be wanting to provide those funds.

I, therefore, urge a "no" vote on the amendment and an affirmative vote on House bill No. 1207. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, I naturally rise to oppose the amendment offered by Mr. Mullen.

We have been over and over this issue over the past several days. As everyone in this House knows, the transfer of that money is necessary to balance this budget. That is recognized by everyone. It is a very responsible position and the position taken by the Pennsylvania Catholic Conference.

Mr. Mullen attempts to make what appears to be a cogent legal argument for keeping that fund there. What he is saying is this: The parents reimbursement fund has been declared to be unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. That is a fact. In fact, a permanent injunction was issued against any payouts from that fund. Now what he is saying is that the parents in this case have applied for a rehearing, and as I understand it, there is a stipulation of counsel to bypass the Commonwealth Court and take it directly into the Federal Court. On that rehearing, I do not know what the arguments will be because the case, as I read it, was pretty thorough in its rejection and the Supreme Court's determination of its unconstitutionality.

Assuming the rehearing is heard in September, no matter what side wins on that, I am sure it is going to be appealed up to the Circuit Court and eventually to the Supreme Court. How long that is going to take I cannot stand here and predict, but it surely will take us well beyond this fiscal period.

Mr. Mullen, in holding out hope that the Supreme Court will change its mind—and I doubt that very much—has compared this case, or the rehearing case, to the original Kurtzman case. But there really is a great distinction in those cases. In the Kurtzman case, there was an actual contract issue existing; there was a reliance on that contract by the individual nonpublic schools; and in addition, it was really a case of first impression involving the contract issue. That is not the situation with the parents reimbursement fund. There is no contract existing between the state and the parents. There is no contract at all, and it is thoroughly distinct and absolutely distinct from the prior case. In my opinion the Supreme Court on this rehearing will not change its mind. It is going to rule in the same way, because there is really no additional grounds that can be argued in order to have that case declared constitutional and money be paid out.

With all those facts in mind and the positions that everyone is taking, the absolute need for that money to be transferred in order to balance this budget, I would really strongly urge the membership to vote in the negative on Mr. Mullen's amendment.

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Mr. Mullen's amendment. One of the things I would like to point out to the membership about our moral and/or legal obligation to fund programs that are subsequently found to be constitutional while we vote on the basis of them being unconstitutional, and the other moral obligations that we say we have to fund programs, I think what we should do is take a look at what we did yesterday.

We all agree we owe the pension fund some hundred millions of dollars. I believe that is right, is it not, Mr. Speaker? Eighty-one million dollars we owe the pension fund. If my memory serves me correctly, a few years back—and I would like Mr. Mullen or Mr. Seltzer here to correct me if I am wrong—we passed legislation or a resolution or some equally ineffective piece of paper that said we were going to repay that fund at the rate of \$10 million a year. Is that right? I do not see anyone disagreeing with me.

My recollection yesterday—and I believe it was even Mr. Mullen who was speaking in behalf of it as I think of it—was, well, we are not going to pay them the \$10 million this year. We are only going to give them \$5 million. But that is all right; that fund has plenty of money in it and we can only—and I am stealing Mr. Mullen's words. It seems uncharitable of me to support him on the one hand and feed his words back to him on the other—but nevertheless we had a \$10-million-a-year moral and/or legal obligation to repay the pension fund. Let us find it more convenient yesterday in order to "balance the budget" to chop that obligation moral and/or legal to the pension funds in half, because we found it fiscally convenient to pay back \$5 million instead of \$10 million.

I suggest to Mr. Doyle, who is suggesting to the House that we will take care of all these wonderful problems, that this may not take place, that if, in fact, the Supreme Court says we do owe this \$120 million to the parent reimbursement fund, we are faced then with a problem of raising taxes perhaps. I wonder how many of us are going to raise the taxes to do it. I wonder if maybe we will not transfer the \$120 million from a pension fund gain so that we can owe the teachers and the state employes \$200 million instead of \$81 million, and we can then pass a resolution saying we will pay them back at the rate of \$20 million a year instead of \$10 million a year. Then next year we can give them maybe \$7.5 million instead of the \$20 million, because it will be so much easier to handle.

We have an obligation to the pension fund of \$10 million a year. We cut it in half yesterday.

If the Supreme Court comes back and says that we owe \$120 million to the parents of nonpublic school children because of the existing contractual relationship that exists over the years prior to its being declared unconstitutional, I wonder where we get the money.

That money, as I view it, was escrowed money, and I think under the law, it was escrowed money; it was trust money. Now there are, I understand from all the lawyers, about one-third of this body with law degrees. I think each one of you and even the non-lawyers or the lawyers recognize that when you are dealing with escrowed money or fiduciary or trust moneys, there are certain obligations in connection with them. We have

that same obligation, in my judgment, with the pension fund which we neglected yesterday and cut in half and gave them \$5 million instead of the \$10 million. We have that same obligation with the \$120 million. Until there is a final determination by the courts that we do not owe the \$120 million, then I ignore the remarks of Mr. Fetterhoff from the Catholic Conference, who will be the first one to cry out, who will be the first one to cry out and write us further letters should the court find that we owe the \$120 million to the parents.

If Mr. Fetterhoff thought it out—and I found his letter somewhat wishy-washy—he would be well advised to keep that \$120 million in trust so that that money would be paid and we would not be in a position to find it easier, from a fiscal sense, to cut that obligation in half or steal it from the pension fund, which we have done in the past, and not repay it to a pension fund or not repay it to the parent reimbursement fund.

So I join with Mr. Mullen in suggesting that we transfer the money that is in excess of our potential legal obligation, but that we reserve the \$120 million that there is a contingency on, and that contingency is that the Supreme Court may say we owe it. If we owe it, we had better have it in the bank to pay it and, if we do not do as Mr. Mullen suggested, we are not going to have it in the bank.

Then we can go use the same excuse we used yesterday, well, we will steal it from the pension fund or we will pay it back to you parents at the rate of \$10 million a year, which is what we did to the teachers and to the state employes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority whip.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, the money that is in the parents reimbursement fund that we seek to transfer by House bill No. 1207 was money raised by a cigarette tax.

That tax was not imposed at the time that we passed the parents reimbursement procedures. That money existed, the tax existed, and when we passed the parents reimbursement procedures, simply said, we will take this percentage of the tax that is already enacted and place it in a fund for the parents of nonpublic school children. That money belonged to the general fund. That is where the money went before we enacted that law. That money went into the general fund where we seek to place it right now.

You can talk of escrow and trust and fiduciary, but all of that is law. And the law is, as illustrated by the Supreme Court of the United States, that our Parents Reimbursement Act was unconstitutional, that we were not permitted to take moneys from the general fund of the Commonwealth as we did, we were not permitted to do that in light of the Constitution and give it to the nonpublic school parents. That is what the Supreme Court said.

You can analogize all you want about *Lemon v. Kurtzman* and you are never going to get the Supreme Court to change the decision that they made. Their decision was that that act is unconstitutional. In the *Lemon v. Kurtzman* case, the second case, as Mr. Mullen likes to point out, that went off on the viability of contracts. What the Court said was that people who contract with the Commonwealth in good faith and sit down and bargain and negotiate and sign a contract on the basis of

the law of that state, then those people are entitled to be paid.

There are no contracts in this particular case. There is no contract in existence between any nonpublic school and the parents of the nonpublic school children. They did not contract to do anything in reliance on the state law.

A further distinction that is eminently important is that the Supreme Court in this case enjoined permanently any payments of these moneys to the parents. They are going to have to reverse themselves on that point, which was not the case in the Lemon v. Kurtzman case. The first decision never spoke to that point. In this particular case, the court did speak; it enjoined payment of any moneys from that fund.

So all we are really doing is putting the money back where it was before the court spoke and said that scheme to get aid to nonpublic schools is unconstitutional and you cannot make those payments and you are enjoined from making those payments.

You know that it is interesting that the gentleman on the other side of the aisle and all of the gentlemen over there who have spoken about our obligation to fund the teachers' retirement system that we are behind some \$81 million in, and yesterday there was a proposal to put in that \$81 million in one lump sum, it is interesting that it was their proposal last year that cut the agreement from \$10 million to \$5 million under the direction of the Appropriations Committee chairman, Mr. Seltzer, last year. They returned to a tax base in this Commonwealth.

We were told by the Governor of this Commonwealth last year that the tax relief that we granted of a permanent nature was going to rest this year in budget problems, and nothing could be further from the truth.

He asked us to give one-shot tax rebates to the people of Pennsylvania, but under the insistence of the other side of the aisle, we granted permanent tax relief or we would not be with the budget problems that we have right now.

It is interesting that when they were voting to grant the tax relief last year and to send money back that we did not need, that they would not have elected at that time to pay that \$81 million into the teachers' retirement fund.

I understand what they are doing. I do not agree with what they are doing. If they want to be obstructionists, if they want to tell us this year something different from what they told us last year because it serves their purposes better this year, I can understand it, but I will never agree with it.

We have a budget to pass. It has got to be a balanced budget, and if we want to do it without additional taxes, we will simply return to the general fund the moneys that originally were scheduled to go into the general fund from the cigarette tax, which we tried to set aside for nonpublic school students and which the court told us that we cannot; it is impossible.

We have recognized our obligation to the nonpublic school students. We passed yesterday or the day before and put into the budget some \$30 million in aid to these schools, which everyone believes has the best chance of passing the constitutional test. I think that is where we ought to let it lie. We ought to pass House bill No. 1207 and get on with the business of adopting a budget.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, just one point or two points. Well, I will just ignore the first point. Just one point.

Will the gentleman please advise us whether he used the blue campaign literature in the last campaign?

The SPEAKER. The question is not pertinent.

Mr. BUTERA. Oh, yes, it is, Mr. Speaker. We were accused of doing some horrible thing by advocating tax relief in the last session when, in fact, I believe everyone in this House participated in that decision ultimately and, indeed, most of the members on the other side used it in their campaign literature as a huge plus, taking full credit for that act. And let us just eliminate that argument once and for all from these discussions.

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

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday and again today we heard the strong proponents of nonpublic school aid debating on the floor of this House whether or not this money should be transferred or should not be transferred, and they have been citing and reciting all kind of rulings and opinions by the courts.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the nontransfer of this money from another point. Let us look at it from the point of being fiscally responsible. Let us look at it from the point of keeping fiscal integrity here in this House because, Mr. Speaker, what is attempting to be done to the people of Pennsylvania is to transfer this money and spend it in ongoing programs, the cost of which will increase substantially next year and force us into a major tax increase.

Mr. Speaker, the proponents of nonpublic school aid on both sides have made very good potent argument on why they should not transfer the money or why they should transfer the money. But let us lay that aside, because nonpublic school aid is nowhere in the bill and nonpublic school aid is nowhere in the amendment. All we are doing is attempting to transfer "X" number of dollars from the special fund into the general fund.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for all of us who are attempting to keep fiscal integrity in this Commonwealth to support this amendment, and, if it fails to vote "no" on the bill.

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

Mr. M. P. MULLEN. I just want to answer Mr. Doyle and Mr. Manderino.

First of all, Mr. Doyle indicated that if this amendment is not inserted in the bill, it will be necessary to raise taxes.

I do not share that particular point of view. The reason I do not share that particular point of view is I do not want to increase taxes either, but I say that we have to set priorities.

Now no member in this House of Representative outside of the Speaker and Mr. Wojdak, had any say in presenting the budget.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not only factually incorrect, but he is out of order.

Mr. M. P. MULLEN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am a member—

The SPEAKER. The Chair would hope that the ger

tleman would refrain from those kinds of remarks in the future.

Mr. M. P. MULLEN. Well, all I can say is, I am a member of the Appropriations Committee and there are 28 other members of the Appropriations Committee. We never had any input into the bill. We never had an opportunity to—

The SPEAKER. Well, that is a lot different from what the gentleman said prior to that statement. The gentleman is factually incorrect. Now I have heard you say that many times and I have let it pass; I will not let it pass again. Now you are incorrect and do not repeat it.

Mr. M. P. MULLEN. Well, Mr. Speaker, why do you not come down here on the floor and tell us what part you played in it?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

For what purpose does the minority leader rise?

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 days, I think we have seen a very high level debate and I think the Chair has conducted himself admirably through a lot of pressure. However, there will be a lot of factually incorrect things stated during any debate such as this and I do not think it is your prerogative from that Chair to admonish any of us as to our factual conclusions.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Mullen.

Mr. M. P. MULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I will not refer to that again. I am sorry.

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I object to Mr. Mullen's making those remarks, which he did that only two people had any input in the general appropriations bill.

I am a member of the Appropriations Committee and I had a lot of input on that bill. It was not done as Mr. Mullen alluded to, so I object to his remarks, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. All right.

Mr. M. P. MULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the remarks.

In answer to Mr. Doyle, I state this: I think if the priorities were reset again, we can adopt a budget which will not require any additional new taxes and recognize the obligations which I am trying to recognize in this amendment.

Now in regard to Mr. Manderino, he stated that the contract with the parents was not in fact a contract. Well, the whole purpose of the reimbursement fund, believe it or not, was to try to meet Article III, section 29's provision of the Constitution. The only way that we felt that we could do that at the time we adopted the bill was, in fact, to base it upon contracts.

So what actually happened here was, the parents went to the school and paid the tuition. Then when they paid the tuition, they sent the bill to the state and then the state had an obligation under the law, under contract, to pay to the parents the amount of money they were entitled to under the act.

Now, in regard to the Supreme Court decision, the United States Supreme Court's decision did not issue a permanent injunction prohibiting the payment. What the United States Supreme Court did was to send the

act back to the Federal District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to be disposed of in accordance with their decision, which, of course, was unconstitutional. Now the injunction was originally issued by a Federal District Court Judge in Philadelphia prior to sending it up to the Supreme Court.

In regard to Mr. Wojdak's appeal procedure, it will not be necessary to go through the circuit court of appeals, the third circuit, because two district judges and the circuit court judge sat en banc in order to bypass the third circuit appeal. So whatever decision is rendered by the Federal District Court, when I was referring to the Federal District Court, really is a decision of the Federal District Court and the third circuit for Philadelphia. So if that would be appealed, it would be appealed directly to the Supreme Court. But I just cannot conceive, if this Federal District Court rules in our favor, that anyone would bother appealing it, because they would render that decision based upon the second *Lemon v. Kurtzman* case.

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

Mr. ZELLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that I have seen in my time here so many would-be supreme court justices in trying to interpret the Constitution to fit their cause to increase the budget of 1974 by \$440 million, and then they call it holding the line, bare-bone budget and all kinds of other adjectives to brain-wash the public. I do not know if they ever talk about cuts, and I mean real cuts, where we get cuts—and I have an amendment which has not seen the light of day yet. Maybe it will after we get through voting for Mr. Mullen's amendment—and get down to real cuts. Cut it \$120 million, rather than push for a very ultra-liberal budget by transferring money from the fund that was properly earmarked, contrary with what Mr. Manderino said, and we are waiting for a decision.

I was very surprised to hear Mr. Doyle's feelings as to using \$120 million to avoid an increase this year. How about the tax increase next year if the courts rule in favor of the \$120 million being given to the parents?

I just cannot understand the thinking and using all these fancy adjectives and hiding under the fact that you give this money—what we call the money that Mr. Mullen talked about yesterday—that is already ongoing money under the services provisions to the nonpublic school parents and children, but the money has already been earmarked for that. All you do is do something, and that is why I voted against it because it was phony. It is already ongoing. Therefore, let us get on with the holding on to this money which is a trust fund. Whether you believe it or not, it is, in effect, trust money placed there for this very, very reason. Here we want to take this money out and use it to balance a budget that is so ultra-liberal.

Last year we had \$500 million above 1973 and \$440 million above 1974, and we call it bare bone. Then we go home and tell our people—by the way, did anybody really look at this printout? You see all kinds of fancy things on the second to last column that says minus. Do you know what that minus is? They try to allude to the fact that you are cutting the budget. They are merely cutting the Governor's request. They are not cutting any budget. That to me is so misleading to those—and with all respect, I do not think they are fooling the new members. Some people said to me that that

is just for some of these new guys. They will walk all over them. I talked to a lot of the new members, and new members are not being brainwashed by this.

So I would like to see the members get out here and vote for Marty's amendment. Do not call it Marty's amendment, because some of the people I have talked to say, Marty this and Marty that. You are not voting for Marty Mullen's amendment; you are voting for people who have already spent this money, for people who have known, they were told, it was earmarked for this purpose. All you are going to do is hold that money there until the courts rule. You are being fair.

It is not Marty Mullen's amendment. It is the people of Pennsylvania who spent this money who deserve it back. So let us vote for it and get on with the business.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mifflin, Mr. DeVerter.

Mr. DeVERTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not wish to prolong the debate on this matter, but I rise deeply distressed about what we are about to do here today. It causes me a little bit more than grief, and I am not looking at it from the standpoint of whether I support Mr. Mullen or do not support Mr. Mullen. It is not a question of that. It is not even a question of the parent reimbursement fund. It is really a question of how much increase is going into this budget and how this budget document was arrived at. For that purpose, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman, Mr. Wojdak, would stand for interrogation, please?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Wojdak, consent to interrogation?

Mr. WOJDAK. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DeVERTER. Mr. Speaker, this budget document that was given by the Governor was for some \$4.5 billion, I understand, was that correct, for the 12-month period?

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

Mr. DeVERTER. And how much of an increase is that, Mr. Speaker, over the previous fiscal year?

Mr. WOJDAK. Approximately 9 percent.

Mr. DeVERTER. In dollars, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOJDAK. In dollars, an exact figure? If you will hold on one moment—

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman addressing himself to House bill No. 1336 or the amendment to House bill No. 1207?

Mr. DeVERTER. I am addressing myself, Mr. Speaker, to the Mullen amendment, which I will get to in a moment.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman try to confine his interrogation to House bill No. 1207 and to the amendment on same?

Mr. DeVERTER. I will, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOJDAK. It is approximately \$300 million.

Mr. DeVERTER. If we move the \$169.5 million from the parental trust fund to the general fund, what will we be balancing as far as the other documents that we have been looking at for the last several days, House bill No. 1336.

Mr. WOJDAK. I am really not sure I follow your question. In order to arrive at the figure of \$4.5 billion, included in that is the transfer of the \$169 million. If, in fact, the transfer is not made, that figure of \$4.4 billion will be short \$169 million.

Mr. DeVERTER. Is that the figure that would be totaled in House bill No. 1336?

Mr. WOJDAK. That is correct.

Mr. DeVERTER. So that still leaves us, then, without anything for the nonpreferred areas. Is that correct?

Mr. WOJDAK. Oh, no, no, I am sorry. These are the figures for the general appropriations bill. For the nonpreferred area, I think what is available is \$281 million.

Mr. DeVERTER. Where does that money come from?

Mr. WOJDAK. That also comes from various tax shields.

Mr. DeVERTER. Should that not be considered as part of the total revenues of this Commonwealth when the entire budget process is being taken into consideration?

Mr. WOJDAK. Well, it very surely is considered as the total revenues of this Commonwealth.

Mr. DeVERTER. I think what I am trying to drive at, Mr. Speaker, is this: That we have before us today in House bill No. 1207 a request to transfer \$169.5 million, as I understand it, but yet we do not have what the total budget of this Commonwealth is before us. Is that correct?

Mr. WOJDAK. You have the budget of the general appropriation bill before you in House bill No. 1336.

Mr. DeVERTER. But we do not have the entire budget picture in front of us, do we, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. WOJDAK. Not encompassed within House bill No. 1336, no. If you recall, in House bills Nos. 1333, 1334 and 1335 are the other elements of the total picture that you are referring to.

Mr. DeVERTER. That still does not consider some of the other areas, does it?

Mr. WOJDAK. No; in addition to that are the non-preferreds and the disbursement of the motor vehicle fund.

Mr. DeVERTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to get to is that we are being asked to move the money out of a fund and include it into the total budget picture of this Commonwealth. If we do that, would Mr. Wojdak be willing to tell us what the effect of that move will be for the next fiscal year, 1976-1977?

Mr. WOJDAK. If I understand you correctly, your question is: If the transfer is made into the general fund, what will the picture look like next year?

Mr. DeVERTER. That is correct.

Mr. WOJDAK. I do not know; I cannot sit here with a crystal ball and tell you what the exact tax yields will be next year or what this House determines to spend via their appropriation priorities.

Mr. DeVERTER. But is it not a fact if we move this money into the general fund this year, that that money will have to be found from some other source next year?

Mr. WOJDAK. No.

Mr. DeVERTER. No?

Mr. WOJDAK. No; it is set aside as a special fund to speak to only the purposes of reimbursing parents of nonpublic school students. The Supreme Court has declared that disbursement to be unconstitutional.

What Mr. Mullen is saying is that there is going to be a rehearing and on the contingency that the court changes its mind, the fund will be there for disbursement. The position that I am taking is that the disbursement should be made in order to balance this budget.

Mr. DeVERTER. Mr. Speaker, you are answering only in the case of nonpublic schools. What I am after, sir, is: What will this body, incorporating that \$169.5 million into the general fund this year, do to the total revenue that will be available in the coming fiscal year, 1976-1977?

In other words, we are adding \$169 million to the fund this year. Where are we to get that money next year?

Mr. WOJDAK. If your question is, sir: Is this a one-shot deal into the general fund—

Mr. DeVERTER. That is generally the way it is considered. But what I want to know is where that \$169.5 million is going to come from in another year if we put it into general operations of government this year.

Mr. WOJDAK. That is going to be up to next year's tax yields.

Mr. DeVERTER. I see. In other words, we can look forward to, hopefully, another \$169.5 million in additional yields from the present tax base to take care of the budget next year.

Mr. WOJDAK. I cannot project that far. I do not know that to be true or untrue, nor do you.

Mr. DeVERTER. That is correct, sir, but what I am saying is, if we do this, we have obligated ourselves for at least that much more money next year. Is that not correct?

Mr. WOJDAK. Yes, in general terms that is correct.

Mr. DeVERTER. I do not understand that, sir, in general terms?

Mr. WOJDAK. When you say we have obligated ourselves for the 1975-1976 fiscal year, of course, we have obligated ourselves. You are saying, what if we obligated ourselves for the fiscal year following that, 1976-1977? I am saying to you, I do not know. I do not know what tax yields will be like. I do not know what expenditures will be like, what priorities this House will set. I do not know the answer to that.

Mr. DeVERTER. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mifflin, Mr. DeVerter.

Mr. DeVERTER. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, deeply so, that we are being asked today to transfer this money with nowhere down the road can we see where we are going to make up this additional revenue for another year.

I do not know how many of you ladies and gentlemen feel strongly or not so strongly about this budget document, but I guess the votes are going to reflect that on the board.

I, for one, am going to support the amendment that is presently being offered, not because, not because I entirely agree with any concept that has been advanced by the other side in the form of the so-called Mullen forces, but rather because of what we are going to be doing to the people of this Commonwealth when we already owe money under previous acts of this legislature that have never been paid.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the membership of this body cast an affirmative vote on this amendment. Thank you.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. M. P. MULLEN and DOYLE and were as follows:

YEAS—97

Abraham	Gillette	McClatchy	Schmitt
Anderson, J. H.	Goodman	McCue	Scirica
Beren	Grieco	McGinnis	Seltzer
Bittle	Halverson	McGraw	Shuman
Brandt	Hamilton, J. H.	Mebus	Sirianni
Burns	Hasay	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Smith, L.
Butera	Haskell	Moehlmann	Spencer
Cessar	Hayes, D. S.	Mrkonje	Stahl
Cimini	Hayes, S. E.	Mullen, M. P.	Taddonio
Crawford	Hepford	Mullen	Taylor
Cumberland	Hill	Musto	Trello
Davies	Hopkins	Noye	Turner
Deverter	Hutchinson, W.	O'Brien	Ustynoski
Dicarlo	Katz	O'Connell	Vann
Dietz	Klingaman	Pancoast	Vroom
Dombrowski	Knepper	Perri	Weidner
Dorr	Kusse	Pitts	Westerberg
Fisher	LaMarca	Polite	Whelan
Flaherty	Lederer	Pyles	Whittlesey
Foster, A.	Levi	Renninger	WorriLOW
Foster, W.	Lincoln	Renwick	Wright
Gallen	Lynch	Rieger	Yahner
Geisler	Manmiller	Ryan	Yohn
George	McCall	Scheaffer	Zeller
Giammarco			

NAYS—82

Arthurs	Garzia	Milanovich	Shane
Barber	Geesey	Milliron	Sheihamer
Bennett	Gillespie	Miller, M. E.	Shelton
Berlin	Gleason	Miscevich	Shupnik
Berson	Green	Morris	Smith, E.
Bonetto	Greenfield	Novak	Stapleton
Bradley	Hutchinson, A.	O'Donnell	Stout
Brunner	Irvis	O'Keefe	Sullivan
Cohen	Itkin	Oliver	Toll
Cole	Kelly, A. P.	Parker, H. S.	Walsh, T. P.
Cowell	Kelly, J. B.	Perry	Wansacz
Davis, D. M.	Kernick	Petrarca	Wargo
DeMedio	Kistler	Pratt	Wilson
Doyle	Kolter	Prendergast	Wilt, R. W.
Dreibelbis	Kowalshyn	Reed	Wilt, R. W.
Eckensberger	Laughlin	Richardson	Wojdak
Engelhart	Lehr	Ritter	Zord
Fee	Letterman	Romanelli	Zwikel
Fischer	Manderino	Ross	
Fryer	McLane	Ruggiero	Fineman,
Gallagher	Menhorn	Schweder	Speaker

NOT VOTING—24

Bellomini	Gleeson	Myers	Sweeney
Blackwell	Gring	Pievsky	Thayou
Caputo	Hammock	Rappaport	Thomas
DiDonato	Johnson, J.	Rhodes	Valcenti
Dininni	Laudadio	Saloom	Wagner
Fawcett	McIntyre	Salvatore	Zearfoss

So the question was determined in the affirmative and the 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.

SUNDAY SCHOOL CLASS WELCOMED

The SPEAKER. The Chair wants to recognize the presence of a Sunday School class from Troy, Pennsylvania, with their pastor, Reverend Minarcek.

They are the guests of the gentleman from Bradford, Mr. Turner.

HOUSE BILL No. 1336 AND AMENDMENTS
TAKEN FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that House bill No.

1336 and the amendments thereto be removed from the table.

On the question recurring,

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

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

Amend Sec. 2, page 22, line 10, by striking out "263,000" and inserting: 587,196

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Gleason.

Mr. GLEASON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had submitted six amendments. The only amendment that I am going to ask the House to adopt today is the amendment designated No. 6. It reads: "Amend Sec. 2, page 22, line 10, by striking out '263,000' and inserting 587,196." This increases the appropriation from state funds to the Pennsylvania Crime Commission by approximately \$324,000, and I would ask that the House favorably act upon this amendment.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, what Mr. Gleason's amendment does is attempt to restore the Governor's request for the Crime Commission. The original request made by the Governor was for, what we considered, an abnormally large increase in that bureaucracy. We did not feel it was sufficiently justified. We did not allow and it did not allow a budget that met our standard criteria which I had spoken about earlier.

We have increased the budget over last year by 10 percent which will take care of employes on board. It will not allow for what we consider to be abnormal expansion.

I would ask for a negative vote on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Gleason.

Mr. GLEASON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly outline for the members the chronology, which I believe leads up to the inescapable conclusion that we should amend the budget for the Pennsylvania Crime Commission.

In January of this year, Mr. Speaker, the Governor hired as executive director of the Pennsylvania Crime Commission, Mr. George Rayborn, who was assistant to majority counsel George Dorr of the Rodino Committee.

A few months thereafter, Attorney General Kane in an appearance before, I believe, a Senate Appropriations Committee in response to a question as to what the Pennsylvania Crime Commission was going to do with the report of the committee on state contract practices, Attorney General Kane at that time said, we are going to turn the entire matter of the committee's report and all of the documents and data, some 5,000 pages, over to the Pennsylvania Crime Commission, and Attorney General Kane said, I am charging the Crime Commission with the responsibility of following through on this investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I was approached by members of the press who asked my reaction to Attorney General Kane's

statement. My response to the members of the press was that I was delighted that at last an agency of state government was going to involve itself directly and intimately in governmental corruption.

I was further pleased, Mr. Speaker, when I read the Governor's proposal for the Pennsylvania Crime Commission. The Governor's budget request was for \$607,000, approximately \$350,000 more than last year. Up to this point, I felt we had a total commitment by this administration to a fair and even-handed examination of government corruption in Pennsylvania.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1975, I met with Mr. Rayborn and informed him as to many of the committee's findings and where he could get the information, which he was very sincere about wanting to get. I believed in his sincerity at that time and I still believe in his sincerity.

He at the present time is getting all of the evidence together from the U. S. Attorney's office, from the chief clerk's office and all other sources of information.

On June 2 of 1975—the date may be a little incorrect—the report in the press of House bill No. 1336 was given out, and the Governor's budget request was cut back in House bill No. 1336 to \$263,000 from \$607,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not impute bad motives to anybody, but I am suggesting very strongly that the way House bill No. 1336 is drawn at the present time is an invitation to suspicion as to the sincerity of this administration. In saying, on the one hand, that we are going to turn the matter of government corruption over to the Crime Commission and, on the other hand, Mr. Wojdak informs us that the Governor is intimately familiar with this House bill No. 1336 and that he supports this bill. Then I have to ask the question: Where is the administration on this issue? Have they backed down from their promise? Have they backed down from their assertion that they are going to turn this matter over to the Crime Commission?

It is not enough, Mr. Speaker, to talk about a minimal 10-percent increase when you have committed an agency of this government to investigate a rather considerable problem.

I cannot believe, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Rayborn, a high professional, a very excellent public servant, would have come on board in this administration had he known that his budget request, or his commission, would be cut by 60 percent of its funds. It does not make sense. I am not standing here telling you what Mr. Rayborn told me, but I can suggest to you that turning this matter over to the Crime Commission and then cutting the guts out of their appropriation is an example of what I had talked about yesterday only in reverse.

I am suggesting to the members of the House, Mr. Speaker, that this question crosses all party lines. This question is a test of the sincerity of Democrats and Republicans and a test of this administration as to its sincerity about what it is going to do through its Crime Commission—not a Republican Crime Commission, but a Crime Commission of this administration—about what has been disclosed so far. It seems to me that it is incumbent upon us, as legislators, as responsible people concerned with clean government, to turn this matter over to the Pennsylvania Crime Commission.

I am somewhat disturbed, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal authorities seem to be doing 90 percent of the work in this area. Where is state government? The election

has passed us. It is gone; it is behind us. We have got a problem and it is a state-government problem, and it should be something which state government addresses itself to, not a commission whose money has been taken away from it and who has been stripped of the power and the ability to do anything about what the Governor said he wanted to have done in the first place.

It seems to me that this borders on hypocrisy and sham, and I would hope that the members of this House would vote to restore to the Crime Commission, the commission of this administration, the funds necessary to do the right job for the people of Pennsylvania. I ask for an affirmative vote.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, the Governor's request had been for almost doubling the budget of the Crime Commission. We did not treat that Crime Commission any differently than we treated any other department. There was just no way in the fiscal situation that we are in that that could meet our criteria. There is no special reason why that should be funded or its budget doubled. We treated that commission in the same manner that we treated every department in going through this budget.

In our opinion, what they are attempting to do is build another bureaucracy with layers and layers of people there, and in our opinion their request was not justified. We have given them the normal increase that we have given to every department and that is a 10-percent increase. I do not think that in any way will inhibit their ability to ferret out the problems that Mr. Gleason speaks of.

I really could not justify nor would it be fair to double that budget when, in fact, we are holding the reins tight on every other department in this state.

Much of what Mr. Gleason said is true. We are not in a fiscal situation to allow that type of increase, and it is for that reason that we cut back that request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Gleason.

Mr. GLEASON. Mr. Speaker, just one brief reply. I know I have gone over the two-speech rule and I am sure we do not want to get into much more of what we have had the last couple of days. But I think it is important for the members of the House to recognize that the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Wojdak, is not totally consistent. Let us look at the Council on the arts in House bill No. 1336.

The Governor requested \$1,558,000, an increase of approximately \$100,000 over last year's figures. Yet House bill No. 1336 increases the Governor's appropriation by \$300,000, up to approximately \$1,860,000. Which is more important, Mr. Speaker? I have been a supporter of the arts; I have been a supporter of increased appropriations; but I just ask the members of the House, which is more important?

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

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

YEAS—66

Anderson, J. H. Beren	Geesey Gleason	McGinnis Manmiller	Smith, L. Spencer
--------------------------	-------------------	-----------------------	----------------------

Bittle	Grieco	Mebus	Stahl
Brandt	Halverson	Moehlmann	Taddonio
Burns	Haskell	Noye	Turner
Butera	Hayes, D. S.	O'Connell	Ustynoski
Cessar	Hayes, S. E.	Pancoast	Vroon
Cimini	Hepford	Parker, H. S.	Weldner
Cohen	Hill	Pitts	Westerberg
Crawford	Hopkins	Polite	Whelan
Cumberland	Katz	Ryan	Whittlesey
Davies	Kernick	Scheaffer	Wilson
Dietz	Klingaman	Scirica	Wilt, R. W.
Fischer	Kusse	Seltzer	Wright
Foster, A.	Lehr	Sirianni	Yohn
Foster, W.	Levi	Smith, E.	Zord
Gallen	McCue		

NAYS—115

Abraham	Gillespie	Menhorn	Romanelli
Arthurs	Gillette	Milanovich	Ross
Barber	Goodman	Miller, M. E.	Ruggiero
Bennett	Green	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Schmitt
Berlin	Greenfield	Milliron	Schweder
Berson	Hamilton, J. H.	Miscevich	Shane
Bonetto	Hasay	Morris	Sheihamer
Bradley	Hutchinson, A.	Mrkonjc	Shelton
Cole	Irvis	Mullen	Shuman
Cowell	Itkin	Musto	Shupnik
Davis, D. M.	Johnson, J.	Myers	Stapleton
DeMedio	Kelly, A. P.	Novak	Stout
Deverter	Kelly, J. B.	O'Brien	Sullivan
Dicarlo	Kistler	O'Donnell	Taylor
DiDonato	Knepper	O'Keefe	Toll
Dombrowski	Kolter	Oliver	Trello
Dorr	Kowalyszyn	Perri	Vann
Doyle	LaMarca	Perry	Walsh, T. P.
Dreibelbis	Laughlin	Petrarca	Wansacz
Eckensberger	Lederer	Pievsky	Wargo
Englehart	Letterman	Pratt	Wilt, W. W.
Fee	Lincoln	Prendergast	Wojdak
Fisher	Lynch	Pyles	Worrlow
Flaherty	Manderino	Reed	Yahner
Fryer	McCall	Renninger	Zeller
Gallagher	McClatchy	Renwick	Zwinkl
Garzia	McGraw	Richardson	
Gelsler	McIntyre	Rieger	Fineman, Speaker
George	McLane	Ritter	
Giammarco			

NOT VOTING—22

Bellommi	Gleeson	Rappaport	Tayoun
Blackwell	Gring	Rhodes	Thomas
Brunner	Hammock	Saloom	Valicenti
Caputo	Hutchinson, W.	Salvatore	Wagner
Dininni	Laudadio	Sweeney	Zearfoss
Fawcett	Mullen, M. P.		

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?

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

Amend Sec. 2, page 20, by inserting between lines 15 and 16: For payment to Temple University to cover the hospital deficit, an amount not to exceed 3,000,000
Amend Sec. 2, page 26, line 30, by striking out "922,694,000" and inserting: 919,694,000

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

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

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, several years ago there was a change in the presidency of Temple University and, much to his chagrin as he reviewed the budget of the first year of his presidency, he found out that there was an accumulative operating deficit at Temple University of somewhere in the neighborhood of \$24 million, caused in its entirety by the operation of the Temple University Hospital.

Dr. Wachman spoke to me and he spoke to the other

chairmen of the Appropriations Committees in the House and the Senate. He spoke to the Budget Office and he spoke to the Governor. The Governor at that point appointed a seven-man committee, made up of the four Appropriations Committees chairmen of the House and Senate, two members of the public from Philadelphia, and asked his then-medical adviser, Dr. Bachman, to be chairman. This committee has met on numerous occasions, has hired a consulting firm, and is now ready to report.

Since the deficit was first discovered, it has now increased to just about \$30 million, and the projection in the future will be a continuing accumulation of deficit from here on in.

A recommendation is going to be made which is twofold. It is not an easy recommendation to be made and it will be less easy for the members of this General Assembly to accept. One part of it is going to be the acquiring of the hospital by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with a sizable outlay in capital funds, and the other is going to be meeting a continuing annual deficit to keep this hospital operating. The decisions were very few, two, in fact: one, to let the hospital close; two, to keep it open. And to keep it open, this is the result.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment I am offering today is for \$3 million made to the Department of Health to meet an anticipated accumulated deficit for the fiscal year 1975-76 for Temple University Hospital. And, Mr. Speaker, this is of such serious nature that the final payroll of June of this year cannot be met because of the cash position that Temple University Hospital finds itself in. I have tried to maintain my fiscal responsibility by taking this money from elsewhere in the budget, and the question is where, and I have taken it from the cash-grants part of public assistance.

Now that is not as bad as it sounds for two reasons: First of all, as we calculate the need for the projected case load for 1975-76 for cash grants, our figure is that there is an additional \$20 million in there over what is needed. In talking to some members on the other side who have made a similar calculation, they feel it would be somewhat less. But they also feel that there is additional money in there, and since most of this deficit has been caused because the people who utilize this hospital, in many instances if not most instances, are welfare patients and medicare patients, this is a proper place for this money to come from. Mr. Speaker, I ask for support of this very crucial amendment.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this amendment. Temple University Hospital, which is in desperate financial straits in the city of Philadelphia, as Mr. Seltzer indicated earlier, has put together a blue-ribbon committee. They have met on numerous occasions and, in fact, are in the very final stages of their deliberations as to how to solve the problem with Temple University Hospital.

I am not insensitive to the problem of the Temple University Hospital, and I am really not trying to avoid our responsibility. Last year the appropriation to Temple University Hospital was made through one of the non-preferred appropriations. What Mr. Seltzer is now suggesting is that an appropriation be made to the Health Department which increases that \$2½ million to \$3 million, and takes that by cutting the cash grants to

public assistance by \$3 million or roughly doing away with the 1-percent increase that we had talked about yesterday or the day before.

Now what I am suggesting, because of the enormity of the problem with Temple University Hospital, is this: I think it is appropriate for us to wait for what recommendations they do come up with in order to solve the problems that Temple University Hospital is facing. I suggest the vehicle that we can use to speak to that problem is, again, a nonpreferred appropriation.

For us to move at this point would do away with all the time and effort and all the work that has been put in by the blue-ribbon committee. I again stress that it is really appropriate for us to wait and see what kind of conclusions, what kind of recommendations, they do come up with. We have a vehicle to handle those recommendations via the nonpreferred appropriation, and I would suggest that this matter be defeated and a "nay" vote cast on Mr. Seltzer's amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Centre, Mr. Letterman.

Mr. LETTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I interrogate Mr. Seltzer, please?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Lebanon, Mr. Seltzer, consent to interrogation?

Mr. SELTZER. I shall, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. LETTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, can you tell me if this deficit is because of lack of collecting from the hospital patients?

Mr. SELTZER. No, Mr. Speaker. Let me say a few more words other than just "no." As in all hospitals, there is always a percentage of the case load which are noncollectible bills. That is not the problem at Temple. The problem at Temple is that the bills that are being paid from medicaid, third-party payments, are not sufficient to meet the needs or the costs of operating the hospital. This hospital probably serves more poor people than any hospital in Pennsylvania. This is a very unique situation, and here I find this unique for me, to be standing here as a rural Pennsylvanian debating a city problem.

But after our investigations, I have been sold on the fact that the only two alternatives we have are let it close or fund it. And we cannot let that hospital close. It is the only institution for medical care for several millions of people in the northern Philadelphia area.

Mr. LETTERMAN. Could you tell me if this expense is occurring because they allow medicare patients to stay over the limited time? Did you research this far enough to find out how many millions they did not collect last year alone, and if these were from people of well-to-do families that could have paid?

Mr. SELTZER. The consulting firm that made an in-depth study of the operation of Temple Hospital has compiled all of this information, and I will be very happy to make this information available to the gentleman.

There were not very many wealthy families who went to Temple, but there were people who had means of paying for insurance and went there without insurance when they would have been demanded by another hospital to pay.

Mr. LETTERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Seltzer.

May I make a comment?

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

Mr. SELTZER. In response to Mr. Wojdak, apparently because he has been so busy preparing the budget, he has not been quite as involved in the last several weeks as I have in this study. The study has been completed. The recommendations are being made. In fact, when the other body introduced the Temple Non-preferred appropriations bill, they kept out of that bill an appropriation for the Temple University Hospital, anticipating that when this budget is finally resolved, some positive action will be taken for Temple University.

I will be perfectly honest, if this amendment passes today, I would be surprised. Not because the majority of the members will not eventually pass this amendment, but it was sprung on you. This is a serious matter of dire consequences, costing a heck of a lot of money, and this General Assembly in their wisdom many times mulls these things over in their minds and comes up with a good answer eventually. I know that this General Assembly this year will do the same thing.

Whether you vote "yes" today or you vote "yes" next week, it really does not matter. I can only assure you that before this budget is wrapped up for 1975-76, some positive program will have been adopted by this General Assembly and I would hope that we could begin by adopting it today.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Centre, Mr. Letterman.

Mr. LETTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just one comment. You know, a lot of us do not have a state hospital in our areas and a lot of our people, poor or otherwise, have to furnish payment when they go to these hospitals. I feel that it is an absolute obligation of these state hospitals to start collecting. We have seen, in the past, hospitals that I know of that left bills run for people who were able to pay, did not collect them, and we had to appoint special people to go out and make collections.

At Philipsburg State Hospital in Centre county, in particular, I know about this. For 9 years the bills kept dropping off. No one was collecting them and they sent a collector out, and out of \$987,000 in back bills, they were able to collect \$736,000 of that money.

I think that it is an absolute obligation of these hospitals to do a job and these schools to quit thinking that we are just going to take care of their problems every time they come up. It is unfair to the rest of the people of Pennsylvania that do not have a state hospital in their area to continue to provide free medical assistance to these people. Thank you.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Seltzer indicated that the studies have been done and we are awaiting the recommendations of that committee. Now many long hours went into looking at this problem at Temple University. I think that it is really premature on Mr. Seltzer's part to move on it in this direction at this point. There just seems to be no reason for us to act at this stage until those conclusions and recommendations of that blue-ribbon committee are made. If in fact the recommendation is for this amount, we can fund that via one of the nonpreferred appropriations rather than putting it into this budget, into the Health Department budget. It just makes absolutely no sense for me to move as Mr. Seltzer is suggesting that we do move today, until those recommendations are made.

I am not certain what he is trying to do here. I think that he is guessing at an amount rather than taking the conclusions that the committee has made, so that we can solve that problem, not only for the fiscal year, but give it the long-range solution that it needs.

Everything that he says about the hospital is true. It is in very desperate straits, yet it is very desperately needed in that area of Philadelphia which it serves. I would suggest to the membership that they reject this amendment and await those conclusions and take this matter up at a later date, still within this fiscal year.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Erie, Mr. DiCarlo.

Mr. DiCARLO. Mr. Speaker, presently the Health and Welfare Committee has been holding public hearings on House bill No. 853, the comprehensive health care package.

The problem that Mr. Seltzer alludes to indeed, is a very dire problem, because we have heard testimony in the Philadelphia area about the financial problems revolving around Temple, and it was inferred that the problem is because of the location of the hospital and the many poor people that the hospital services. But the problem that exists there also exists throughout the Commonwealth. All the hospitals are experiencing the high amount of cost because of utilities and other concerns in their operation. All the hospitals are experiencing a certain percentage, and that percentage is constant in bad debts and noncollectible expenses.

The third thing that I think we have to look at if we are going to solve the problem, not for Temple but for all the hospitals in the Commonwealth, we ought to look at the amount that we are reimbursing for third-party payers, and that is the medicare reimbursement. That amount that we are giving the hospital for medicated patients is too low.

You gave two alternatives: we either have to close Temple or we have to give funds to run that institution from the General Assembly. I think that the third alternative is to revamp and relook at the structure on medicaid payments. Not only will that help Temple, but it is going to help hospitals throughout the Commonwealth to make sure that we can provide services for those people. Mr. Speaker, as a result of that, I would urge this assembly to vote against this amendment.

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

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Erie, let me say that very point was taken into consideration. In fact, the prime mover of the legislation which was referred to was the chairman of the committee, Dr. Bachman. He concurs with the other members of the committee that there are two alternatives, neither of which is necessarily good. But there is only one that will keep the hospital going.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

YEAS—65

Anderson, J. H.	Haskell	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Smith, L.
Beren	Hayes, D. S.	Moehlmann	Spencer
Bittle	Hepford	O'Connell	Taddonio

Brandt	Hill	Pancoast	Turner
Burns	Hutchinson, W.	Parker, H. S.	Ustynoski
Butera	Katz	Perri	Vroon
Cimini	Kistler	Pitts	Weidner
Crawford	Klingaman	Polite	Westerberg
Davies	Kusse	Pyles	Whelan
Foster, A.	Lehr	Renninger	Whittlesey
Foster, W.	Lynch	Ryan	Wilson
Gallen	Manmiller	Scheaffer	Wilt, R. W.
Gleason	McClatchy	Scirica	Wilt, W. W.
Grieco	McCue	Seltzer	Worrlow
Halverson	McGinnis	Sirianni	Wright
Hamilton, J. H.	Mebus	Smith, E.	Yohn
Hasay			

NAYS—117

Abraham	Fryer	McCall	Ross
Arthurs	Gallagher	McGraw	Ruggiero
Barber	Garzia	McIntyre	Saloom
Bennett	Geesey	McLane	Schmitt
Berlin	Geisler	Menhorn	Schweder
Berson	George	Milanovich	Shane
Bonetto	Giammarco	Miller, M. E.	Shelhamer
Bradley	Gillespie	Milliron	Shelton
Brunner	Gillette	Miscevich	Shuman
Cessar	Goodman	Morris	Shupnik
Cohen	Green	Mrkonic	Stahl
Cole	Hayes, S. E.	Mullen	Stapleton
Cowell	Hopkins	Musto	Stout
Cumberland	Hutchinson, A.	Myers	Sullivan
Davis, D. M.	Irvins	Novak	Taylor
DeMedio	Itkin	Noye	Toll
Deverter	Johnson, J.	O'Brien	Trello
Dicarlo	Kelly, A. P.	O'Donnell	Vann
DiDonato	Kelly, J. B.	O'Keefe	Walsh, T. P.
Dietz	Kernick	Oliver	Wansacz
Dombrowski	Knepper	Perry	Wargo
Dorr	Kolter	Petrarca	Wojdak
Doyle	Kowalshyn	Pratt	Yahner
Dreibelbis	LaMarca	Prendergast	Zeller
Eckensberger	Laughlin	Reed	Zord
Englehart	Lederer	Renwick	Zwikl
Fee	Letterman	Richardson	
Fischer	Levi	Rieger	Fineman,
Fisher	Lincoln	Ritter	Speaker
Flaherty	Manderino	Romanelli	

NOT VOTING—21

Bellomini	Greenfield	Pievsky	Tayoun
Blackwell	Gring	Rappaport	Thomas
Caputo	Hammock	Rhodes	Valicent
Dininni	Laudadio	Salvatore	Wagner
Fawcett	Mullen, M. P.	Sweeney	Zearfoss
Gleason			

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

Amend Sec. 2, page 23, line 10, by striking out "7,282,000" and inserting: 7,531,000

Amend Sec. 2, page 28, line 5, by striking out "44,643,000" and inserting: 44,394,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment pertains to the Department of Military Affairs. I am asking for an increase of \$249,000 to the general government line of the department.

Mr. Speaker, again, I am not adding to the budget, but I am transferring \$249,000 in this amendment from general government of the Department of Revenue, which adds something over 10 percent to the Department of Military Affairs.

This may sound like a parochial amendment because Indiantown Gap happens to be in Lebanon county. It is not in my legislative district, but I am very familiar with the installation.

There are several things which I think are very pertinent and which deserve your consideration in making up your minds on how you will vote on this amendment.

Just opened at Indiantown Gap within the last 30 days is probably the most up-to-date modern helicopter operation in this country. To fund that with the additional personnel that are needed will take more money than is currently in the budget. To carry the present complement forward in the department will cost an additional amount of money than is in the budget.

As a third very pertinent item, today there are over 15,000 Vietnamese and Cambodian refugees at the Gap, plus supporting Federal military personnel. Very luckily for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, this throws very little burden on the Commonwealth. But just being a part of this entire operation has also increased slightly the cost of doing business at Indiantown Gap Military Reservation.

With these three points, which I think justify more than necessary, I think it is very important that this small amount, \$249,000, be given. I ask the members to support this amendment.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, this cut of \$249,000 that was made in the military really does not represent a cut. In checking the mathematics of their personnel needs, a mistake was made in the amount of \$249,000. This does not represent any cut in their operating budget, any cut of personnel. It in no way speaks to that. It is a pure mathematical error that we discovered in the Governor's budget document, which has been admitted to by the Governor's budget office.

In checking the personnel needs with the Department of Military Affairs, they have also indicated that it represents only a mathematical error.

Now, Mr. Seltzer referred to the new helicopter facility in Indiantown Gap. We were aware of that. In fact, it is going to take 15 new employes. That is provided for in the general-operations amount. Those employes will be funded 75 percent by the Federal Government and 25 percent through our funds. That represents \$38,000 which is included in the general-government operations budget.

This cut of \$249,000 in no way affects that, in no way affects their budget. In fact, this is one of the few budgets that was not touched at all. There has been no cut made. This represents only a mathematical error.

I would suggest that the membership vote in the negative.

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

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong it, but it is very simple mathematics. Out of a \$7-million budget, what is before you today is an increase as proposed by Mr. Wojdak of only \$363,000. Now that additional \$363,000 is supposed to carry the current complement forward, which it cannot possibly do by itself, pay the 25 percent of the 15 Federal technicians. That is the Commonwealth's cost, with the Federal Government picking up the other 75 percent. And there is one other

item that I had forgotten. Because of all of this helicopter activity, apparently there are a lot of mercy missions being flown with nonmilitary personnel aboard. They have asked and requested and told us about the seriousness of the nature and that they should be funded with liability insurance in case of any accidents in these mercy missions.

The fourth and very important item, which did not come about until way after this budget was presented to us and the bills were printed and laid on our desks, and that is, the 15,000 refugees who are now there. Mr. Speaker, if you can support it, I would certainly appreciate it. I am sure the Department of Military Affairs would also. Thank you.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, all the increased activity which Mr. Seltzer refers to at Indiantown Gap is totally funded by the Federal Government. All the needs which Mr. Seltzer is speaking to are adequately provided for in this budget.

Let me stress this again. The \$249,000 represents nothing but a mathematical error. It is that pure and simple. All the needs which Mr. Seltzer refers to is taken care of in this budget. There is no need to insert an additional quarter of a million dollars. It is going to be an excess amount which was not requested by the department, which was not requested by the Governor's budget office, and it is pure and simple a mathematical error.

The things he is alluding to are adequately provided. The increased activity is being paid for by the Federal Government. There is just absolutely no need for this restoration of \$249,000.

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

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, just one final word if I may, please. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Wojdak, is wrong and, if I had 102 votes, I would prove it.

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

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

YEAS—65

Table with 4 columns of names: Anderson, J. H., Hamilton, J. H., McClatchy, Sirrianni, Beren, Haskell, McCue, Smith, E., Little, Hayes, D. S., McGinnis, Smith, L., Brandt, Hayes, S. E., Mebus, Spencer, Butera, Hepford, Miller, M. E., Jr., Stahl, Jimini, Hill, Moehlmann, Turner, Crawford, Hopkins, Noye, Ustynoski, Cumberland, Hutchinson, W., O'Connell, Vron, Davies, Katz, Pancoast, Weidner, Dietz, Kistler, Perri, Westenberg, Wischer, Klingaman, Pitts, Whelan, Foster, A., Kusse, Polite, Whittlesey, Foster, W., Lehr, Pyles, Wilt, R. W., Fallon, Levi, Ryan, Wilt, W. W., Feesey, Lynch, Scirica, Worrilow, Heason, Manmiller, Seltzer, Wright, Halverson

NAYS—120

Table with 4 columns of names: Abraham, Geisler, Milanovich, Saloom, Arthur, George, Miller, M. E., Scheaffer, Barber, Gammarco, Milliron, Schmitt, Bennett, Gillespie, Mischevich, Schweder, Berlin, Gillette, Morris, Shane

Table with 4 columns of names: Berson, Goodnan, Mrkonic, Shelhamer, Bonetto, Green, Mullen, M. P., Shelton, Bradley, Greenfield, Mullen, Shuman, Brunner, Grieco, Musto, Shupnik, Burns, Hasay, Myers, Stapieton, Cessar, Hutchinson, A., Novak, Stout, Cohen, Irvis, O'Brien, Sullivan, Cole, Itkin, O'Donnell, Taddonio, Cowell, Johnson, J., O'Keefe, Taylor, Davis, D. M., Kelly, A. P., Oliver, Toll, DeMedio, Kelly, J. B., Parker, H. S., Trello, Deverter, Kernick, Perry, Vann, Dicarlo, Knepper, Petrarca, Walsh, T. P., DiDonato, Koiter, Plevsky, Wansacz, Dombrowski, Kowalyszyn, Pratt, Wargo, Dorr, LaMarca, Prendergast, Wilson, Doyle, Laughlin, Reed, Wojdak, Dreibelbis, Lederer, Renninger, Yahner, Eckensberger, Letterman, Renwick, Yohn, Englehart, Lincoln, Richardson, Zeller, Fee, Manderino, Rieger, Zord, Fisher, McCall, Ritter, Zwiki, Flaherty, McIntyre, Romanelli, Fineman, Fryer, McGraw, Ross, Gallagher, McLane, Ruggiero, Speaker, Garzia, Menhorn

NOT VOTING—18

Table with 4 columns of names: Bellomini, Gleeson, Rhodes, Thomas, Blackwell, Gring, Salvatore, Valicenti, Caputo, Hammock, Sweeney, Wagner, Dininni, Laudadio, Tayoun, Zearfoss, Fawcett, Rappaport

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

QUESTIONS OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, on House bill No. 1207, the Mullen amendment, I pushed my button "yes," but after looking here at a copy of the roll call, I am recorded as not voting. I would like the record to show my vote should have been "yes."

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. E. H. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I voted in error. I voted "nay" on Mr. Mullen's amendment to House bill No. 1207. I would like to be recorded as voting in favor of the amendment.

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

On the question recurring,

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

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

Amend Sec. 2, page 11, by inserting between lines 12 and 13:

For the payment of subsidies to be made available to directly reduce building mortgages for the construction of new low and low-medium cost homes (range up to \$35,000) built by a qualified builder during the period of July 1, 1975 and June 30, 1976 to be administered by the Department of Community Affairs 5,000,000

For the payment of subsidies to be made available to directly reduce home buyer mortgages by 1% for newly constructed homes built under programs fostered by the Commonwealth, said homes to be constructed between July 1, 1975 and June 30, 1976 to be available on a first come basis until the fund is exhausted and administered by the Department of Community Affairs 5,000,000

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

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

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is the one which starts with section 2, page 11, with the amounts of \$5 million in both sublimes and not to be confused with the second amendment. To make sure for the members, I intend to withdraw the second amendment which refers to the amounts of \$3 million and \$2 million.

Also, I apologize for the fact that the fiscal amounts are not expressed as to where the moneys are to come from, other than in those particular projections that the Appropriations Committee chairman has alluded to that they expect as far as increases in revenue.

The design of this is to stimulate, of course, employment in the Commonwealth. We realize, of course, that by the same time the Congress of the United States is currently struggling with one of the same programs that could well dovetail with some of the provisions in these amendments to House bill No. 1336. This program is to give the private sector a quick stimulus in man years of work or the creation of new jobs with new housing starts by the end of the ensuing fiscal year. The projections on this could range as high as a potential of 37,000 jobs in the construction industry in the Commonwealth. That, of course, would be a maximal figure.

If we look at it in reality, it may well not be anywhere near that, but even half of that stimulation, of course, would be a shot in the arm to a rather dull economy or something where we are not getting the snapback that we should as far as the recession that we have gone through or are going through.

The employment figures of yesterday show again that, even though seasonally adjusted, they were off again as far as May's figures over April, even though we had more people employed in May than we had in April. This, of course, is by the fact of the adjustment in the formula.

The total jobs would give a maximal potential to the Commonwealth in a year's time of realizing some \$8 million in state income taxes that would be generated by a program of this if it had maximal results. Over \$4 million in local taxes could be realized in the ensuing fiscal year as well.

Without any other details on how it might well dovetail with the program that the Federal Government has, the Federal Government program would be for approximately 400,000 units. And if we take it based on population, we hope that with Pennsylvania getting its fair share, this would really be a stimulus to the housing industry. Thank you.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, it is a very credible proposal. It is the first time I have been made aware of it. It at no time had been suggested prior to today that this

money be put in the budget. You are talking about adding \$10 million to this budget. We just do not have the money, despite the credibility of the suggestions that are embodied in this amendment. I would suggest that we vote in the negative on it, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. SHANE. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to me that the pump-priming economics of the eminent British economist, John Maynard Keynes, which were embraced by the Democratic Party in the New Deal in the 1930's, have finally arrived at the Republican Party in the 1970's as advocated by former President Nixon and by this amendment. Unfortunately, I do not believe we have the wherewithal to prime this particular pump, and, therefore, I would urge a negative vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berks, Mr. Gallen.

Mr. GALLEN. Mr. Speaker, in the Reading Times this morning there was pictured a man who was going on the welfare rolls, a man who had worked all his life. He had been a carpenter. He has worked 3 days in the last 8 months.

Mr. Speaker, some stimulus must be given to the housing industry, and I think Mr. Davies' proposal is a valid one.

It has been my history in 11 years in this House of Representatives to oppose new spending programs. Mr. Speaker, this is a spending program which will return to this Commonwealth many more dollars than will be expended. I think that the budget, as presented by Mr. Wojdak, is a stultifying one; it is a no-game budget; it is something that is regressive and will have the effect on this Commonwealth of regression. This is, I think, one of the prime proposals that the members of this House will receive today, Mr. Speaker, and I urge support for this amendment.

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

Mr. M. E. MILLER, JR. Mr. Speaker, this morning on the way to Harrisburg, I listened to a 9 o'clock news report in which a member of the Department of Labor and Industry was announcing—in behalf of the administration, I assume—the latest unemployment figures for the Commonwealth. He cited them at 9.8 percent. And asked why or what was the most contributing factor at this current time of the year, he credited the lack of seasonal building starts that usually happen at this time of the year in the home-construction industry.

I would just like to reflect for the record that an administration spokesman is acknowledging indirectly support for the gentleman's issue, and I would encourage everyone of you to consider it on behalf of our trade unionists and private carpenters and plumbers, et cetera, throughout the Commonwealth, people who want to work but just do not have a job. Thank you.

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

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, last session we had before us a proposal which passed this House and the Senate, and the Governor was ready to sign it, which increased all mortgage rates. And the claim then was, we need this; this is what is required to stimulate home buying and

new home construction. I was mocked on this floor for trying to delay the passage of that legislation.

Now, subsequent to that, after people have been paying these higher interest rates and there is no extensive home buying, you come back to this House and you say now that we should subsidize these payments, but you do not talk to the question of eliminating that unfair, unjust increase in mortgage interest rates that you foisted on the people of Pennsylvania. I would like a response to my retort.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman want to interrogate the gentleman, Mr. Davies?

Mr. ITKIN. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Davies, respond to the question?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DAVIES. Being a new member, I certainly hope that I in no way in my former profession—I was teaching economics at the time—had fostered those increases in the rates. I do not take any claim to it. I wish I would have enjoyed some of the profits from it, sir, but I do not even hold any bank stock or realize any of those profits from it, so I cannot speak to that particular issue.

At the same time I say to Mr. Shane, I do not particularly care if it was a Roosevelt New Deal nor do I care what economist adopted it, sir; I am interested in creating jobs in the Commonwealth for Democrats, Republicans, liberals or conservatives, whatever they may be and wherever they come from. If you want to call it priming the pump, I will take hold of the handle. I will not, however, take the responsibility for the claim to increased interest rates.

I share your concerns, sir. What I am trying to do is combat those with this amendment. Thank you.

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, I could consider supporting his type of legislation, but not until those rates are reduced. Thank you.

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

Mr. SHANE. If the pump-priming would work, I might be able to support it, but we have some evidence at the Federal level that their attempt to provide the mortgage rebate, the \$2,000 mortgage rebate, and to pump additional funds into the housing market is not having the desired effect.

If I recollect, reading the financial pages of some of the major newspapers, what is happening is that the fantastic skyrocketing of the cost of building materials has put houses out of the reach of everyone, including the middle-income people, with the exception of those persons who are affluent, namely, above the \$25,000-a-year annual income. So whether we lower the mortgage interest rates, whether we try to prime the housing pump, as we have already done at the Federal level, the desired result which we all desire does not seem to be forthcoming because the fact is the price of houses themselves has skyrocketed beyond the reach of the average man, even if he does have the advantage of lower mortgage financing.

So I just submit that although this attempt I know is sincere and with goodwill and all good purposes, the Federal experience, as I recall reading the financial pages, has proved that it probably is not going to work in today's difficult economy.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Warren, Mr. Kusse.

Mr. KUSSE. Mr. Speaker, based on the average member of this House working 50 hours a week—and I believe yesterday plenty of members stood up and pointed out they worked more than that, but based on that 50 hours a week—we make approximately \$6 an hour. I would suggest that when carpenters, plumbers, electricians, and so on, are willing to work for \$6 an hour, I think there will be plenty of home-building. I suggest that we oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Speaker, there are three points that I evidently missed when I spoke to this which I would like to address to Mr. Shane as just points of clarification.

This is not to median housing; this is to low-cost and low-median housing. The limits are \$35,000, which take into consideration the most recent increases that you are speaking to. It is not designed for median housing; it is to dovetail with the Federal program.

The Federal program is still trying to get out of Congress with the problems that it has and it faces. This is, hopefully, something that would stimulate low to low-median housing in this Commonwealth, something that we vitally need; not the middle income and not median housing.

To speak to the average of this, for Mr. Kusse's information, the average and the latest figures are that it is only \$5.60 an hour, which is the average wage computed into these figures, to reach the \$400-million level that I am talking about as the potential. This does not go to any exaggerated figures and it takes into consideration all of those in the industry. It is not that kind of substantial amount that you are talking to. It talks to both union and nonunion contractors and it strikes a mean or an average to that point. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

YEAS—55

Abraham	Hasay	Moehlmann	Spencer
Anderson, J. H.	Haskell	Noye	Stahl
Beren	Hayes, D. S.	O'Connell	Turner
Bittle	Hepford	Pancoast	Ustynoski
Brandt	Hill	Parker, H. S.	Weidner
Burns	Hopkins	Polite	Westerberg
Butera	Hutchinson, W.	Pyles	Whelan
Cimlini	Katz	Reed	Wilson
Davies	Klingaman	Renninger	Wilt, R. W.
Fischer	Lynch	Ryan	Wilt, W. W.
Gallen	Manmiller	Scirica	Worrlow
Gillespie	McGinnis	Strianni	Wright
Gleason	Mebus	Smith, E.	Yohn
Halverson	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Smith, L.	

NAYS—127

Arthurs	Garzia	McCall	Ross
Barber	Geesey	McClatchy	Ruggiero
Bennett	Geisler	McCue	Saloom
Berlin	George	McGraw	Scheffer
Berson	Giammarco	McIntyre	Schmitt
Bonetto	Gillette	McLane	Schweder
Bradley	Goodman	Menhorn	Shane
Brunner	Green	Miller, M. E.	Shelhamer
Cessar	Greenfield	Milliron	Shelton
Cohen	Grieco	Miscevich	Shuman
Cole	Hamilton, J. H.	Morris	Shupnik
Cowell	Hayes, S. E.	Mrkonjic	Stapleton
Crawford	Hutchinson, A.	Mullen, M. P.	Stout

Cumberland	Irvis	Mullen	Sullivan
Davis, D. M.	Itkin	Musto	Taddonio
DeMedio	Johnson, J.	Myers	Taylor
Deverter	Kelly, A. P.	Novak	Toll
Dicarlo	Kelly, J. B.	O'Brien	Trello
DiDonato	Kernick	O'Donnell	Vann
Dietz	Kistler	O'Keefe	Vroon
Dombrowski	Knepper	Oliver	Walsh, T. P.
Dorr	Kolter	Perri	Wansacz
Doyle	Kowalyshyn	Perry	Wargo
Dreibelbis	Kusse	Petrarca	Whittlesey
Eckensberger	LaMarca	Pievsky	Wojdak
Engelhart	Laughlin	Pitts	Yahner
Fee	Lederer	Prendergast	Zeller
Fisher	Lehr	Renwick	Zord
Flaherty	Letterman	Richardson	Zwikel
Foster, A.	Levi	Rieger	
Foster, W.	Lincoln	Ritter	Fineman,
Fryer	Manderino	Romanelli	Speaker
Callagher			

NOT VOTING—21

Bellomini	Gring	Rappaport	Tayoun
Blackwell	Hamnock	Rhodes	Thomas
Caputo	Laudadio	Salvatore	Valicenti
Dininni	Milanovich	Seltzer	Wagner
Fawcett	Pratt	Sweneey	Zearfoss
Gleeson			

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?

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

Amend Sec. 2, page 32, line 9, by striking out "1,144,-000" and inserting: 1,044,000

Amend Sec. 2, page 44, by inserting between lines 29 and 30:

For a joint committee of the House and Senate to study all depressed and distressed industry in the Commonwealth for the purpose of stimulating the same and creating employment for the people of the Commonwealth, with the first order of consideration being the housing industry 100,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to section 2, page 32, line 9, in which we strike out \$1,144,-000 and insert \$1,044,000, so that we do our economy at home from the printing and those incidental expenses to provide for the moneys for this study, which I think is one of the most crucial that this House can undertake.

The second part of it, on page 44, inserts between lines 29 and 30: "For a joint committee of the House and Senate to study all depressed and distressed industry in the Commonwealth for the purpose of stimulating the same and creating employment for the people of the Commonwealth, with the first order of consideration being the housing industry."

And I would like to say again, parenthetically, that it would dovetail with the Federal program; not that of median housing but of low-income and low-median housing. I have nothing more than that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment. The Committee on Federal-State Relations issued a preliminary report to the members of the

House of Representatives wherein we have taken advantage of any number of reports that have already been issued in terms of stimulating the economy. I also have a report from the Budget Office wherein they talk about some of the problems in industry today and the reasons for the position they find themselves in.

I guess what I am trying to illustrate is that we really do not need to take the money out of the budget and create a special committee at the moment to study all depressed and distressed industry. What we need to do is to take advantage of the reports that have already been issued and act on some of those recommendations.

If we do that and do it within the next few weeks, I think we can help to stimulate the economy to a great deal that way. Therefore, I would oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, I do not have a copy of Mr. Davies' amendment, but in listening to him, what he is doing, it appears, is cutting \$100,000 from the House incidental account which is used to fund the standing committees of this House. He is taking that \$100,000 and applying it to his suggestion of a joint committee to study the housing industry.

Now I do not know why the matter of studying the distressed and depressed conditions in the housing industry cannot be handled by one of our standing committees. I think it really is unfair to fund the committee to this amount of \$100,000 at the expense of the account that pays for all of our standing committees. I would oppose the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I would inform the membership of this House that Mr. Davies' points are well taken. However, I would invite the gentleman, if he would care to, to attend a meeting that is scheduled for July 9 with the Secretary of Community Affairs, directed to exactly what you are talking about, Mr. Speaker.

I think that the Subcommittee on Housing under the Business and Commerce Committee has been actively searching for answers concerning the housing industry. The Governor has asked for 100,000 new starts in his administration. I think that is quite a bit to ask for. I think it is needed. I would invite the gentleman, if he cares to join with us in that meeting. I am sure you are sincere in your efforts, but I do feel that this amendment ought to be defeated.

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

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Speaker, I have but two replies: The \$100,000 is taken from the increase of \$100,000 over last year's amounts fixed.

I would be glad to accept your invitation, Mr. Speaker with its intent. July is fine. It is a relative date. But why in the world are we sitting here spending all of this time, all of these hours, over \$4.7 billion, when we should be speaking to jobs for Pennsylvanians? We should be talking to the issue in this particular budget not delaying, not taking more studies, going over, and taking additional studies. What we should be doing is talking to the creation of jobs in this particular budget. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

YEAS—67

Abraham	Gallen	McClatchy	Seltzer
Anderson, J. H.	Geesey	McGinnis	Sirianni
Beren	Gleason	Mebus	Smith, L.
Bittle	Halverson	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Spencer
Brandt	Hamilton, J. H.	Moehlmann	Stahl
Burns	Haskell	Noye	Taddonio
Butera	Hayes, D. S.	O'Connell	Turner
Cimini	Hayes, S. E.	Pancoast	Ustynoski
Crawford	Hepford	Parker, H. S.	Vroon
Cumberland	Hill	Perri	Westerberg
Davies	Hopkins	Pitts	Wilson
Deverter	Katz	Polite	Wilt, R. W.
Dorr	Klingaman	Pyles	Wilt, W. W.
Dietz	Kusse	Ranninger	WorriLOW
Fischer	Levi	Ryan	Wright
Foster, A.	Lynch	Scheaffer	Yohn
Foster, W.	Manmiller	Scirica	

NAYS—115

Arthurs	Gillette	McLane	Schmitt
Barber	Goodman	Menhorn	Schweder
Bennett	Green	Milanovich	Shane
Berlin	Greenfield	Miller, M. E.	Shelhamer
Berson	Grieco	Milliron	Shelton
Bonetto	Hasay	Miscevich	Shuman
Bradley	Hutchinson, A.	Morris	Shupnik
Brunner	Hutchinson, W.	Mrkonjic	Smith, E.
Cessar	Iris	Mullen, M. P.	Stapleton
Cohen	Itkin	Mullen	Stout
Cole	Johnson, J.	Musto	Sullivan
Cowell	Kelly, A. P.	Myers	Taylor
Davis, D. M.	Kelly, J. B.	O'Brien	Toll
DeMedio	Kernick	O'Donnell	Trello
Dicarlo	Kistler	O'Keefe	Valicenti
DiDonato	Knepper	Oliver	Vann
Doyle	Kolter	Perry	Walsh, T. P.
Dreibelbis	Kowalshyn	Petrarca	Wansacz
Eckensberger	LaMarca	Pratt	Wargo
Engelhart	Laughlin	Prendergast	Weidner
Fee	Lederer	Reed	Whittlesey
Fisher	Lehr	Renwick	Wojciak
Flaherty	Letterman	Richardson	Yahner
Fryer	Lincoln	Rieger	Zeller
Gallagher	Manderino	Ritter	Zord
Garzia	McCall	Romanelli	Zwilk
Geisler	McCue	Ross	
George	McGraw	Ruggiero	Fineman, Speaker
Giammarco	McIntyre	Saloom	
Gillespie			

NOT VOTING—21

Bellomini	Gleeson	Pievsky	Tayoun
Blackwell	Gring	Rappaport	Thomas
Caputo	Hammock	Rhodes	Wagner
Dininni	Laudadio	Salvatore	Whelan
Dombrowski	Novak	Sweeney	Zearfoss
Fawcett			

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

HOUSE SCHEDULE AND DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, we are close to the hour of 12. It was my intention to run until 12 and break for lunch, but I suggest that we stop now for a lunch break. We will be back on the floor at 1:30.

For the Democrats, there will be a caucus at 1 o'clock promptly in the majority caucus room. I would be delighted to see all Democratic chairmen present as well as other Democratic members, but particularly the

chairmen I would like to see at 1 o'clock, please. We will be back on the floor at 1:30.

NO REPUBLICAN CAUCUS ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, there is no need for a Republican caucus. We will return to the floor at 1:30.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. This House now stands in recess until 1:30 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The time of recess having expired, the House was called to order.

THE SPEAKER (Herbert Fineman) IN THE CHAIR

CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL No. 1336 RESUMED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is about to resume deliberations on House bill No. 1336 and the amendments thereto.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. SHANE.

Mr. SHANE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The good news is that amendment No. 1, amendment No. 2, amendment No. 3, amendment No. 4, are withdrawn. The bad news is that I am going to offer amendment No. 5.

Perhaps the clerk would like to read amendment No. 5 to observe the parliamentary niceties.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

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

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

Amend Sec. 2, page 11, line 20, by striking out "13,447,000" and inserting: 13,204,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. It is the intention of the Chair to run until 5 o'clock this evening and then break off. If the members will give their rapt attention to the speakers, we can move along expeditiously.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. SHANE.

Mr. SHANE. I will settle for a state of "awakedness" rather than rapt.

This amendment is on page 11, line 20, of the bill. It proposes to reduce the appropriation for general government in the Department of Education from \$13,447,000 to \$13,204,000. The reason for this proposal is that the Department of Education has recommended approximately a 9-percent budget increase for the state colleges—well, excuse me—the state colleges are due to

get in this budget a 9-percent increase. Pitt, Penn State, Temple and Lincoln, I understand, in the nonpreferred appropriation bills are due to get about a 9-percent appropriation increase. I do not see why the Department of Education should get a 13-percent appropriation increase. Therefore, I offer this amendment to reduce the department's appropriation to an overall increase of 10 percent.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment. I am particularly impressed with the amendment in that the gentleman has not tried to give any other rational approach for the reduction. I think that is wise, because you cannot. However, when people are hired in this particular department, there is no rationale behind their additional hiring, and I think the only way we are ever going to corral it is to treat it exactly in the same manner, and that is, to reduce it and make them live with it.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, I do not consider that a rational approach. To me it would seem to be an arbitrary across-the-board cut without looking at the various components that make up that general government operation.

Mr. Speaker, we have cut from the Governor's budget request \$150,000. We derived that cut by looking at the various components within the general government operation, by looking at its payroll costs, its general operating costs; we squeezed the contracts as tightly as possible. We have squeezed this entire appropriation for general operation. We have laced it up as tightly as we think it can be laced, and, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend a negative vote on this.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman, Mr. Wojdak, explain to the House what the Education Department is going to do with a 13-percent increase and how much of that money is going to be used to hire new people?

We know that there is a need for an increase to cover increased costs of salaries, social security, fringe benefits, et cetera. Now it appears that that which exceeds that amount can go only in one direction, and I question that we need more people layered on top of all the other people who are over there whom we call administrators.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, in the general operating budget, they suffer the same kind of inflationary costs that everyone does. There has been a substantial increase consistent with inflation.

In addition, Blue Cross and Blue Shield rates have been up for those employees. That alone is causing a \$150,000 increase, and I could run through the whole gamut of increases in operation expenses. But let me make one thing clear. It does not provide for one additional payroll slot in this increase that we have given to the Department of Education in this general operation budget.

One of the reasons for this increase that the Governor has indicated here is the general government operation. We thought it did not have to go as high as he had recommended. We had made a \$150,000 cut here. To cut it as the Shane amendment is attempting to do, I think you would be cutting, at that point, into personnel and severely affecting some of their operating costs.

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

Mr. SHANE. This body decided, by a heartening margin, to require the state colleges to retrench by 5 percent even though they are going to get a 9-percent appropriation increase. It is my understanding that the Senate is going to require the state-related institutions to retrench by 5 percent even though they get a 9-percent appropriation increase. It seems to me not irrational to require the Department of Education itself to retrench a bit even though they would get a 10-percent appropriation increase.

The chairman has said that we have laced this particular item up as tightly as we can. It is my personal belief that the General Assembly of Pennsylvania can lace this one up a little tighter, and I ask you to vote for the amendment, please.

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

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

YEAS—131

Abraham	Fryer	Manmiller	Shane
Anderson, J. H.	Gallen	McClatchy	Shelhamer
Arthurs	Garzia	McCue	Shuman
Bellomini	Geesey	McGinnis	Sirianni
Bennett	Gillespie	Mebus	Smith, E.
Beren	Gillette	Menhorn	Smith, L.
Bittle	Gleason	Miller, M. E.	Spencer
Bonetto	Goodman	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Stahl
Bradley	Grieco	Milliron	Stapleton
Brandt	Halverson	Miscevich	Sullivan
Burns	Hamilton, J. H.	Moehlmann	Taddonio
Butera	Hasay	Morris	Taylor
Cessar	Haskell	Mrkonic	Turner
Cimini	Hayes, S. E.	Mullen	Ustynoski
Cole	Hepford	Novak	Valicenti
Cowell	Hill	Noye	Vroon
Crawford	Hopkins	O'Connell	Wagner
Cumberland	Hutchinson, W.	O'Keefe	Wansacz
Davies	Itkin	Pancoast	Weidner
Davis, D. M.	Katz	Parker, H. S.	Westerberg
Deverter	Kelly, J. B.	Perri	Whelan
Dicarlo	Kernick	Pitts	Whittlesey
Dietz	Kistler	Polite	Wilson
Dorr	Klingaman	Pyles	Wilt, R. W.
Doyle	Knepper	Reed	Wilt, W. W.
Dreibelbis	Kusse	Renninger	WorriLOW
Eckensberger	Laughlin	Ritter	Wright
Fee	Lederer	Romanelli	Yahner
Fischer	Lehr	Ryan	Yohn
Fisher	Letterman	Scheaffer	Zeller
Flaherty	Levi	Schweder	Zord
Foster, A.	Lincoln	Scirica	Zwinkl
Foster, W.	Lynch	Seltzer	

NAYS—55

Barber	Hammock	Musto	Saloom
Berlin	Hayes, D. S.	Myers	Schmitt
Berson	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien	Shelton
Blackwell	Irvis	O'Donnell	Shupnik
Brunner	Johnson, J.	Oliver	Stout
DeMedio	Kelly, A. P.	Perry	Toll
DiDonato	Kowalshyn	Petrarca	Trello
Dombrowski	LaMarca	Pratt	Vann
Englehart	Manderino	Prendergast	Walsh, T. P.
Gallagher	McCall	Renwick	Wargo
Geisler	McGraw	Richardson	Wojdak
George	McIntyre	Rieger	

Giammarco Green Greenfield	McLane Milanovich	Ross Ruggiero	Fineman, Speaker
----------------------------------	----------------------	------------------	---------------------

NOT VOTING—17

Caputo Cohen Dininni Fawcett Gleeson	Gring Kolter Laudadio Mullen, M. P.	Pievsky Rappaport Rhodes Salvatore	Sweeney Tayoun Thomas Zearfoss
--	--	---	---

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

Amend Sec. 2, page 11, by inserting between lines 28 and 29:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other act every 30 days the Secretary of Education shall transmit to the chairpersons of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and the chairpersons of the House and Senate Education Committees a list of persons who are proposed for employment in a position whose salary exceeds \$14,000 per year, within the Department of Education at any State-owned college or university.

In addition to the name of the proposed employees and the proposed compensation, the list shall contain a brief job description and a justification for the proposed employment.

The list of proposed employees required under this section shall be effective at the end of the first period of 12 legislative days unless after the date of transmittal and the passage of the 12 legislative days either house passes a resolution by a two-thirds vote stating in substance the House or Senate does not approve all or any of the proposed contracts of employment listed therein.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. SHANE. Thank you, colleagues. This is a heartening beginning.

CONSTITUTIONAL POINT OF ORDER

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KOWALYSHYN. This appears to be a substantive type of proposal which is not regularly part of an appropriation bill. I question the regularity of this kind of a proposal and would like to request permission of the Chair to move that it is out of order and not properly a part of an appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The point of order that the gentleman raises is a point well taken. The Speaker had made reference to it yesterday. In essence, you cannot, by a rider to a general appropriation bill, alter, modify, repeal, or in any way amend other existing law by a rider to a general appropriation bill.

However, since you are raising the matter of constitutionality—and I might say that three separate Attorneys General of this state have repeatedly and consistently held that such a rider is unconstitutional and

is a nullity—the Speaker will refer the matter to the House for a decision.

I would hope that the members would vote, not in accordance with what they would like to see in the bill nor the direction that the merits of this bill takes but, rather, I would hope that they would vote in accordance with what is the law.

Mr. SHANE. Will I have the opportunity to comment on this, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for that purpose at this point. Upon the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks, the Chair will refer the matter to the House for a decision.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Shane.

Mr. SHANE. I argued the other day that I believe the General Assembly can attach conditions to the appropriation of money, and I cited the Mullen amendment relating to birth-control information in state-aided hospitals and the precedent of the Snyder amendment. It is, therefore, my feeling that we can exercise our legislative oversight function by attaching a condition to the appropriation bill that would require the Secretary of Education to report all proposed employment contracts involving salaries that exceed \$14,000 per year.

I would, therefore, submit that this is constitutional and, if there is a vote on the constitutionality of this amendment No. 6, I would urge the members to vote to uphold its constitutionality.

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

Mr. GREENFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am not an attorney and I will not speak directly to the constitutionality question, however, it appears to me that the constitution is set to provide certain limits and guidelines and rules.

What we are doing here is adding more chaos to a chaotic situation. If we are going to permit such kind of substantive language to be placed in budget bills now and in the future, I can visualize total, absolute chaos. Every item that anyone wants to interject, as far as amendments are concerned, to restrict their pet project or their pet language, can be supplied as we see on our desk today.

I think that we ought to face up to this issue very squarely. The budget bill, as we know it traditionally and habitually, deals with figures and money appropriations and not with substantive language as this particular amendment does.

I think that this is the wrong place. I think that the budget process, as Mr. Butera has tried to clear up in the past, is in enough of a chaotic position. I think that if we are going to set a precedent as we are doing this year by allowing these kinds of amendments to be interjected into the budget, we are not going to see any end to the kinds of problems we have now.

I ask each and every member who is interested in good legislative processes to vote that these amendments are not constitutional. Thank you.

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

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was yesterday that I made quite a detailed argument to the House on precisely the same point. I cited the Attorneys General's opinions of the Commonwealth regarding

Article III of the Constitution which prohibits this type of rider. The history of the Attorneys General's opinions is clear.

On the several occasions that the Attorneys General have had to strike this language or deem by official opinion that this language was ineffectual and does not belong in an appropriation bill and, therefore, does not have to be followed by the department, the reasoning came to light in those opinions, and I would like to share it with you.

The reasoning is that to attach this kind of provision or any kind of provision, which might have perhaps doubtful merit, by the amendment process in an appropriation bill, really forces a change in substantive law without the necessary 102 votes or the constitutional majority necessary to change those particular laws.

What you are doing is attaching a rider to an appropriation bill which many of the members of the Assembly would hesitate to vote against on final passage because of the necessity of funding all of the departments and all of the various programs that are contained in a general appropriation bill. Each of the attorneys general's opinions which struck down this kind of language indicated that it was precisely for that reason, that we would not allow a rider to change substantive law of the Commonwealth in a general appropriation bill, which, of necessity, garners votes from persons who must vote for various programs in that appropriation bill and perhaps would not vote for this particular rider if it stood on its own in bill form and needed the constitutional majority of 102.

Now as I said when the matter was discussed previously, there may be significant merit to the conditions that we attempt to attach, regardless of the section of the budget that we want to attach it to, but that particular legislation or legislative language ought to come on its own in bill form before the General Assembly so that when we vote on the issue on final passage, we have pinpointed the question before us.

And this is the reason that all of these rider type provisions have been held to be unconstitutional, because they allow, without the constitutional majority, measures to be adopted by the General Assembly changing or affecting existing law without the required number of votes.

I would suggest, as the previous speaker suggested, that we not vote on the particular issue of constitutionality on whether or not we believe it would be good for the Department of Education to make these kinds of reports. If we honestly believe that they should make these kinds of reports, and if we want them to make those kinds of reports, we can certainly pass a bill to that effect. We should not coattail it onto a general appropriation in a manner which has clearly been indicated to be unconstitutional. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. SHELHAMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this amendment and I rise to support it for this reason: I do not think it is unconstitutional. I do not visualize the contents of this amendment as substantially or materially changing the law.

I believe what Mr. Shane's amendment is speaking to, however, though, is that the amount of funding that is contained in this general appropriation bill shall be ex-

pendent only under certain conditions. Now those conditions are that the Education Committees in the House and the Senate be apprised, in this case by reports, of all the people employed in that area earning over a certain dollar figure.

I do not look on that as a substantive change in the law. I do not think it is, and I, personally, would hope that the members of the House would support this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Northampton, Mr. Kowalyszyn.

Mr. KOWALYSHYN. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add that though we have had a considerable number of amendments, I am quite sure other amendments would have been offered. I know I had a couple of substantive ideas, too, to offer, but I felt that they were out of order, as this, I suggest, is out of order, too. This is not the kind of substantive proposal to attach to an appropriation bill.

Contrary to what Mr. Shelhamer has said, spelling out the terms and conditions under which expenditures are to be made is a substantive matter and should be handled by general legislation rather than by an appropriation bill. I suggest that we vote to support the ruling that this proposal is not constitutional.

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

Mr. SHANE. For the past several years, the state legislatures in California, Wisconsin and Florida have been writing legislative oversight language into appropriation bills. Indeed, Wisconsin has written retrenchment language into their appropriation bills quite similar to what I offered 2 days ago or we considered 2 days ago.

It seems to me appropriate and constitutional to attach certain conditions to the appropriation of money. I think most lawyers recognize that the opinions of attorneys general are not as authoritative as the decisions of courts.

I can see that probably this concept of extending the legislature's authority through legislative oversight language will be tested in the courts, but I feel that it has been done in other legislatures. The United States Congress, just about 4 weeks ago, attached conditions to the National Science Foundation grants, giving the Congress veto power over those grants, and I suggest that we are now at a crucial point where we should extend our authority in state government through the vehicle of legislative oversight language. I urge the members to vote to support the constitutionality of this amendment.

The SPEAKER. Just for the information of the gentleman, the opinions of attorneys general, the formal official opinions, have the force and effect of law until overruled by the court.

The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, on that very subject, it is my understanding that the official opinions of the attorneys general have a binding effect on the executive and are advisory only as to the legislative branch.

On the question on constitutionality, I do not think the members of this House should use that kind of authority as binding in making their determination as to their vote on the constitutionality question.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. Have the members been called on to vote on the question specifically of the constitutionality of this amendment?

The SPEAKER. Not as yet.

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. I would merely then ask the membership to disregard the issue of constitutionality and vote on the merits of the amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, I do understand, though, that the question which is before the House is the question of constitutionality.

The SPEAKER. That is correct. It has been raised by the gentleman, Mr. Kowalyszyn. The gentleman, Mr. Kowalyszyn, has raised the question of constitutionality, and that matter will be referred to the House for a decision.

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the issue.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I dislike taking issue with my good friends, Mr. Kowalyszyn and Mr. Manderino, and the former attorneys general of the Commonwealth, but I think the point had been made, one point at least, by both Mr. Shane and Mr. Butera, that the attorneys generals' opinions are not certainly binding on this legislative body.

I think we should not overlook the presumption of constitutionality of those enactments that go through both chambers. I think that that is a point which all of us should consider very carefully, inasmuch as we have the same right to decide that issue as would the attorney general.

I would suggest also, without attacking the attorneys general in their competency or in any other way, that they may very well have a bias in ruling as they have inasmuch as ruling to the contrary may fly in the face of the executive branch.

We might again point out that there are no court decisions that have stated that this type of an amendment is unconstitutional, and I, along with Mr. Shane, believe that the issue should ultimately be resolved by the court and not by the Attorney General.

May I also suggest to the membership that even if we do enact this amendment as part of the appropriation bill and ultimately it is declared unconstitutional, this will not render the entire appropriation bill unconstitutional. We have a severability concept written into the Legislative Statutory Construction Act, and I suggest to the members disregard the idea that this amendment would violate the constitution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the members cannot disregard whether or not the amend-

ment is constitutional or not constitutional because that is precisely the question that is before the House. The question of constitutionality, when it is raised by a member on any proposal, is a matter for the House to decide, and that is before us. We must make the decision on whether or not the proposal is constitutional. Now it may well be—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend?

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to Mr. Kowalyszyn. In his remarks he never once mentioned the word "constitution." He mentioned the word "appropriateness," but did not mention the word "constitution." The first time that was brought up was by the Speaker.

There has been no motion made by anyone. I do not know why we are debating the question of constitutionality because the motion was not made.

The SPEAKER. The only point that the gentleman could raise, no matter what language he employed, is the matter of constitutionality.

The matter is before the House.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland, Mr. Manderino.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, the question of constitutionality being before the House may well be, as the minority leader has indicated, that the attorneys generals' opinions, which are official and in existence, are advisory only to this legislature, but they are binding on the executive. If those attorneys generals' opinions say, as they do say and as I pointed out to you that they do say, that this language is unconstitutional, it simply means that it will not be abided by and the department can ignore it. And this is the whole purpose, I would think, of the opinions and their reasoning, pointing out that should the legislature want to provide these types of restrictions or provisions, they should be done in a manner that the executive branch of government will have to abide by, and that should be in legislation.

Just briefly also, Mr. Speaker, pointing out that several other states use oversight language in their general appropriation bills and Congress may do the same is not a valid argument so far as the constitutionality of this particular provision is concerned.

I do not know what those other states may say in their constitutions regarding what a general appropriation bill can contain. I do not know what the Federal Constitution says about what a general appropriation bill can contain or is permitted to contain. I know that the Constitution of Pennsylvania says that we are to consider, on our vote, that nothing can be contained in the general appropriation bill except the appropriations, and that clause has been interpreted by several attorneys general of the Commonwealth and is binding on the executive and is advisory to us. I think it should be taken into consideration, serious consideration, by this House.

And I repeat, these provisions and restrictions may have all the merit in the world and maybe they should

pass here with every vote in the affirmative, but the manner to go is by separate legislation and not by attachment to the appropriation bill.

The caveat is that we can change substantive law in many respects. If we begin doing it in appropriation bills, we are really not pinpointing an issue for the members to decide upon, because there are many people who vote, when they vote for general appropriation bills, who are not happy with the language of that bill in this section or that section or the dollar figure appropriated in this section or that section but are forced to vote for the bill because of the general outline of the appropriations contained therein. This is why this kind of provision has been called an unconstitutional rider: It may take a proposition of doubtful merit and pass it with the general appropriation bill, that measure, perhaps, not being able to stand on its own.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. DiCARLO. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DiCARLO. When the House addresses itself to the issue of constitutionality, will we be concerning ourselves just with Shane amendment No. 6 which is before us? Is that the only thing we will be determining, as to whether it is constitutional or not?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. DiCARLO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Schuylkill, Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. W. D. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with care and attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Allegheny County. I believe that this House, of course, has a right to determine the constitutionality or the unconstitutionality of this particular amendment. But I would like to state that the argument used here by the gentleman from Allegheny raises a fundamental issue.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman refer to Mr. Manderino?

Mr. W. D. HUTCHINSON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. He is from Westmoreland County.

Mr. W. D. HUTCHINSON. I beg your pardon, sir. The argument of the gentleman from Westmoreland, Mr. Manderino, raises a fundamental issue. The power of legislatures in the Anglo-American system, the real power, was hard won, and it was the power over the appropriations that was won in England during the long Parliament when the King kept everybody locked up. What is being said here, if you adduce the attorney general's opinion as grounds for our decision on constitutionality or unconstitutionality, is that we are to consider and be bound by the executive. I object to that. I think it is up to this House to determine the constitutionality or the unconstitutionality in the first instance.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Centre, Mr. Dreibelbis.

Mr. DREIBELBIS. Mr. Speaker, for a point of clarification on the question, could I ask Mr. Manderino a question?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Manderino, consent to interrogation?

Mr. MANDERINO. I shall.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DREIBELBIS. Mr. Speaker, you said that since the attorneys general had ruled or made an opinion on this subject, that it might be that the departments would not have to acknowledge these provisions that we, the legislature, would put in. My question would be: Would they have the prerogative to pick and choose which of the ones that they would want to?

Mr. MANDERINO. I cannot speak for the executive; I can only say that in the past when these kinds of provisions have been put in, they have been ignored by the executive.

Mr. DREIBELBIS. Mr. Speaker, as I remember the Snyder amendments that were inserted in past appropriation bills, the Department of Education did honor those and did require that the schools acknowledge those provisions of the appropriation.

Mr. MANDERINO. I do not know the particular reference that you have, Mr. Speaker, but I am sure that if it is something that is within the executive to abide by or not abide by as they choose, they are in no violation if they abide by what we say.

Mr. DREIBELBIS. In other words, they could abide by one or they could ignore it as you have indicated?

Mr. MANDERINO. Yes. And what I am trying to point out to you is, if you really want to change a particular process or restrict an appropriation, it should be done by substantive law because that is your only guarantee that it is going to be done.

When you say that the executive will pick and choose, he probably will pick and choose, because the attorneys general's opinions in existence in this Commonwealth say that they do not have to listen to that language. You may be holding out a promise to yourselves and to those who are affected that they will abide when, in effect, they will not.

Mr. DREIBELBIS. I understand what you are saying. I was not aware of the fact that the department did not have to acknowledge these provisions put in. I might call to your attention that the amendments that I spoke of were the amendments concerning the requirements of the hours worked by particular professors, this type of thing. I might draw to your attention that the Department of Education did require that these schools do that. So I believe that it is not always the case that they would ignore these kinds of provisions.

I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the matter of the constitutionality of the amendments offered by the gentleman, Mr. Shane. Those voting in the affirmative will vote to sustain the constitutionality—

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BEREN. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that in response to a question from Mr. DiCarlo, you indicated that this vote on constitutionality would affect only this amendment. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. That is correct. He is raising the constitutionality as to this particular amendment.

Mr. BEREN. Would it not also, however, affect the constitutionality of any other amendment to House bill No. 1336?

The SPEAKER. Only in terms of it being a precedent by which the members would be guided.

Mr. BEREN. Yes; right.

Now, would that also have an effect, then, on the amendment that has already been approved by this House that dealt with the Department of Education previously voted on?

The SPEAKER. The House has already ruled on the constitutionality of that amendment. The House would be in the position of being inconsistent if they should rule this one unconstitutional, but the House has the prerogative of doing that.

Mr. BEREN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. SHANE. Mr. Speaker, I would remind that I do not really think it is a change in substantive law. I think it is attaching a condition to the appropriation requiring certain information.

But I would ask the Speaker to state most precisely, as he began to do, the vote on the constitutional issue.

The SPEAKER. A vote in the affirmative will be a vote to sustain constitutionality; a vote in the negative will be to vote against constitutionality.

On the question,

Will the House sustain the constitutionality of the Shane amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. KOWALY-SHYN and SHANE and were as follows:

YEAS—127

Abraham	Gallen	Manmiller	Seltzer
Anderson, J. H.	Garzia	McClatchy	Shane
Arthurs	Geesey	McCue	Shelhamer
Beren	George	McGinnis	Shuman
Berlin	Gillespie	Mebus	Sirianni
Bittle	Gillette	Miller, M. E.	Smith, E.
Bonetto	Gleason	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Smith, L.
Bradley	Goodman	Milliron	Spencer
Brandt	Grieco	Miscevich	Stahl
Burns	Halverson	Moehlmann	Stapleton
Eutera	Hamilton, J. H.	Mrkonic	Taddonio
Cessar	Hasay	Mullen	Taylor
Cimini	Haskell	Novak	Turner
Cole	Hayes, D. S.	Noye	Ustynoski
Cowell	Hayes, S. E.	O'Brien	Valicenti
Crawford	Hepford	O'Connell	Vroon
Cumberland	Hill	O'Keefe	Walsh, T. P.
Davies	Hopkins	Parker, H. S.	Wansacz
Davis, D. M.	Hutchinson, W.	Perri	Weidner
Deverter	Katz	Pitts	Westerberg
Dicarlo	Kelly, J. B.	Polite	Whelan
Dietz	Kernick	Pyles	Whittlesey
Dorr	Kistler	Reed	Wilson
Doyle	Klingaman	Renninger	Wilt, R. W.
Dreibelbis	Knepper	Renwick	Wilt, W. W.
Eckensberger	Kusse	Romanelli	WorriLOW
Fee	LaMarca	Ryan	Wright
Fischer	Lehr	Saloom	Yahner
Flaherty	Letterman	Scheaffer	Yohn
Foster, A.	Levi	Schmitt	Zeller
Foster, W.	Lincoln	Schweder	Zord
Fryer	Lynch	Scirica	

NAYS—54

Barber	Greenfield	Menhorn	Ritter
Bellomini	Hutchinson, A.	Milanovich	Ross
Bennett	Irvis	Morris	Ruggiero
Brunner	Johnson, J.	Musto	Shupnik
Cohen	Kelly, A. P.	Myers	Stout

DeMedio	Kolter	O'Donnell	Toll
DiDonato	Kowalyszyn	Oliver	Trelio
Dombrowski	Laughlin	Pancoast	Vann
Englehart	Lederer	Perry	Wargo
Fisher	Manderino	Petrarca	Wojdak
Gallagher	McCall	Pratt	Zwinkl
Geisler	McGraw	Prendergast	
Giammarco	McIntyre	Richardson	Fineman,
Green	McLane	Rieger	Speaker

NOT VOTING—22

Berson	Gring	Rappaport	Sweeney
Blackwell	Hammock	Rhodes	Tayoun
Caputo	Itkin	Salvatore	Thomas
Dininni	Laudadio	Shelton	Wagner
Fawcett	Mullen, M. P.	Sullivan	Zearfoss
Gleeson	Pievsky		

The majority required by the constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the constitutionality of the Shane amendment was sustained.

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, would the gentleman, Mr. Shane, consent to brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Shane, consent to interrogation?

Mr. SHANE. I shall.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, does your amendment deal with present employes in the state-owned colleges and university?

Mr. SHANE. No.

Mr. RITTER. It deals only with prospective employes?

Mr. SHANE. Yes.

Mr. RITTER. Let us assume that this legislature adjourns sine die and the Department of Education wants to and, in fact, has to hire some employes to replace someone who may have passed away or somebody who retired. What would the status of that employe be during the time that we were adjourned sine die?

Mr. Speaker, my understanding in reading the amendment is that that person could not be employed.

Mr. SHANE. I will read the paragraph in question for the members' consideration, the last paragraph:

The list of proposed employees required under this section shall be effective at the end of the first period of 12 legislative days unless after the date of transmittal and the passage of the 12 legislative days either house passes a resolution by a two-thirds vote stating in substance the House or Senate does not approve all or any of the proposed contracts of employment listed therein.

If the House adjourns sine die, my answer would be that the person proposed for employment could not finally be hired; 12 legislative days must pass. I do not feel this is onerous since job freezes have not been unknown in the past. In fact, we are now in the midst of a job freeze.

Therefore, I do not feel that there is any crucial personnel that is going to handicap any college by the brief periods of sine die adjournment.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, is the president of a state college or Indiana University considered a state employe?

Mr. SHANE. Yes.

Mr. RITTER. So if there was a vacancy in one of the

state colleges and we were not in session, then that vacancy could not be filled until we returned to session and remained in session for at least 12 legislative days?

Mr. SHANE. That is true, and we could get along very nicely without him.

Mr. RITTER. Well, that may be, Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

May I make a few brief remarks, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. RITTER. The point I was trying to raise was that I guess a lot of us are concerned about who is being hired and so on. I guess that the amendment was addressing itself to that problem. But if you read that last paragraph that Mr. Shane read, it says that upon a resolution passed by a two-thirds vote, by the House or Senate.

It seems to me that the House could pass a resolution by a two-thirds vote saying that, yes, we approve this person or these hundred employes, and the Senate could reject that same proposal by a two-thirds vote, and where will we end up then? There is no recourse in here as to what would take place. It seems to me that either body has a veto power. I can just foresee an absolutely chaotic situation.

If we insist on adopting this amendment, we are going to stifle the administrative procedures in this Commonwealth. And I am as much opposed to some of the things the administration does as anyone else is, but I really do not believe that this amendment is the proper way in which to do it. I think it is taking on a power and a duty that, first, I do not think we are fully equipped to handle; and, second, I really do not believe that it is within our prerogative to make determinations as to contracts of employment for each and every employe over a certain amount of money in the Department of Education, because there are other amendments which deal with the Department of Transportation and every other department, and we are going to spend all of our time involving ourselves in whether or not we should have someone on the payroll. I just do not think that we are equipped to do that, and we ought to vote against the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Gleason.

Mr. GLEASON. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this amendment. Really, I cannot for the life of me, Mr. Speaker, see what an awesome threat this amendment is to this legislature, and the scurrying and scrambling to try to avoid this amendment when it does not cost any money. It is not costing us anything; it is not costing the taxpayers anything. It is an attempt, and it may be a feeble attempt, to try to get a handle on expenses in this bureaucracy that grows every single day.

You know, I think Pennsylvania state government, unlike the Federal Government, has a civil service or a bureaucracy that can be eventually governed. But when we bend over backwards to try to defeat efforts like this and make it as if it is an effort which spells doomsday for Pennsylvania, it is ridiculous. It is a waste of time, our time, everybody's time.

What kind of threat is this amendment? It is an attempt to do something about the bureaucracy, and I suggest that we support it and get on with the business of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, the House has decided that Shane amendment No. 6 is constitutional. I do not, therefore, see any reason to oppose it and I suggest we get on with the voting and support it.

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

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

YEAS—153

Abraham	Geisler	Manmiller	Schmitt
Anderson, J. H.	George	McCall	Schweder
Arthurs	Giammarco	McClatchy	Scirica
Bellomini	Gillespie	McCue	Seltzer
Bennett	Gleason	McGinnis	Shane
Beren	Goodman	McGraw	Shelhamer
Berson	Greenfield	McLane	Shuman
Bittle	Grieco	Mebus	Shupnik
Bradley	Halverson	Miller, M. E.	Sirianni
Brandt	Hasay	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Smith, E.
Brunner	Haskell	Milliron	Smith, L.
Butera	Hayes, D. S.	Miscevich	Spencer
Cessar	Hayes, S. E.	Moehlmann	Stahl
Cimini	Hepford	Mrkonic	Stapleton
Cowell	Hill	Mullen	Sullivan
Crawford	Hopkins	Musto	Taddonio
Cumberland	Hutchinson, A.	Novak	Taylor
Davies	Hutchinson, W.	Noye	Toll
Davis, D. M.	Irvis	O'Brien	Trello
DeMedio	Itkin	O'Connell	Turner
Deverter	Johnson, J.	O'Donnel	Ustynoski
Dietz	Katz	O'Keefe	Vroon
Dombrowski	Kelly, J. B.	Parker, H. S.	Wagner
Dorr	Kernick	Perri	Wansacz
Doyle	Kistler	Petrarca	Wargo
Dreibelbis	Klingaman	Pitts	Weidner
Eckensberger	Knepper	Pratt	Westerberg
Englehart	Kolter	Pyles	Whelan
Fee	Kowalyszyn	Reed	Whittlesey
Fischer	Kusse	Renninger	Wilson
Fisher	LaMarca	Renwick	Wilt, R. W.
Flaherty	Laughlin	Richardson	Wojdak
Foster, A.	Lehr	Romanelli	Worriow
Foster, W.	Letterman	Ross	Wright
Fryer	Levi	Ruggiero	Yahner
Gallagher	Lincoln	Ryan	Yohn
Gallen	Lynch	Saloom	Zeller
Garzia	Manderino	Scheaffer	Zord
Geesey			

NAYS—27

Barber	McIntyre	Perry	Valicenti
Cohen	Menhorn	Polite	Vann
Cole	Milanovich	Prendergast	Walsh, T. P.
Gillette	Morris	Rieger	Zwikel
Green	Myers	Ritter	
Hamilton, J. H.	Oliver	Shelton	Fineman,
Kelly, A. P.	Pancoast	Stout	Speaker
Lederer			

NOT VOTING—23

Berlin	DiDonato	Laudadio	Sweeney
Blackwell	Dininni	Mullen, M. P.	Tayoun
Bonetto	Fawcett	Pievsky	Thomas
Burns	Gleeson	Rappaport	Wilt, W. W.
Caputo	Gring	Rhodes	Zearfoss
Dicarlo	Hammock	Salvatore	

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

Amend Sec. 2, page 11, by inserting between lines 28 and 29:
The disbursement of this appropriation for the State

colleges and Indiana University shall be on a full-time equivalent student basis.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Will the gentleman identify the particular amendment that is before the House?

Mr. SHANE. I am withdrawing amendment No. 7.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. SHANE. I offer for the House's consideration amendment No. 8.

On the question recurring,

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

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

Amend Sec. 2, page 27, lines 9 through 12, by striking out all of said lines

Amend Sec. 2, page 27, line 17, by striking out all of said line and inserting:

For the operation, maintenance and administration of the State institutions for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded, excluding the Southeastern State School and Hospital, and for administration of the Mental Health and Amend Sec. 2, page 27, line 23, by striking out "75,542,000" and inserting: 386,336,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. SHANE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would appreciate the members' indulgence after a long time of amendments. This is what I consider a major issue in the budget, and I, therefore, would like to give just a couple of minutes of background.

This amendment would combine the appropriation for the state mental hospitals on line 12 with the appropriation for the community mental health program on line 23. Adding \$310 million for mental hospitals and \$75 million for community mental health, you get a total of \$386 million. This amendment does not reduce that appropriation one cent; it simply combines the two appropriations.

When the Health and Welfare bureaucrats discussed this idea, they had a piece of jargon for it. They call it single streaming. That does not really shed any light, but maybe for some of you it is a code word to help you understand what we are trying to do.

Basically, what this amendment tries to do is combine these two to give the Department of Welfare some discretion in administering these mental health funds.

I read an interesting article in this morning's Philadelphia Inquirer by the minority leader, Robert Butera. Mr. Butera had the following words in the Philadelphia Inquirer. By the way, the headline is "The bureaucracy is long overdue for some surgery," and I want you to keep some of these thoughts in mind as we deal with the next couple of amendments.

Mr. Butera says this:

there are areas of activity where government activity ought to be increased, and new needs will come. What, then, is to be done?

The only good answer is for us to now quite courageously, and without protecting any lovable sacred cows, get about the business of challeng-

ing the existence, worth and efficiency of every agency in existence.

The only vehicle available to the people to initiate and carry out this task is their legislative branch—state and federal.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that the three biggest, the three fattest, the three most sacred, sacred cows in state government are: the state mental hospitals, special education, and the colleges. I do not know today whether we have the will to confront these sacred cows, but I offer these amendments for your consideration.

Let me read to you, by way of background again, a couple of passages from the presentation of Secretary Beal and from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

First from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, May 7, editorial:

The first is that it has proved most difficult to close state hospitals. In the rural areas where most state hospitals are located (under the "out-of-sight, out-of-mind" philosophy of earlier days) they often constitute the major industry of a community. Also, increasingly strong employe unions resist cutting work forces, let alone phasing them out.

So the hospitals continue at a costly level even as their populations decline. For instance, the obsolescent Philadelphia State Hospital, with 1,288 patients compared to 6,700 in 1955, still costs \$30 million a year to operate. That compares with \$40 million Pennsylvania spent for its community mental health programs serving 85,000 persons.

But community health programs cannot be expanded to depopulate the institutions because so much money is tied up in the state hospitals . . .

Here is what Secretary Beal said in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee:

One of my major concerns, and a concern of many of you, is the State Mental Hospital system. In 1955, Pennsylvania had 20 Hospitals and 40,000 patients; today we have 20 Hospitals and 15,000 patients. In the last four years alone, the patient census has decreased by nearly 8,000.

But the cost of Hospital care continues to rise. Because of increased costs and decreased census, the cost of patient day of care has increased six times in the last nine years. Regretfully, the level of care has not increased proportionately. Seven of our Hospitals are not accredited by the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Hospitals; the accreditation of others is provisional. One Hospital has been decertified for Medical Assistance payments and others face decertification.

We are being required to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in old buildings to meet minimum safety and patient care standards. One-half of our buildings are more than 50 years old; one-third are more than 80 years old; and almost none of them meet modern program needs. An important economic basis of our institutional program, which assumed larger numbers of patient workers, has been altered by Court actions and by the fact that our increasingly aged and infirm patients are not able to work.

The ever increasing costs of an institutional program which every year serves fewer people limits our ability to adequately finance the community-based program which already serves five times more people and each year serves more. It is a major objective of the Department to break this cycle, where the increasing demand of the State Hospital system consumes the resources needed to develop a quality community program.

Mr. Speaker, if you divide the number of current residents in our 20 mental hospitals into \$310 million, you will see that it costs approximately \$20,000 per year per resident to maintain this system. What we are doing is strangling the community mental health program, where we get much more therapy for our dollar, to maintain these sacred cows.

I am not suggesting that we throw people out into the streets. Many of these geriatric patients have no place to go, and we should keep them there. I am suggesting to you that let us give the Department of Public Welfare and the Secretary of Welfare the discretion to administer these funds. I have confidence in Frank Beal. Let us let him administer these mental hospital and mental health funds, and let him decide on the allocation of these funds so that we can begin to deal with this problem that I have tried to outline for you in a rational, humane and compassionate manner.

For this reason, I solicit your vote for this amendment which does not decrease by one penny the appropriation for mental health.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, what Mr. Shane is doing here is taking two line items and combining them into one and calling it single-stream funding. Now generally, I would not be opposed to that where it could give the administrator—in this case, the Secretary of Welfare—some flexibility as to the use of these funds when they are combined into one line item.

The problem in these particular items is this: Anywhere where we have combined various items into one was generally to give the administrator some flexibility, and we did it in several places in the Health Department where we had new, small programs—for instance, Cooley's disease and the renal dialysis. We are really not certain how much is needed, how much the secretary will need, for treatment of these various diseases, so we lumped them together into one fund to give him the necessary discretion on a day-by-day basis for spending that kind of money when the need arose.

In this particular case we have put two items in the budget—one for the mental institutions and one for the community mental health centers. We have done it for this reason: There is presently a great deal of competition between these two concepts, between institutionalizing people and the other idea of letting them into the community for treatment on an out-patient basis in the community mental health centers.

Now both items are very costly. The only way we can keep track of them, the only way we can monitor them, the only way we can see what their effectiveness is so that they do not get lost within the same line item is if we separate them into two items. What would happen here if we merge them into one item is, I suspect, the

unions at the various institutions will practically eat up the community mental health services with the kind of pressure they are capable of putting on.

I have nothing against the unions in these particular institutions, but to treat both concepts fairly, I would suggest we keep them separate. I suggest to you that it is the way to monitor them; I suggest to you that it is the way to hold them accountable. Now anyone interested in having them be accountable, not only to the department but to this legislature, vote in the negative on this amendment so that we can track them.

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

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment. I concur with many of the statements of the Appropriations Committee chairman and I would like to take just a few exceptions to some of the things that Mr. Shane had indicated.

One of the institutions that is being decertified and is in jeopardy right at this particular time serves Luzerne County in my geographic area. I have contended for some long time, and contend even today, that there were errors in judgment on the part of the department in regards to this decertification.

This legislature appropriated moneys to meet the life safety standard codes, and the department saw fit not to expend those moneys, thereby jeopardizing not only the certification but sums of money that were in excess of the amount that would have been spent to meet these standards.

I am not going to go on with this because the hour is late. We have had about enough for the week. This is a whole new can of worms, and I would be glad to debate the gentleman at some future date. But up until such time as the hearings are completed and the study is completed, I would like it to remain as it is and I would appreciate anyone who might see it that way and vote against this amendment.

Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Delaware, Mrs. Whittlesey.

Mrs. WHITTLESEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the membership should know that the county mental health and mental retardation program administrators who administer the community-related programs in the county are strongly opposed to this change in the proposed budget. There are 41 different county administrators throughout the state and 41 divisions, and they feel strongly that if this line item is changed, they will be shortchanged and all the money will go into the state institutions. So I think you should be aware of that.

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

Mr. SHANE. Let us roll the bill.

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

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

YEAS—7

Dicarlo	Letterman	Schweder	Sullivan
Flaherty	Mrkonic	Shane	

NAYS—175

Abraham	Geisler	McCue	Schmitt
Anderson, J. H.	George	McGinnis	Scirica
Arthurs	Gillespie	McGraw	Seltzer
Barber	Gillette	McIntyre	Shelhamer
Bellomini	Goodman	McLane	Shelton
Bennett	Green	Mebus	Shuman
Beren	Greenfield	Menhorn	Shupnik
Berlin	Grieco	Milanovich	Sirianni
Berson	Halverson	Miller, M. E.	Smith, E.
Bittle	Hamilton, J. H.	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Smith, L.
Blackwell	Hammock	Milliron	Spencer
Bonetto	Hasay	Miscevich	Stahl
Bradley	Haskell	Moehlmann	Stapleton
Brandt	Hayes, D. S.	Morris	Stout
Brunner	Hayes, S. E.	Mullen, M. P.	Taddonio
Burns	Hepford	Mullen	Taylor
Butera	Hill	Musto	Toll
Cessar	Hopkins	Novak	Trello
Cimini	Hutchinson, A.	Noye	Turner
Cohen	Hutchinson, W.	O'Brien	Ustynoski
Cole	Irvic	O'Connell	Valicenti
Cowell	Itkin	O'Donnell	Vann
Crawford	Johnson, J.	O'Keefe	Vron
Cumberland	Katz	Pancoast	Walsh, T. P.
Davies	Kelly, A. P.	Parker, H. S.	Wansacz
Davis, D. M.	Kelly, J. B.	Perri	Wargo
DeMedio	Kernick	Perry	Weidner
Deverter	Kistler	Petrarca	Westerberg
Dietz	Klingaman	Pitts	Whelan
Dombrowski	Knepper	Polite	Whittlesey
Dorr	Kolter	Pratt	Wilson
Doyle	Kowalshyn	Prendergast	Wilt, R. W.
Dreibelbis	Kusse	Pyles	Wilt, W. W.
Eckensberger	LaMarca	Reed	Wojdak
Engelhart	Laughlin	Renninger	Worrilow
Fee	Lederer	Renwick	Wright
Fischer	Lehr	Richardson	Yahner
Fisher	Levi	Ritter	Yohn
Poster, A.	Lincoln	Romanelli	Zeller
Poster, W.	Lynch	Ross	Zord
Fryer	Mandinoro	Ruggiero	Zwinkl
Gallagher	Manmiller	Ryan	
Gallen	McCall	Saloom	Fineman, Speaker
Garzia	McClatchy	Scheaffer	
Geesey			

NOT VOTING—21

Caputo	Gleason	Pievsky	Sweeney
DiDonato	Gring	Rappaport	Tayoun
Dininni	Laudadio	Rhodes	Thomas
Fawcett	Myers	Rieger	Wagner
Giammarco	Oliver	Salvatore	Zearfoss
Gleason			

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

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

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

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

Amend Sec. 2, page 24, by inserting between lines 23 and 24:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other act every 30 days the Secretary of Welfare shall transmit to the chairpersons of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and the chairpersons of the House and Senate Health and Welfare Committees a list of persons proposed to be employed at an annual salary exceeding \$14,000 by either the Department of Welfare, any State mental hospital, any local office of the Department of Public Welfare or any other institutions administered by the Department of Welfare.

The list shall contain the names of the proposed employees, the proposed annual salary and a brief job description including a brief statement of the reason for filling the position.

The list transmitted under this section shall be effective at the end of the passage of 12 legislative days subsequent to the submission of the proposed list, unless

between the date of the transmittal and before the passage of 12 legislative days either House passes a resolution by a two-thirds vote stating in substance that the House or Senate does not approve any or all of the proposed contracts of employment.

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

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

Mr. SHANE. I thank you, my colleagues, again. I realize you cannot bat a thousand.

Amendment No. 9 would require the Department of Welfare, when they propose to employ anybody whose salary exceeds \$14,000 at any state mental hospital or within the welfare bureaucracy itself or any local office of the Department of Welfare, to forward to the chairpersons of the Senate Health and Welfare Committee, the House Health and Welfare Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee and the House Appropriations Committee the proposed employment arrangement. The rest of it is similar to the Department of Education amendment which this body passed by a very large margin. So I would call for a vote on this.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clearfield, Mr. George.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to interrogate my colleague, Mr. Shane.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Shane, consent to interrogation?

Mr. SHANE. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise not to embarrass you, but I rise for the point that I am really concerned about this amendment. I really believe that with children we can allow for overreaction. But for such as us, I believe it should be explained whether we are overreacting.

Now a moment ago when there was a resolution before the House—and I also agree with our colleague, Mr. Gleason, that the bureaucratic situation is definitely out of hand. But I do not believe the rule of thumb applies on every line. So I rise to ask you, if I may, when you say Health and Welfare, would you be involving an employe of such as the Philipsburg State Hospital in my area?

Mr. SHANE. The amendment says that the Secretary shall forward to the respective committee chairpersons “. . . a list of persons proposed to be employed at any annual salary exceeding \$14,000 by either the Department of “welfare,”—any person employed by the Department of Welfare—“any State mental hospital, any local office of the Department of Public Welfare or any other institutions administered by the Department of Welfare.”

Is the Philipsburg General Hospital administered by the Department of Welfare?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, it certainly is, and that is why I come to my second point, if you do not mind: Would you say that the man in charge or the doctor in charge of the X-ray department that staffs all of those employes would also be an employe, especially when I know for a fact that he is paid through the Department of Revenue, which goes through the Department of Property and Supplies for a contract? Would you say he is an employe?

Mr. SHANE. Probably.

Mr. GEORGE. Then would you say, as you answered the question relevant to your amendment No. 7—and I also agree with you that if a professor could not be hired while we are in sine die, we will get along—but could we possibly get along without a man running our X-ray department if we were in sine die?

Mr. SHANE. Sine die?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. SHANE. Yes; I think you can always have temporary employes. Often people go on the job before their employment contract grinds through the bureaucracy, and I doubt whether this legislative body is ever going to veto the employment of some kind of X-ray technologist at a hospital.

Mr. GEORGE. My third question, if you do not mind: If three or four nurses decided to walk out of the hospital in some kind of trial or tribulation and the hospital then wanted to replace them with three or four nurses in the two and three classification, those making over \$14,000, then could we hire them unless they came before this board?

Mr. SHANE. The point is this: These proposed employment contracts come before the legislature for our information. If the legislature does nothing about it, which I am sure will be 99 percent of the cases, the employment contracts take effect.

All we are saying is that we would like the legislature to have some information about who is being hired and to give them the power to veto a contract within 12 legislative days if they think it is unreasonable or extravagant.

Mr. GEORGE. Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I do believe that in your schools of higher learning we can get along without the administrator or without an individual.

Mr. SHANE. These employes do not have to come before any legislative board or anything like that before they are hired. We are asking for information for the legislature.

Mr. GEORGE. What you are saying, in essence, though, is that you want the information before you in fact ruled on whether they can be hired?

Mr. SHANE. We do not have to rule on anything. In mosts cases I am sure we will do nothing. We are basically asking for information about proposed employes, and after the passage of 12 legislative days, that employment contract is automatic and final.

Mr. GEORGE. Do you mean they can hire them with or without you?

Mr. SHANE. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Well, then what is the purpose of this amendment?

Mr. SHANE. To give us some veto power when we think it extravagant.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that we need veto power in many parts of this state, but when we impose veto power on the health care of the people of this state, then I beg you to look up at that sign that says, "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." Thank you very much.

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

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one point. The gentleman, Mr. Shane, keeps saying that this

is going to come before this legislative body. All this amendment and the other amendment do is say that it shall be sent to the chairpersons—the chairmen or chairwomen of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees and the Health and Welfare Committees. It does not say a thing about Jim Ritter, member, getting any information or the Speaker getting any information. There is no provision in here if the chairman or chairwoman does not want to provide the information to this House that they have to do that. There is no provision here that if they refuse to do that there is any penalty attached to it. It is just an exercise in futility, Mr. Speaker, and we ought to defeat the amendment.

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

Mr. SHANE. I did not want to get the institutions in the terrible administrative and paper burden that the Snyder amendment has put on the various state-related institutions, so I thought we would just pick the chairpersons of the apparently relevant committees and then let them move it from there. That is what I was trying to do, to avoid the inconvenience of the Snyder amendment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. SHANE and GEORGE and were as follows:

YEAS—107

Anderson, J. H.	Geesey	Lynch	Seltzer
Arthurs	Gillespie	Manmiller	Shane
Beren	Gleason	McClatchy	Sheihamer
Bittle	Goodman	McCue	Shuman
Brandt	Grieco	McGinnis	Sirianni
Burns	Halverson	Mebus	Smith, E.
Butera	Hamilton, J. H.	Miller, M. E.	Spencer
Cimini	Hasay	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Stahl
Cowell	Haskell	Milliron	Sullivan
Crawford	Hayes, D. S.	Moehlmann	Taddonio
Cumberland	Hayes, S. E.	Mrkonic	Taylor
Davies	Hepford	Noye	Turner
Davis, D. M.	Hill	O'Brien	Ustynoski
Deverter	Hopkins	O'Connell	Wansacz
Dicarlo	Hutchinson, W.	O'Keefe	Weidner
Dietz	Itkin	Parker, H. S.	Westerberg
Dorr	Katz	Ferri	Whelan
Doyle	Kelly, J. B.	Pitts	Whittlesey
Dreibelbis	Kernick	Pyles	Wilson
Fee	Kistler	Reed	Wilt, R. W.
Fischer	Klingaman	Renninger	Worrlow
Fisher	Knepper	Renwick	Wright
Foster, A.	Kusse	Ryan	Yahner
Foster, W.	Lehr	Saloom	Yohn
Fryer	Letterman	Scheaffer	Zeller
Gallagher	Levi	Schweder	Zord
Gallen	Lincoln	Scirica	

NAYS—74

Abraham	George	Menhorn	Ruggiero
Barber	Giammarco	Milanovich	Schmitt
Bellomini	Gillette	Miscevich	Shelton
Bennett	Green	Morris	Shupnik
Berlin	Greenfield	Mullen	Smith, L.
Berson	Hammock	Musto	Stapleton
Bonetto	Hutchinson, A.	Novak	Stout
Bradley	Irvis	O'Donnell	Toll
Brunner	Johnson, J.	Pancoast	Trello
Cohen	Kelly, A. P.	Perry	Valicenti
Cole	Kolter	Petrarca	Vann
DeMedio	Kowalshyn	Polite	Vroon
DiDonato	LaMarca	Pratt	Walsh, T. P.
Dombrowski	Laughlin	Prendergast	Wargo
Eckensberger	Lederer	Richardson	Wojdak
Englehart	McCall	Rieger	Zwikl
Flaherty	McGraw	Ritter	
Garzia	McIntyre	Romanelli	Fineman,
Geisler	McLane	Ross	Speaker

NOT VOTING—22

Blackwell	Gring	Pievsky	Tayoun
Caputo	Laudadio	Rappaport	Thomas
Cessar	Manderino	Rhodes	Wagner
Dininni	Mullen, M. P.	Salvatore	Wilt, W. W.
Fawcett	Myers	Sweeney	Zearfoss
Gleeson	Oliver		

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

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

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

Mr. W. W. WILT. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. W. W. WILT. Mr. Speaker, I was called off the floor and I missed that last vote. I would like to be recorded in the negative on the fourth Shane amendment.

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

Does the gentleman, Mr. Shane, desire to offer amendment No. 10?

Mr. SHANE. I withdraw amendment No. 10.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to offer amendment No. 11?

Mr. SHANE. Yes.

On the question recurring,

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

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

Amend Sec. 2, page 27, by inserting between lines 12 and 13:

All State mental hospitals whose patient population as of January 1, 1976 is less than 60% of patient capacity shall be closed by June 30, 1976.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. SHANE. This amendment would require that all state mental hospitals whose patient population as of January 1, 1976, is less than 60 percent of patient capacity shall be closed by June 30, 1976.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, in order to properly understand this, you really have to refer to one of the amendments that Mr. Shane withdrew.

What he is really saying here is that if you want to close down that list of six state mental hospitals, that is the effect that this amendment will have. Now if that is going to be the will of the House, go to it.

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

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, Mr. Shane, made a statement which, according to my amendment No. 10, is absolutely incorrect.

It does not say anything about 60-percent occupancy. It says, "The conditions precedent—"

The SPEAKER. We are now on amendment No. 11.

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

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, would Mr. Shane answer one question?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Shane, consent to interrogation?

Mr. SHANE. I shall.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. O'CONNELL. This amendment pertains to the state hospitals. Is that correct? Mental hospitals?

Mr. SHANE. Mental hospitals, not the general hospitals.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I would ask them to oppose the amendment for the same reasons that I stated earlier.

Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Mrs. Kelly.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to interrogate Mr. Shane, if I may, please.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Shane, consent to interrogation?

Mr. SHANE. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The lady may proceed.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, could you tell me where you are going to place all these patients who are presently in these hospitals? Just in Harrisburg alone we have 757 patients. In Embreeville we have 232, and I can go on to all the other six or seven that we have here, which amount to 5,836 patients.

Now, in conversation with you earlier today you stated that you are going to merge them into other hospitals, regardless of the fact that the parents of these patients, who find it a hardship to start with to have a mental patient as a child, would have to travel miles and miles to visit their dear ones.

If you are going to appropriate less money to those that have less patients, do so, but do not try to make it hard for the parents who have these retarded children and who want to visit them or even a dear one who is mentally deranged.

Where are you going to put them? We have tried to get group homes together in all the neighborhoods of this state and we have petitions that the neighborhoods do not accept them. Would you answer that for me?

Mr. SHANE. Is this a question you just finished asking me?

Mrs. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. SHANE. The amendment says that only those institutions whose current residents are less than 60 percent of that institution's patient capacity would be closed. Many of the other institutions are not near their full capacity.

It is my thesis that these residents can be moved to these facilities where there is excess capacity, and, in fact, I saw a plan that would do it with a minimum of inconvenience to the family; namely, moving them to alternate institutions within the same geographic region. And I think this is the direction our Secretary of Welfare would like to go so that we can get more therapy for our mental health dollar.

Nobody is trying to be cruel to these residents. In fact, one of the things we should be doing is taking some of these institutions and converting them into skilled nursing homes so we can bring in more federal dollars for nursing homes.

Mrs. KELLY. Well, let us do that first and have a

place to place them first. I urge all the members of this House to please vote "no" on this amendment.

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

Mr. ZELLER. Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a time when we legislators should look out for ourselves, it is on this one, because if we close down all these hospitals, we will have no place to retire.

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, not to prolong this again, but would Mr. Shane answer a question or two?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Shane, consent to interrogation?

Mr. SHANE. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, what would this do to a facility like Woodhaven that was just recently opened by the state for mentally retarded youngsters? It has not been fully staffed yet because of some problems with Temple University and the contract there, and it was not working at near capacity, and it may be below that 60 percent. What happens to all those youngsters at that facility?

Mr. SHANE. The Wojdak oversight language will take care of it, and I yield to the gentleman for further details, if he wishes.

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, I think that is an excellent question that Mr. Burns has asked, because we have line-itemed Woodhaven and you specifically excluded that from your prior amendments. But as I look at amendment No. 11, I suspect that if it passes and the capacity of Woodhaven is not at 60 percent, the Woodhaven facility would have to be closed.

Mr. BURNS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wonder what we are going to do with those mentally retarded youngsters in the Woodhaven situation. You all remember last session we had the big fight to get money down there to open up that facility, and here we are proposing to close a brand new facility less than a year or maybe just slightly over a year after it was built. So I would suggest that my colleagues vote "no" on this amendment.

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

Mr. SELTZER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that the capacity of any state institution is determined by the department under which the institution functions. All they would have to do is change the capacity of Woodhaven, and then there would be no reason to close the institution.

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

Mr. O'CONNELL. Just one comment: The gentleman referred to Secretary Beal and the direction he was going in. I would like to redirect him and tell him where to go.

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

Mr. SHANE. I withdraw this amendment. I see the inevitable on this one. Let me try another tack.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withdraw amendment No. 11?

Mr. SHANE. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Does the gentleman desire to offer amendment No. 12?

Mr. SHANE. Yes.

On the question recurring,

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

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

Amend Sec. 2, page 27, line 12, by striking out "310,-794,000" and inserting: 290,794,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. SHANE. This amendment, amendment No. 12, would propose to cut the appropriation for the state mental hospitals from \$310 million to \$290 million. This is for a \$20-million cut.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, this is very similar to the prior amendment wherein Mr. Shane attempted to cut \$40 million from the state mental institutions. This amendment would cut \$20 million and, as I recall, the effects of it would be to cut into the personnel at the state mental institutions very severely. I would have to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. O'CONNELL. Does the gentleman want to withdraw this one?

Mr. SHANE. No.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Okay, thank you. I would oppose it.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The yeas and nays were required by Messrs. SHANE and O'CONNELL and were as follows:

YEAS—5

Shane	Whelan	Whittlesey	Zeller
Stahl			

NAYS—175

Abraham	George	McCall	Saloom
Anderson, J. H.	Giammarco	McClatchy	Scheaffer
Arthurs	Gillespie	McCue	Schmitt
Barber	Gillette	McGinnis	Schweder
Bellomini	Gleason	McGraw	Scirica
Bennett	Goodman	McIntyre	Seltzer
Beren	Green	McLane	Shelhamer
Berlin	Greenfield	Mebus	Shelton
Bittle	Grieco	Menhorn	Shuman
Blackwell	Halverson	Milanovich	Shupnik
Bonetto	Hamilton, J. H.	Miller, M. E.	Sirianni
Bradley	Hammock	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Smith, E.
Brandt	Hasay	Miliron	Smith, L.
Brunner	Haskell	Miscevich	Spencer
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	Moehlmann	Stapleton
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	Morris	Stout
Cessar	Hepford	Mrkoncic	Taddonio
Cimini	Hill	Mullen	Taylor
Cole	Hopkins	Musto	Toll
Cowell	Hutchinson, A.	Novak	Trello
Crawford	Hutchinson, W.	Noye	Turner
Cumberland	Irvis	O'Brien	Ustynoski
Davies	Itkin	O'Connell	Valicenti
DeMedio	Johnson, J.	O'Donnell	Vann
Deverter	Katz	O'Keefe	Vroon
Dicarlo	Kelly, A. P.	Pancoast	Walsh, T. P.

Dietz	Kelly, J. B.	Parker, H. S.	Wansacz
Dombrowski	Kernick	Perrri	Wargo
Dorr	Kistler	Perry	Weidner
Doyle	Klingaman	Petrarca	Westerberg
Dreibelbis	Knepper	Pitts	Wilson
Eckensberger	Kotter	Polite	Wilt, R. W.
Englehart	Kowalyszyn	Pratt	Wilt, W. W.
Fee	Kusse	Prendergast	Wojdak
Fischer	LaMarca	Pyles	WorriLOW
Fisher	Laughlin	Reed	Wright
Flaherty	Lederer	Remninger	Yahner
Foster, A.	Lehr	Renwick	Yohn
Foster, W.	Letterman	Richardson	Zearfoss
Fryer	Levi	Ritter	Zord
Gallagher	Lincoln	Romanelli	Zwinkl
Gallen	Lynch	Ross	
Garzia	Manderino	Ruggiero	Fineman,
Geesey	Manmiller	Ryan	Speaker
Geisler			

NOT VOTING—23

Berson	Fawcett	Oliver	Sullivan
Caputo	Gleeson	Pievsky	Sweeney
Cohen	Gring	Rappaport	Tayoun
Davis, D. M.	Laudadio	Rhodes	Thomas
DiDonato	Mullen, M. P.	Rieger	Wagner
Dininni	Myers	Salvatore	

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?

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

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 27, line 12, by striking out "310,794,000" and inserting: 290,794,000

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 2), page 27, line 28, by striking out "14,611,000" and inserting: 19,611,000

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

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

Mr. SHANE. This is the last thrust of my Don Quixote lance, and this time it is going to have a little rougher edge to it.

We are keeping these fat sacred cows of the mental hospitals open to accommodate union muscle of AFSCME and pork-barrel attitudes on the part of a lot of politicians.

This proposes to cut the appropriation for the state mental hospitals from \$310 million to \$290 million and increase the appropriation for community mental health from \$14 million to \$19 million. I leave this proposal to your tender mercies.

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

Mr. O'CONNELL. I completely and wholeheartedly disagree with that statement, Mr. Speaker. I think that is absolutely and totally wrong.

And I will tell you right now for the record that I am not interested in preserving Retreat State Hospital for the protection of jobs, and let that be public, as far as I am concerned.

My interest is in the delivery of the health services to the constituents and the people of Pennsylvania, in all areas—in general medicine as well as in the mental health field.

And, Mr. Speaker, if I wanted to take the time and indulge on the people of this House, I could, you know,

really lace you with this one, but I will not. I just respectfully ask you to oppose it.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, the community-based services, generally, over the past few years have lapsed approximately \$5 million. That has become traditional over the last several years. We have provided adequately for them in this budget consistent with what the history of lapsing has been. I doubt very much that they need this additional \$5 million in the community-based health service units.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Beaver, Mr. Laughlin.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, would Mr. Shane please submit to brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Shane, consent to interrogation?

Mr. SHANE. Why prolong this quixotic venture?

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to know if you have visited any of the mental institutions that you are attempting to cut in this particular proposal?

Mr. SHANE. It simply reduces the overall appropriation.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, that is not my question. I asked you if you ever visited any of the institutions that you are making this cut on. And I am not referring to a visit when you might have been treated; I am referring to the fact that, did you ever go there to check and see? I did not want anybody to misunderstand that, Mr. Speaker; that is why I said it.

Mr. SHANE. Yes, I have. As a matter of fact, my mother is the former president of Indiana County Mental Health, and every Friday she leads a group of volunteers through Torrance State Hospital where they have bingo and play cards, and I go with my mother with that volunteer group to Torrance fairly frequently on Fridays.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I visited a number of the institutions, and if you had taken the time to go to Western State School and Hospital and see the treatment that is available there and see the young people come in from California State Teachers College to aid and help those people there because they are understaffed, I do not think you would be making such a proposal as this.

Thank you.

Mr. SHANE. You might be interested in knowing that Western State School is a school for the mentally retarded and has nothing to do with this amendment.

Secondly, if we are talking about Western Psychiatric Institution—which is one of the really good top-notch psychological programs in western Pennsylvania—they have had to shut down their community mental health clinics in Shadyside, Squirrel Hill, and a couple of other areas where these community mental health clinics were operating, because they are getting strangled by the fact that we are continuing to feed these sacred cows.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, you say you are not making mention of them. But on page 27, lines 9 through 12 indicate that it does include such institutions. It says "mentally ill and the mentally retarded," Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SHANE. I was led down the primrose path—

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker. I did not hear you.

Mr. SHANE. He says that it is for state mental hospitals and the state schools. It would be at the discretion of the department as to where the cut was made, but I am pretty sure it would be in the mental hospitals, which is what they want to work on.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, you are pretty sure, but I think you recall last year when we had an appropriation specially voted for Western State School and Hospital and other schools throughout the state for staff, this money was not used for staff but was used to purchase furniture in that department. And I had the opportunity to call on Frank Beal on a number of occasions to question him on this matter. So I do not think that we are moving in the proper direction nor do I favor in any way your amendment.

Thank you.

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

Mr. McCLATCHY. Mr. Speaker, would Mr. Wojdak submit to interrogation, please?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Wojdak, consent to interrogation?

Mr. WOJDAK. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. McCLATCHY. We had some problem down in Delaware County and Montgomery County with the base service units running out of money this past year. Do we take care of that in this budget to any extent?

Mr. WOJDAK. Well, it is our feeling that we have funded the entire program adequately.

If you point out specific examples, I do not know the specific answer to that. I do know this: Last year \$5 million was lapsed from that particular appropriation.

Mr. McCLATCHY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Crawford, Mr. Haskell.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman, Mr. Shane, consent to interrogation after he speaks to the press?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Shane, consent to interrogation?

Mr. SHANE. Yes, Mr. Speaker. But I was speaking to our staff.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman aware of the patient-to-staff ratio in Polk State Hospital located in northwestern Pennsylvania? I am specifically referring to the latest report of March of 1975.

Mr. SHANE. No.

Mr. HASKELL. For the edification of the member, I would like to point out that the ratio at our state hospital in that part of the state is 1 to 1.01.

I know what the handwriting on the wall is going to be on this amendment, but I want to congratulate the gentleman for attempting to get the thundering herd out of the public trough.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

YEAS—16

Arthurs Fryer Mebus Shelhamer

Beren
Butera
Flaherty

Gillespie
Haskell
McGinnis

Miller, M. E., Jr.
Scirica
Shane

Stahl
Wilt, R. W.
Zeller

NAYS—165

Abraham
Anderson, J. H.
Barber
Bellomini
Bennett
Berlin
Bittle
Bonetto
Bradley
Brandt
Brunner
Burns
Cessar
Cimini
Cohen
Cole
Cowell
Crawford
Cumberland
Davies
Davis, D. M.
DeMedio
Deverter
Dicarlo
DiDonato
Dietz
Dombrowski
Dorr
Doyle
Dreibelbis
Eckensberger
Englehart
Fee
Fischer
Fisher
Foster, A.
Foster, W.
Gallagher
Gallen
Garzia
Geesey
Geisler

George
Giammarco
Gillette
Gleason
Goodman
Green
Greenfield
Grieco
Halverson
Hamilton, J. H.
Hammock
Hasay
Hayes, D. S.
Hayes, S. E.
Hepford
Hill
Hopkins
Hutchinson, A.
Hutchinson, W.
Iris
Itkin
Johnson, J.
Katz
Kelly, A. P.
Kelly, J. B.
Kernick
Kistler
Klingaman
Knepper
Kolter
Kowalyszyn
Kusse
LaMarca
Laughlin
Lederer
Lehr
Letterman
Levi
Lincoln
Lynch
Manderino
Manmiller

McCall
McClatchy
McCue
McGraw
McIntyre
McLane
Menhorn
Milanovich
Miller, M. E.
Milliron
Misceovich
Moehlmann
Morris
Mrkonie
Mullen
Musto
Novak
Noye
O'Brien
O'Connell
O'Donnell
O'Keefe
Pancoast
Parker, H. S.
Perri
Perry
Petrarca
Pitts
Polite
Pratt
Prendergast
Pyles
Reed
Renninger
Renwick
Richardson
Ritter
Romanelli
Ross
Ruggiero
Ryan
Saloom

Scheaffer
Schmitt
Schweder
Seltzer
Shuman
Shupnik
Sirianni
Smith, E.
Smith, L.
Spencer
Stapleton
Stout
Taddonio
Taylor
Toll
Trello
Turner
Ustynoski
Valicenti
Vann
Vroon
Walsh, T. P.
Wansacz
Wargo
Weidner
Westerberg
Whelan
Whittlesey
Wilson
Wilt, W. W.
Wojdak
Worrilow
Wright
Yahner
Yohn
Zearfoss
Zord
Zwikel

Fineman, Speaker

NOT VOTING—22

Berson
Blackwell
Caputo
Dininni
Fawcett
Gleeson

Gring
Laudadio
Mullen, M. P.
Myers
Oliver
Pievsky

Rappaport
Rhodes
Rieger
Salvatore
Shelton

Sullivan
Sweeney
Tayoun
Thomas
Wagner

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Shane. Does the gentleman have any further amendments to offer?

Mr. SHANE. No. But I would like to thank the members for their indulgence.

It has been a very productive week for me. I think we confronted one of the sacred cows a couple of days ago. I think in the future years we will probably get around to confronting this sacred cow, and that is good enough progress for me.

Thank you.

On the question recurring,

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

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

Amend Bill, page 54, by inserting between lines 9 and 10:

Section 9. No funds appropriated by this act shall be expended after March 31, 1976 to pay the wages, salaries, expenses or fringe benefits of more than a complement of 70,000 State employees. If a total of more than 70,000 employees is on the payrolls after March 31, 1976 by reason of administrative refusal to cut the total number

of employes to 70,000 by the cut-off date the State Treasurer and Auditor General shall summarily refuse to approve payments to all persons beyond the first 70,000 presented for payment.

Amend Sec. 9, page 54, line 10, by striking out "9." and inserting: 10.

Amend Sec. 10, page 54, line 13, by striking out "10." and inserting: 11.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. PYLES. Mr. Speaker, my amendment addresses itself to a new section 9, which says: "No funds appropriated by this act shall be expended after March 31, 1976 to pay the wages, salaries, expenses or fringe benefits of more than a complement of 70,000 State employees."

I refer to my amendment as the anti-big-state-government amendment.

As a new member of this House and this body, I have spent 3 days going through the budget process for the first time. I have heard very few of my colleagues address themselves to big state government. Only one attempt—by my colleague, Mr. Lincoln—was there made to reduce this galloping cost of government. And he got some sort of vague promise that he will be informed more adequately in the future, so he withdrew his amendment.

I have heard and spoken to many of my colleagues to find out from them if they knew how many employes were contained in House bill No. 1336. I am surprised to find that very few of the members of this House know how many people are to be paid out of this appropriation. I have been informed by reliable sources that a 77,822 complement is in this appropriation.

Our chief executive of this state, 4½ years ago when he was running for the position of Governor, admonished the then-administration for the size of the state employment. He promised the people of this state that he was going to lower employment in state government by 10 percent. And yet the facts are that 4 years ago state employment was at a level of about 101,000 people, totally. Now I am told it is near 117,000 people.

I have heard many of my colleagues, during this debate, speak about the bureaucratic operation, that bureaucracy is out of hand. Where it grows is from human beings plying the trade of their positions in government. They feed each year on employment and building up their little bureaucracies. Each year the complement seems to go up; not level off; not reduce; but continues to loom forward. Somebody has to stand up and take action to slow this down.

I do not intend in my amendment to slay this dragon, but only wound it.

At the present time, for your edification, there are 71,273 employes on the payroll that are contained in the general appropriation budget. My amendment would affect only 1,273 people who are employed at the present time and are paid out of the general appropriation. By March 31, 1976, through attrition, retirement, people quitting, it would be easy to accomplish a reduction of 1,273 employes. But if we do not take a step as I am proposing by my amendment, the employment is apt to rise to the 77,822 complement that is contained in the budget we have before us.

I think we have to take a step. Now is the time. Big

government is just getting out of hand, and I think this state government should take the lead and do something about it. There are many local governments, particularly in the cities, that are having to lay off people because they cannot raise the taxes. We are going to find ourselves in the same position next year if we let the 77,822 employes come on board. And I am proposing to stop it right now.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, this again is one of the arbitrary cuts slashing across the board as to the entire number of state employes.

From my calculations it would have the effect of laying off approximately 7,000 employes. I do not know where Mr. Pyles got the figure of 1,100 or 1,000. But you are talking about slashing a state complement in significant numbers, and I do not know the exact number, but it is somewhere near 7,000 or 8,000, according to my calculations.

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

Mr. PYLES. Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the information I have received, it is true that my proposal will reduce the complement—not the on-board count now; the complement—by 10 percent.

The complement—those who are receiving paychecks right now from the general appropriation—is only 71,273. I recognize that there are some lapses built into the 77,822 complement, so I am not affecting that large number of people. All I am saying here today is that somebody has got to step forward and slow down this creeping bureaucracy, and I am proposing to do it by holding down employment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority whip.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman proposes is what I would call the meat-ax approach, and that meat ax is going to hit the heads of state employes across the board who are doing a job, who are needed, and whom we are funding when we fund various programs within the Commonwealth.

I think if the gentleman would take a more sensible approach, or if this General Assembly decided in its wisdom that a reduction of the state force were necessary, it should not be done in the manner suggested.

I would ask all members on this side of the aisle and all members in this General Assembly to oppose such a drastic approach as the gentleman suggests by voting "no."

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

YEAS—52

Beren	Hamilton, J. H.	Manmiller	Stahl
Bittle	Hasay	Moehlmann	Taddonio
Brandt	Haskell	Mrkonic	Turner
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	Noye	Vroon
Crawford	Hepford	O'Connell	Wagner
Davies	Hill	Pancoast	Weidner
Deverter	Kelly, J. B.	Pitts	Whelan
Dorr	Knepper	Pyles	Wilt, W. W.
Dietz	Kusse	Scheaffer	Worrlow

Fischer	Lehr	Seltzer	Yohn
Gallen	McClatchy	Sirianni	Zearfoss
Geesey	McCue	Smith, L.	Zeller
Gleason	McGinnis	Spencer	Zord

NAYS—129

Abraham	Gallagher	McCall	Ruggiero
Anderson, J. H.	Garzia	McGraw	Ryan
Arthurs	Geisler	McIntyre	Saloom
Barber	George	McLane	Schmitt
Bellomini	Giammarco	Menhorn	Schweder
Bennett	Gillespie	Milanovich	Scirica
Berlin	Gillette	Miller, M. E.	Shane
Berson	Goodman	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Shehmer
Bonetto	Green	Milliron	Shelton
Bradley	Greenfield	Miscevich	Shuman
Brunner	Grieco	Morris	Shupnik
Burns	Halverson	Mullen	Smith, E.
Cessar	Hayes, D. S.	Musto	Stapleton
Cimini	Hopkins	Myers	Taylor
Cohen	Hutchinson, A.	Novak	Toll
Cole	Hutchinson, W.	O'Brien	Trello
Cowell	Irvis	O'Donnell	Ustynoski
Cumberland	Itkin	O'Keefe	Valicenti
Davis, D. M.	Johnson, J.	Oliver	Vann
DeMedio	Katz	Perri	Walsh, T. P.
Dicarlo	Kelly, A. P.	Perry	Wansacz
DiDonato	Kernick	Petrarca	Wargo
Dombrowski	Kistler	Polite	Westerberg
Doyle	Klingaman	Pratt	Whittlesey
Dreibelbis	Kolter	Prendergast	Wilt, R. W.
Eckensberger	Kowalshyn	Reed	Wojdak
Englehart	LaMarca	Renninger	Wright
Fee	Laughlin	Renwick	Yahner
Fisher	Lederer	Richardson	Zwinkl
Flaherty	Letterman	Rieger	
Foster, A.	Levi	Ritter	Fineman,
Foster, W.	Lincoln	Romanelli	Speaker
Fryer	Manderino	Ross	

NOT VOTING—22

Blackwell	Hammock	Pievsky	Sullivan
Caputo	Laudadio	Rappaport	Sweeney
Dininni	Lynch	Rhodes	Tayoun
Fawcett	Mebus	Saivatore	Thomas
Gleeson	Mullen, M. P.	Stout	Wilson
Gring	Parker, H. S.		

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

Amend Bill, page 54, by inserting between lines 12 and 13: Section 9.1. Any other provision of this act to the contrary notwithstanding, all appropriations made for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1975 and ending June 30, 1976, by the General Appropriation Bill of 1975, but excepting every item therein or other appropriation relating to servicing the Commonwealth debt, are hereby reduced by 2.4% of the itemized figures herein appearing.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. ZELLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, since we have voted to hold on to the \$120 million in the parents reimbursement fund, there is a need to come up with \$120 million. And in order to come up with \$120 million to balance this budget so that we can all go home, there will be no problems if we give a simple cut of 2.4 percent across the board. It would not be very noticeable in most departments because of the fact that 2.4 percent of the \$4.4-billion budget would come out to a \$120-million cut.

I feel that if we want to get rid of some of the fat in the \$440-million increase this year—and there is no ques-

tion about it, there is a lot of fat in there—and if we want to show that we really mean it, let us give it a cut here. If we find the \$120 million, we balance the budget; we do not raise the taxes; and we can all go home.

Thank you.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, we have been here for 4 days now debating various increases and cuts that have taken place in this budget.

What Mr. Zeller is proposing is an across-the-board cut on every item in that budget that we have been arguing about for 4 days now. To reduce that arbitrarily and blindly by 2.4 percent, I want you to understand that that 2.4-percent cut would affect every school district in this state; it would affect the appropriation for the nonpublic schools. Every item in that budget would be cut.

If anyone would suggest to me that this is a reasonable approach to take in this, there is really no sense for us to stand here day after day arguing about individual items, nor really is there any work that the Appropriations Committee should do or each individual member should do in trying to distribute this money with whatever priorities he may have or with any sense of equity in putting this budget together. I would strongly urge the membership to vote in the negative.

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

Mr. ZELLER. Mr. Speaker, we can use all the words we want to and what you will find is that you will never satisfy all the members. There is no way possible to satisfy everybody.

This way—a very simple cut—every individual's ox is being gored by 2.4 percent. Now we are all happy; we all got a little cut.

What Mr. Wojdak is trying to say is that, in other words, we are going to move around; we will cut some areas where it is necessary; other areas we will not, and this and that, and try to make us believe that by the so-called hurting of our school areas—that is, I should say, a very serious area to many individuals here—we may be fearful of taking some action on this. But 2.4 percent is not going to hurt any of them. This way we all get a little action, and it is all simplified. Let us go home.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

YEAS—49

Brandt	Hepford	Mrkonic	Smith, L.
Crawford	Hill	Noye	Spencer
Eckensberger	Hopkins	O'Connell	Stahl
Fischer	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Taddonio
Fisher	Katz	Polite	Turner
Foster, A.	Klingaman	Pyles	Vroon
Foster, W.	Lehr	Renwick	Wagner
Fryer	Letterman	Scheaffer	Weidner
Gallen	McClatchy	Shane	Wilson
Geesey	McGinnis	Shehmer	Yahner
Hamilton, J. H.	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Sirianni	Zeller
Hasay	Moehlmann	Smith, E.	Zord
Haskell			

NAYS—136

Abraham	Gallagher	McCall	Ruggiero
Anderson, J. H.	Garzia	McCue	Ryan

Arthurs	Geisler	McGraw	Saloom
Barber	George	McIntyre	Schmitt
Bellomini	Giammarco	McLane	Schweder
Bennett	Gillespie	Mebus	Scirica
Beren	Gillette	Menhorn	Seltzer
Berlin	Gleason	Milanovich	Shelton
Berson	Goodman	Miller, M. E.	Shuman
Bittle	Green	Milliron	Shupnik
Bonetto	Greenfield	Miscevich	Stapleton
Bradley	Grieco	Morris	Stout
Brunner	Halverson	Mullen, M. P.	Taylor
Burns	Hayes, D. S.	Mullen	Toll
Butera	Hayes, S. E.	Musto	Trello
Cessar	Hutchinson, A.	Myers	Ustynoski
Cimini	Irvin	Novak	Valicenti
Cohen	Itkin	O'Brien	Vann
Cole	Johnson, J.	O'Donnell	Walsh, T. P.
Cowell	Kelly, A. P.	O'Keefe	Wansacz
Cumberland	Kelly, J. E.	Oliver	Wargo
Davies	Kernick	Pancoast	Westerberg
Davis, D. M.	Kistler	Parker, H. S.	Whelan
DeMedio	Knepper	Perri	Whittlesey
Deverter	Koiter	Perry	Wilt, W. W.
Dicarlo	Kowalshyn	Petrarca	Wojdak
DiDonato	Kusse	Prendergast	Worrilow
Dietz	LaMarca	Pratt	Wright
Dombrowski	Laughlin	Reed	Yohn
Dorr	Lederer	Renninger	Zearfoss
Doyle	Levi	Rieger	Zwikel
Dreibelbs	Lincoln	Ritter	
Englehart	Lynch	Romanelli	Fineman,
Fee	Manderino	Ross	Speaker
Flaherty	Manmiller		

NOT VOTING—18

Blackwell	Gring	Rhodes	Sweeney
Caputo	Hammock	Richardson	Tayoun
Dininni	Laudadio	Salvatore	Thomas
Fawcett	Pievsky	Sullivan	Wilt, R. W.
Gleeson	Rappaport		

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?

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

Amend Sec. 2, page 4, line 2 by striking out all of said line

Amend Sec. 2, page 7, lines 17 and 18 by striking out both of said lines

Amend Sec. 2, page 10, lines 6 and 7 by striking out both of said lines

Amend Sec. 2, page 16, lines 7 and 8 by striking out both of said lines

Amend Sec. 2, page 20, lines 16 to 28 by striking out all of said lines

Amend Sec. 2, page 26, lines 19 to 22 by striking out all of said lines

Amend Sec. 2, page 32, lines 10 to 12 by striking out all of said lines

Amend Sec. 2, page 39, lines 28 and 29 by striking out both of said lines

Amend Sec. 2, page 47, lines 15 to 22 by striking out all of said lines

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. DORR. Mr. Speaker, this amendment would reduce the budget by \$1,038,000. It deals only with the striking of entire programs.

Often legislators are accused of being against taxes and not willing to support the things that we vote for, while preserving the so-called sacred cows or pork-barrel items.

I have several items that I think we can, in the fiscal restraint under which we find ourselves, do away with. I would like to just briefly read those and let the mem-

bers make a decision as to whether or not they think these particular programs can be done away with, thereby reducing the budget in what may seem to be a small amount, but an amount which I think, if everyone would come up with this kind of figure, could make a substantial reduction.

The first item is \$1,000 for the portrait of the Lieutenant Governor; the second item is \$50,000 for dog house construction; the third item is \$2,000 for ceremonies for the Distinguished Daughters of Pennsylvania; the fourth item is \$50,000 for the operation of the Ethnic Heritage Studies Center; the fifth item is \$813,000 for various health research programs; the sixth item is \$100,000 for the development of new and innovative types of child care; the next item is \$11,000 for trips to national conferences for legislators; and the next item is \$5,000 for the same purpose; the last item is \$1,000 for a grant to the National Society of State Legislators which, I understand, is no longer in existence.

Lest I be accused of being in favor of disease, in respect to the health research items, I would just like to bring to the attention of the members the fact that for fiscal 1976, the Federal Government is proposing to spend just in one area of health research the amount of \$1.864 billion. That, essentially, is the National Institute of Health appropriation for the following year.

It seems to me, with that kind of expenditure coming from the Federal Government in a year in which the state must, I think, begin to look for areas where we can cut our expenditures, perhaps we can do away with that particular expenditure even though it is, as perhaps all of these are, a good and worthy program.

I would suggest that the members vote in favor of the amendment in order to reduce the expenditures of state government for the following year.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, out of all the items that Mr. Dorr is attempting to cut, there is one that we do agree with—he is correct—and that is, the National Society of State Legislators. We are preparing an amendment on that to cut the \$1,000. The other items really do provide various services for the people of this Commonwealth.

I noticed in going through these that he has made the greatest cut, the highest amount, in the area of health services. For instance, there is a cut of \$418,000 for cancer research; a cut of \$200,000 for the Wistar Institute for cellular biology research; he is cutting in the area of cardio-vascular research. The heavy cuts are in the area of health services.

There are some here that really do not amount to very much—for instance, the Lieutenant Governor's portrait. I might add that that is for Lieutenant Governor Broderick, not for Lieutenant Governor Kline.

Mr. Speaker, without prolonging this, I would oppose this amendment offered by Mr. Dorr.

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

Mr. DORR. Mr. Speaker, just one further item. I want to clarify the language that the gentleman used. I am not cutting health services. The items that I have in here, I believe, are all health research items, not services.

With due respect to Lieutenant Governor Broderick

and Lieutenant Governor Kline, it does not really matter who it is, I do not think we need to spend that money this year.

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

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

YEAS—63

Anderson, J. H.	Gallen	McCue	Stahl
Bittle	Geesey	McGinnis	Taddonio
Brandt	Gleason	Mrkonie	Turner
Burns	Hasay	Noye	Vroon
Butera	Haskell	O'Connell	Wagner
Cumberland	Hayes, D. S.	Pancoast	Weidner
Davies	Hayes, S. E.	Pitts	Westerberg
Deverter	Hepford	Polite	Whelan
Dicarlo	Hill	Pyles	Whittlesey
Dietz	Hutchinson, W.	Renninger	Wilson
Dorr	Klingaman	Ryan	Wilt, R. W.
Eckensberger	Kusse	Scheaffer	Wilt, W. W.
Fischer	Lehr	Sirianni	Wright
Foster, A.	Levi	Smith, E.	Zearfoss
Foster, W.	Manmiller	Smith, L.	Zeller
Fryer	McClatchy	Spencer	

NAYS—119

Abraham	Gillespie	McLane	Ruggiero
Arthurs	Gillette	Mebus	Saloom
Barber	Goodman	Menhorn	Schmitt
Bellomini	Green	Milnovich	Schweder
Bennett	Greenfield	Miller, M. E.	Scirica
Berlin	Grieco	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Shane
Berson	Halverson	Milliron	Shelhamer
Bonetto	Hamilton, J. H.	Miscevich	Shelton
Bradley	Hopkins	Moehlmann	Shuman
Brunner	Hutchinson, A.	Morris	Shupnik
Cessar	Itkin	Mullen, M. P.	Stapleton
Cimini	Irvig	Mullen	Stout
Cohen	Johnson, J.	Musto	Taylor
Cole	Katz	Myers	Toll
Cowell	Kelly, A. P.	Novak	Ustynoski
Crawford	Kelly, J. B.	O'Brien	Valicenti
Davis, D. M.	Kernick	O'Donnell	Vann
DeMedio	Kistler	O'Keefe	Walsh, T. P.
DiDonato	Knepper	Oliver	Wansacz
Dombrowski	Kolter	Parker, H. S.	Wargo
Doyle	Kowalshyn	Perri	Wojdak
Dreibelbis	LaMarca	Perry	WorriLOW
Englehart	Laughlin	Petrarca	Yahner
Fee	Lederer	Pratt	Yohn
Fisher	Letterman	Prendergast	Zord
Flaherty	Lincoln	Reed	Zwikel
Gallagher	Lynch	Renwick	
Garzia	Manderino	Ritter	
Geisler	McCall	Romanelli	Fineman,
George	McGraw	Ross	Speaker
Giammarco			

NOT VOTING—21

Beren	Gring	Rappaport	Seltzer
Blackwell	Hammock	Rhodes	Sullivan
Caputo	Laudadio	Richardson	Sweeney
Dininni	McIntyre	Rieger	Tayoun
Fawcett	Pievsky	Salvatore	Thomas
Gleeson			

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

Amend Sec. 2, page 50, line 16, by striking out "9,028,000" and inserting: 14,028,000

Amend Sec. 2, page 51, line 24, by striking out "14,000,000" and inserting: 9,000,000

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

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

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I have three amendments. The first one amends page 50, line 16, and page 51, line 24. This amendment would transfer \$5 million from the \$14-million appropriation for county court costs to the appropriation for community courts and district justices' salaries.

You should all be aware of the fact that the Governor's proposed budget had deleted the item known as county court costs completely, and it was the Appropriations Committee that restored that program to the tune of \$14 million.

Last week the members of the Law and Justice Committee and other members of this House introduced House bill No. 1375, which we refer to as the district magistrates reform act. Among the various provisions of that act, we have included provisions which would increase the salaries of district magistrates. The \$5-million transfer that we are asking for in this amendment would provide the funds to pay for that increase in the salaries of district magistrates.

To make up the cost that would be diverted from the counties by this amendment, House bill No. 1375, if we ultimately pass that bill and it is enacted, would increase costs assessable in all summary offense proceedings instituted under the Motor Vehicle Code from \$5 to \$10. Our estimates indicate that this would provide an additional \$4 million that would flow into the county treasuries throughout the Commonwealth.

We believe that this amendment, if adopted, would increase the efficiency of the minor courts in our Commonwealth. This amendment would not add in any way to the budget that we have before us at the present time.

If you are interested in reform of the district magistrates at that level of administering justice, I respectfully request that all of you support this transfer of funds. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. Mr. Speaker, first let me speak to this problem: It is true that the Appropriations Committee restored the cut made in the Governor's budget for county court costs to bring it to the level of expenditure of last year, but what Mr. Eckensberger is doing is taking \$5 million from the county court costs that we have put in here and using that money to provide raises for the district magistrates.

In addition to that, we really have to look at this bill in conjunction with an amendment, which I assume will be offered subsequent to this, whereby he is increasing district magistrates, and I believe the figure is from 127 to 161.

Mr. Speaker, would Mr. Eckensberger consent to interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Eckensberger, consent to interrogation?

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. I shall.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. WOJDAK. In the amendment to be subsequently offered, are you providing for an increase in the number of district magistrates?

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. I am not. Mr. Speaker, that amendment, which is not now before the House, would merely change identification numbers that are used in the report forms provided by the Department of Community Affairs. It is strictly a technical amendment which we had understood was agreed to by your committee, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOJDAK. One further question, Mr. Speaker: Your method of restoring the \$5 million being taken from the county courts, or your attempt to restore it, I assume is via a piece of legislation that is already introduced in the House. Is that correct?

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOJDAK. That legislation, I assume, would increase fees at the county level?

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. It would increase that cost assessable in summary offense proceedings instituted under the Motor Vehicle Code from \$5 to \$10.

Mr. WOJDAK. Do we have an estimate as to the yield on that?

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. About \$4 million.

Mr. WOJDAK. Well, assuming it passes via that method, the fund could be restored for county court costs.

So that everyone knows what they are voting on here, what Mr. Eckensberger has really done is rearrange priorities for the expenditure of that money. If it is taken from the county court costs, that will spread itself proportionally across the state. By that cut it will provide the necessary moneys to give the district magistrates an increase in salary. But only if the subsequent piece of legislation is successful in passing through this House and through the Senate and signed by the Governor would the fund be restored to its present level.

Without going into any further detail, I would suggest to the membership that they vote in the negative on this.

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

Mr. POLITE. Will Mr. Eckensberger consent to a brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Eckensberger, consent to interrogation?

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. I shall, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. POLITE. Mr. Speaker, are you trying to tell us that the increase in costs will be funnelled back to the state?

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. The costs that are presently assessable by district magistrates presently find their way into the county treasury of the respective county where those costs are paid.

Mr. POLITE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, this General Assembly several years ago made a decision to begin paying the court costs incurred in the various counties for the expenses of the courts of common pleas and the ancillary services.

The \$24 million that was paid back last year to the individual counties, the 67 counties of this Commonwealth, represented only about 50 percent of those court costs. We propose, in House bill No. 1336, to keep that figure at \$24 million, which is the figure that we paid last year. Obviously, with inflation and increased expenses all across the Commonwealth for every type of

service, our hold-the-line \$24-million figure really represents a cut to those individual counties for their court costs. They are really going to get a reduction in the percentage of court costs that this \$24 million, which we are going to provide, will pay, and we only paid 50 percent of the costs last year.

Now if we remove \$5 million, as this amendment proposes to remove, from the proposed \$24 million—my mathematics are not that good—somewhere around 20 percent is the reduction that each county will suffer from the money they received last year to help them pay for court costs. Every one of the 67 counties is affected. Now if you add on to that the loss that will be incurred because of inflation, these counties are going to have in excess of 20-percent cut from the moneys that they expect to help to pay their court costs.

I think we ought to continue along the line which we embarked upon several years ago when we made a decision to begin to pick up the court costs across the Commonwealth, deciding that the administration of justice was a proper cost for this Commonwealth to become involved in and a proper manner in which to share revenue with the municipalities across the state.

I think the amendment that Mr. Eckensberger proposes, because of its effect on each and every individual county budget back home, ought to be defeated. I do not think that your county or my county expects or can afford the cut in excess of 20 percent that this amendment would represent to them in the sharing of the court costs. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. Just a brief response, Mr. Speaker. First, the counties will recover most of this loss through the increase costs in motor vehicle cases. That is number one. Number two, we are, by House bill No. 1375, expanding the jurisdiction of district magistrates so that they may handle such things as first offenses under the driving-while-under-the-influence cases arising under the Motor Vehicle Code. We are also giving them full jurisdiction over most of the misdemeanors of the third degree under the Crimes Code, which means that there will be fewer cases going in for determination at the county level, which will, in turn, result in fewer costs to the county in administering those cases.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is a reasonable approach. The time has come for us to reform the minor judiciary system. I think this is the first step to take and I urge all members to vote for this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

YEAS—73

Anderson, J. H.	George	Miller, M. E.	Scirica
Bellomini	Gillespie	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Seltzer
Beren	Grieco	Milliron	Smith, L.
Brandt	Halverson	Moehlmann	Spencer
Burns	Hasay	Morris	Stahl
Butera	Haskell	O'Connell	Turner
Cimini	Hopkins	O'Keefe	Ustynoski
Crawford	Kistler	Pancoast	Wagner
Cumberland	Klingaman	Polite	Weidner
Davies	LaMarca	Pratt	Westerberg
Davis, D. M.	Laughlin	Pyles	Wilson

Dombrowaki	Letterman	Reed	Wilt, R. W.
Doyle	Lynch	Renwick	Worrilow
Eckensberger	Manmiller	Ritter	Wright
Foster, A.	McClatchy	Ryan	Yahner
Foster, W.	McCue	Scheaffer	Yohn
Fryer	McGinnis	Schmitt	Zeller
Geesey	Mebus	Schweder	Zwilk
Gleason			

NAYS—108

Abraham	Garzia	Manderino	Saloom
Arthurs	Geisler	McCall	Shane
Barber	Giammarco	McGraw	Shelhamer
Bennett	Gillette	McLane	Shuman
Berlin	Goodman	Menhorn	Shupnik
Berson	Green	Milanovich	Smith, E.
Bittle	Greenfield	Miscevich	Stapleton
Blackwell	Hamilton, J. H.	Mrkonic	Stout
Bonetto	Hayes, D. S.	Mullen	Taddonio
Bradley	Hayes, S. E.	Musto	Taylor
Brunner	Hepford	Myers	Toll
Cessar	Hill	Novak	Trello
Cohen	Hutchinson, A.	Noye	Valicenti
Cole-	Hutchinson, W.	O'Brien	Vann
Cowell	Irvis	O'Donnell	Vroon
DeMedio	Itkin	Oliver	Walsh, T. P.
Deverter	Johnson, J.	Parker, H. S.	Wansacz
Dicarolo	Katz	Perri	Wargo
DiDonato	Kelly, A. P.	Perry	Whelan
Dietz	Kelly, J. E.	Petrarca	Whittlesey
Dorr	Kernick	Pitts	Wilt, W. W.
Dreibelbis	Knepper	Prendergast	Wojdak
Englehart	Kolter	Renninger	Zearfoss
Fee	Kowalyshyn	Richardson	Zord
Fischer	Kusse	Romanelli	
Fisher	Lederer	Ross	Fineman,
Flaherty	Levi	Ruggiero	Speaker
Gallen	Lincoln		

NOT VOTING—22

Caputo	Hammock	Rappaport	Sirianni
Dininni	Laudadio	Rhodes	Sullivan
Fawcett	Lehr	Rieger	Sweeney
Gallagher	McIntyre	Salvatore	Tayoun
Gleeson	Mullen, M. P.	Shelton	Thomas
Gring	Pievsky		

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

Amend Sec. 2, page 51, lines 4 and 5, by striking out all of line 4 and "and (127) justices and aldermen," and inserting: (160) courts and (161) district justices,

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

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

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to withdraw that amendment and go to the amendment marked "No. 3." This one amends page 3, line 10.

On the question recurring,

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

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

Amend Sec. 2, page 3, line 10, by striking out "1,860,000" and inserting: 1,558,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. ECKENSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment reduces the appropriation to the Council on the Arts from \$1,860,000 to \$1,558,000. This amounts to a reduction of \$302,000, or something more than a quarter of a million dollars.

The amendment lowers the appropriation to that amount that was requested by the Governor's office. I am advised that the increase which the Appropriations Committee added represents contemplated Bicentennial expenditures.

Now I suggest, as a matter of policy, that this chamber should require the separation of Bicentennial expenditures from departmental expenditures. You all know that in practically 100 percent of our budgetary considerations, generally we add to the previous year's appropriation from one fiscal year to the next. Comingling the Bicentennial expenditures and appropriations, which would be limited to possibly one or two years of duration, would escalate the appropriations unreasonably in ensuing fiscal years.

We have a Bicentennial Commission and we have appropriated a considerable amount of money to that commission. I suggest, if we want to retain this in the budget, that we then turn around and put it into the Bicentennial Commission appropriation.

I think it would be appropriate for us to support this amendment, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. WOJDAK. The gentleman is absolutely correct. What he is attempting to do is take it back to the Governor's original request made back in February in the budget document. Subsequent to that date, it is our understanding that requests have been coming in from all over the state specifically for Bicentennial activity.

Now the gentleman is correct that we could or we might put it in the fund of \$5 million. The problem is that the requests for the Council on the Arts are coming from members of this council who are really established professional and amateur groups, and the increase is necessary for Bicentennial activity because the requests of these professional and amateur groups, which are well-established, are not being entertained by the Bicentennial Commission. Now they are established groups and on-going groups. They do plan some increased activity because of the Bicentennial. Their requests are not being entertained by the Bicentennial Commission, and, as a result, there is need for additional funding for the Bicentennial. I would urge a negative vote on Mr. Eckensberger's amendment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

YEAS—108

Abraham	Garzia	Lincoln	Scirica
Anderson, J. H.	Geesey	Lynch	Seltzer
Bellomini	George	Manmiller	Shelhamer
Beren	Gillespie	McClatchy	Sirianni
Bittle	Gillette	McCue	Smith, E.
Brandt	Gleason	McGinnis	Smith, L.
Burns	Goodman	Mebus	Spencer
Butera	Grieco	Miller, M. E.	Stahl

Cassar	Halverson	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Stapleton
Cimini	Hamilton, J. H.	Milliron	Taddonio
Cowell	Hasay	Moehlmann	Taylor
Crawford	Haskell	Morris	Turner
Cumberland	Hayes, S. E.	Mrkonic	Wansacz
Davies	Hepford	Noye	Weidner
Davis, D. M.	Hill	O'Brien	Westerberg
Deverter	Hopkins	O'Connell	Whelan
Dicarlo	Hutchinson, A.	O'Keefe	Whittlesey
Dietz	Hutchinson, W.	Pancoast	Wilson
Dorr	Katz	Perri	Wilt, R. W.
Doyle	Kistler	Pitts	Wilt, W. W.
Dreibelbis	Klingaman	Polite	Worrlow
Eckensberger	Koiter	Prendergast	Wright
Fischer	Kusse	Pyles	Yohn
Foster, A.	LaMarca	Renwick	Zearfoss
Foster, W.	Lehr	Ritter	Zeller
Fryer	Letterman	Ryan	Zord
Gallen	Levi	Scheaffer	Zwilk

NAYS—75

Arthurs	Giammarco	Milanovich	Schweder
Barber	Green	Miscevich	Shane
Bennett	Greenfield	Mullen	Shuman
Berlin	Hayes, D. S.	Musto	Shupnik
Berson	Irvin	Myers	Stout
Blackwell	Itkin	Novak	Toll
Bonetto	Johnson, J.	O'Donnell	Trello
Bradley	Kelly, A. P.	Oliver	Ustynoski
Brunner	Kelly, J. B.	Parker, H. S.	Valicenti
Cohen	Kernick	Perry	Vann
Coie	Knepper	Petrarca	Vroom
DeMedio	Kowalshyn	Pratt	Wagner
DiDonato	Laughlin	Reed	Walsh, T. P.
Dombrowski	Lederer	Renninger	Wargo
Englehart	Manderino	Romanelli	Wojdak
Fee	McCall	Ross	Yahner
Fisher	McGraw	Ruggiero	Fineman
Flaherty	McLane	Saloom	Speaker
Gallagher	Menhorn	Schmitt	
Geisler			

NOT VOTING—20

Caputo	Hammock	Rappaport	Shelton
Dininni	Laudadio	Rhodes	Sullivan
Fawcett	McIntyre	Richardson	Sweeney
Gleason	Mullen, M. P.	Rieger	Tayoun
Gring	Pievsky	Salvatore	Thomas

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

HOUSE BILL No. 1336 AND AMENDMENTS Tabled

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that House bill No. 1336, along with the amendments, be placed upon the table.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT ON MEDICAL MALPRACTICE HEARINGS

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

Mr. BERSON. I would like to make an announcement to the members of the Judiciary Committee and to the members of the Subcommittee on Insurance of the Consumer Protection Committee: It has been impossible, because of floor sessions, to schedule any hearings this week on medical malpractice. The next hearing on medical malpractice will be held in Philadelphia on Thursday, at 10 a.m., at Temple Law School. We have a long list of witnesses to hear. I hope we can have some of the witnesses who were scheduled for Harrisburg today in Philadelphia next Thursday.

I know that a lot of you have been getting mail on

this subject, and you can assure your constituents that we are moving forward in considering a number of bills that have been introduced.

BILL REPORTED AND CONSIDERED FIRST TIME AND Tabled

SENATE BILL No. 150

By Mr. O'DONNELL

An Act amending the act of October 17, 1969 (P. L. 259, No. 105), entitled "An act relating to the Philadelphia Municipal Court," increasing the jurisdiction of the municipal court of Philadelphia.

Reported from Committee on Judiciary.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS HOUSE

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

Mr. BRANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the past two days we have had a hectic schedule. The debate was lengthy and sometimes tempers simmered, but I would like to congratulate the Speaker on the order that was in the House.

Mr. Speaker, as time went on, I think that we did do better in our deportment. Just for the record, Mr. Speaker, you sounded the gavel yesterday 55 times and today just 30.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman for that important piece of trivia.

QUESTION OF INFORMATION

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

Mr. LINCOLN. I rise to a question of information.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, can you inform this body as to how many amendments to House bill No. 1336 we have left?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is advised, at this moment, that there are 35 amendments left.

Mr. LINCOLN. Can the Chair advise this body as to whether there will be further amendments accepted to this bill at any date beyond today?

The SPEAKER. Under the rules of the House, amendments are acceptable on third consideration. The bill is on third consideration.

The Chair would hope that the members would not offer additional amendments so that we can finally dispose of the bill, but the members are free to do so if they want to.

Mr. LINCOLN. Thank you.

REQUEST FOR ROLL CALL

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

Mr. COWELL. Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that it has taken us 3 days to go through the first 45 amendments, I would ask that there be a roll-call vote on any motion to adjourn until next Monday.

HOUSE SCHEDULE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, on the adjournment of the House today until Monday, we shall return to the floor of the House at 1 o'clock on Monday. It will be my plan to urge the Democrats to meet in caucus until 3 o'clock, then come back to work from 3 until 6 o'clock on the additional amendments which we face.

I anticipate that we should have, for a final vote, before us a budget bill, as amended, by Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. BUTERA. Mr. Speaker, since there will not be time to get any kind of a caucus letter out, I would suggest that the Republicans caucus at 1 o'clock as well on Monday, and I would support the gentleman's schedule, having been in his position.

In answer to, I guess, what Mr. Cowell's motion is going to be, I would support the majority leader's position. He, more than anyone else, I am sure, would like to stay here today, tomorrow, Saturday and Sunday to pass this bill, but he knows, as I have known—somebody said he does not have the votes; that is only part of it—that actually there is a limit to how long you can continue continuously on the same subject matter, the same piece of legislation. I would, therefore, support his proposed schedule and oppose whatever motion Mr. Cowell is going to make.

I think, also, it is important that the Speaker is having prepared for each member a list of all amendments which have been successful so that we can gather our thoughts on Monday to find out where we have been this week, whereas if we continue in continuous session, we are going to continue to be confused.

So I would support the gentleman's approach to begin voting at 3 o'clock on Monday.

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

Mr. COWELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make any specific motion. It does occur to me, though, if we keep working at approximately the same pace, that to suggest we might be prepared to vote on this budget by Tuesday might be overly optimistic.

I think it might be most appropriate, therefore, that we can at least consider staying tomorrow to consider as many of these amendments as possible. But as I indicated, I do not suggest any particular motion. I do ask for a roll call, though, if there is a motion or when there is a motion to adjourn until Monday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will take a roll-call vote on the motion for adjournment.

Does anyone else want to be recognized before the Chair calls for adjournment?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS HOUSE

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

Mr. LETTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment pertaining to the demonstration that the state employes had here this week. I would like to commend them for the way they behaved, the manner in which they handled themselves. They took all their trash with them. I thought it was admirable that we did not have to clean up after them since there was

quite a crowd. I think they really handled themselves with the utmost respect of this House.

Thank you.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. For the information of the House, there will be two master roll calls on Monday, one at 1 o'clock and again when we reconvene at 3 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRADLEY moved that this House do now adjourn until Monday, June 16, 1975, at 1 p.m., e.d.t.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

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

YEAS—149

Anderson, J. H.	Gillette	McLane	Shuman
Arthurs	Gleason	Mebus	Shupnik
Barber	Goodman	Menhorn	Sirianni
Bennett	Greenfield	Milanovich	Smith, E.
Beren	Grleco	Miller, M. E.	Smith, L.
Berlin	Halverson	Miller, M. E., Jr.	Spencer
Berson	Hamilton, J. H.	Milliron	Stout
Bittle	Hasay	Moehlmann	Taddonio
Bonetto	Hepford	Morris	Taylor
Bradley	Hill	Mullen	Toll
Brandt	Hopkins	Novak	Trello
Brunner	Hutchinson, A.	O'Connell	Turner
Burns	Hutchinson, W.	O'Donnell	Ustynoski
Butera	Irvia	Pancoast	Valicenti
Cessar	Itkin	Parker, H. S.	Vann
Cimini	Johnson, J.	Perri	Vroon
Cohen	Katz	Perry	Walsh, T. P.
Cole	Kelly, A. P.	Petrarca	Wansacz
Crawford	Kelly, J. B.	Pitts	Wargo
Cumberland	Kistler	Polite	Weidner
Davies	Klingaman	Pratt	Westenberg
Davis, D. M.	Knepper	Prendergast	Whelan
DeMedio	Kolter	Pyles	Whittlesey
Dietz	Kowalyshyn	Reed	Wilson
Dombrowski	Kusse	Renwick	Wilt, R. W.
Doyle	LaMarca	Richardson	Wilt, W. W.
Dreibelbis	Laughlin	Ritter	Wojdak
Eckensberger	Lederer	Romanelli	Worrlow
Englehart	Letterman	Ruggiero	Wright
Fee	Levi	Ryan	Yahner
Fisher	Lynch	Saloom	Yohn
Foster, W.	Manderino	Scheaffer	Zearfoss
Fryer	Manmiller	Schmitt	Zord
Gallagher	McCall	Schweder	Zwick
Garzia	McClatchy	Scirica	
Geesey	McCue	Seltzer	Fineman,
Geisler	McGinnis	Shane	Speaker
George	McGraw	Shelhamer	

NAYS—23

Abraham	Fischer	Kernick	Ross
Bellomini	Foster, A.	Lincoln	Stahl
Cowell	Gillespie	Miscevich	Stapleton
Deverter	Green	Noye	Wagner
Dicarlo	Hayes, D. S.	O'Keefe	Zeller
Derr	Hayes, S. E.	Renninger	

NOT VOTING—31

Blackwell	Gleason	Mullen, M. P.	Rieger
Caputo	Gring	Musto	Salvatore
DiDonato	Hammock	Myers	Shelton
Dininni	Haskell	O'Brien	Sullivan
Fawcett	Laudadio	Oliver	Sweeney
Flaherty	Lehr	Pievsky	Tayoun
Gallen	McIntyre	Rappaport	Thomas
Giammarco	Mrkonic	Rhodes	

So the question was determined in the affirmative and the motion was agreed to, and (at 5:04 p.m., e.d.t.) the House adjourned.