

Legislative Journal

FRIDAY, JULY 15, 1977

Session of 1977

161st of the General Assembly

Vol. 1, No. 62

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 10 a.m., e.d.t.

THE SPEAKER (K. LEROY IRVIS) IN THE CHAIR

PRAYER

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

Heavenly Father, Thou art our strength in every hour of need, and the One to whom we turn to receive that stamina to meet and face the difficult situations of life. We look to Thee in this moment with the fullest recognition that we need Thy presence and guidance in our daily walk of life. We call upon Thee for that counsel and direction which Thou hast to impart to each steward of Thine. We beseech Thee to steer our feet and prick our consciences that we may continually serve Thee as true and faithful workmen in Thy vineyard. And we humbly pray that we may be Thy instruments in bringing forth a most fruitful and bountiful harvest in Thy name. Amen.

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, approval of the Journal for Thursday, July 14, 1977, will be postponed until printed.

MASTER ROLL CALL RECORDED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker advises all those members within the hearing of his voice to report immediately to the floor of the House because the Speaker is about to take the master roll. Only those members physically present are to be voted on the master roll.

The following roll call was recorded.

YEAS—199

| | | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Abraham | Gallen | Manderino | Scanlon |
| Anderson | Gamble | Manmiller | Scheaffer |
| Armstrong | Garzia | McCall | Schmitt |
| Arthurs | Gatski | McClatchy | Schweder |
| Barber | Geesey | McGinnis | Scirica |
| Bellomini | Geisler | McIntyre | Seltzer |
| Beloff | George, C. | McLane | Shuman |
| Bennett | George, M. | Mebus | Shupnik |
| Berlin | Giammarco | Meluskey | Sirianni |
| Berson | Gillette | Milanovich | Smith, E. |
| Bittinger | Gleeson | Miller | Smith, L. |
| Bittle | Goebel | Milliron | Spencer |
| Borski | Goodman | Miscevich | Spitz |

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Brandt | Gray | Moehlmann | Stairs |
| Brown | Greenfield | Morris | Stapleton |
| Brunner | Greenleaf | Mowery | Stewart |
| Burd | Grieco | Mrkonic | Stuban |
| Burns | Halverson | Mullen, M. P. | Sweet |
| Butera | Hamilton | Mullen, M. M. | Taddonio |
| Caitagirone | Harper | Musto | Taylor, E. |
| Caputo | Hasay | Novak | Taylor, F. |
| Cassidy | Haskell | Noye | Tenaglio |
| Cessar | Hayes, D. S. | O'Brien, B. | Thomas |
| Cianciulli | Hayes, S. E. | O'Brien, D. | Trello |
| Cimini | Helfrick | O'Connell | Valicenti |
| Cohen | Hoeffel | O'Donnell | Vroon |
| Cole | Honaman | O'Keefe | Wagner |
| Cowell | Hopkins | Oliver | Wansacz |
| Davies | Hutchinson, A. | Pancoast | Wargo |
| DeMedio | Hutchinson, W. | Parker | Wass |
| DeVerter | Itkin | Petrarca | Weidner |
| DeWeese | Johnson | Piccola | Wenger |
| DiCarlo | Jones | Pievsky | White |
| Dietz | Katz | Pitts | Wiggins |
| Dininni | Kelly | Polite | Williams |
| Dombrowski | Kernick | Pott | Wilson |
| Donatucci | Klingaman | Pratt | Wilt |
| Dorr | Knepper | Prendergast | Wise |
| Doyle | Kolter | Pyles | Wright, D. |
| Duffy | Kowalshyn | Rappaport | Wright, J. L. |
| Dumas | Laughlin | Ravenstahl | Yahner |
| Englehart | Lehr | Reed | Yohn |
| Fee | Letterman | Renwick | Zearfoss |
| Fischer, R. R. | Levi | Rhodes | Zeller |
| Fisher, D. M. | Lincoln | Richardson | Zitterman |
| Flaherty | Livengood | Rieger | Zord |
| Foster, A. | Logue | Ritter | Zwikl |
| Foster, W. | Lynch | Ruggiero | |
| Freind | Mackowski | Ryan | Irvis, |
| Fryer | Madigan | Salvatore | Speaker |
| Gallagher | | | |

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—1

Shelton

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

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED TO COMMITTEES

No. 1495 By Messrs. MILANOVICH, COLE and LIVENGOOD

An Act amending the "Unemployment Compensation Act," approved December 5, 1936 (2nd Sp. Sess., 1937 P. L. 2897, No. 1), defining "participant" for certain purposes.

Referred to Committee on Labor Relations.

No. 1496 By Messrs. WHITE, MILLER, IRVIS,

RHODES, GREENLEAF, D. S. HAYES, R. FISCHER, WILT, GIAMMARCO, RICHARDSON, BERLIN, BROWN, McINTYRE, WILLIAMS, JOHNSON, OLIVER, DONATUCCI, RIEGER, MORRIS, RAPPAPORT, ITKIN, LETTERMAN, PETRARCA, Mrs. TAYLOR, Messrs. REED, KATZ, HOPKINS, SALVATORE, HELFRICK and KNEPPER

An Act establishing protective services for the elderly and handicapped persons; providing procedures for reporting and investigating the abuse of such persons; placing duties on the Department of Public Welfare and county welfare agencies and providing penalties.

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare.

No. 1497 By Messrs. CIMINI, GIAMMARCO, IRVIS, JOHNSON, WHITE, WILLIAMS, DUMAS, BORSKI, RICHARDSON, GRAY, JONES, GRIECO, ZITTEMAN, D. M. O'BRIEN, WILSON, WEIDNER, NOYE, HOPKINS, R. R. FISCHER, MILLER, VROON, MANMILLER, E. H. SMITH, GREENLEAF, D. S. HAYES and LEVI

An Act amending the "Senior Citizens Property Tax or Rent Rebate Act," approved March 11, 1971 (P. L. 104, No. 3), further providing for reimbursement of claims.

Referred to Committee on Finance.

No. 1498 By Messrs. RUGGIERO, KOWALYSHYN, REED, GRAY, CALTAGIRONE, JONES, COLE and CESSAR

An Act amending the act of May 29, 1956 (P. L. 1804, No. 600), entitled "An act providing for the establishment of police pension funds or pension annuities in certain boroughs, towns, and townships, and the regulation and maintenance thereof; ***" further providing for membership on the board and requiring an annual report.

Referred to Committee on Local Government.

No. 1499 By Messrs. SPITZ, ZEARFOSS, FREIND, BURD, LIVENGOOD, DAVIES, GEESEY, MILLIRON, LYNCH AND RYAN

An Act amending the act of May 9, 1949 (P. L. 927, No. 261), referred to as the Sheriff Fee Law of 1949, changing fees for mileage of sheriffs.

Referred to Committee on Local Government.

HOUSE RESOLUTION INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

By Messrs. FREIND, LYNCH, DAVIES, SPITZ, ZEARFOSS, BURD, SCIRICA and W. D. HUTCHINSON
HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 128

The Rules of the House of Representatives be amended.
Referred to Committee on Rules.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority whip.
Mr. GREENFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for leaves of absence.

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

Mr. S. E. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for leaves of absence.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER HOUSE SCHEDULE

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members, the Chair is not going to take up any business on the calendar this morning. The House will be declared in recess until 1 p.m. The purpose of the recess is for the Republican Party to hold a caucus and the Democratic Party to hold a caucus immediately on the declaration of the recess. We shall return to the floor at 1 p.m., and the first order of business will be to complete, hopefully, the debate on the amendment to HB 1171 and calling up HB 1171 on final passage.

Does the majority whip have any business to present to the floor before the declaration of the recess?

Mr. GREENFIELD. No, Mr. Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER. Does Mr. Hayes have any business to present to the floor before the declaration of the recess?

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

Mr. S. E. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I would just ask the Republican Representatives to go to the caucus room immediately.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. This House now stands in recess until 1 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The time of recess having expired, the House was called to order.

HB 207 TO BE CALLED UP

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to request that because of the time element involved in the concurrence on this House bill, the House take up the question of concurrence or nonconcurrence in this bill today. The Chair's calendar indicates that the Democratic caucus has not caucused, but the Chair would ask Mr. Kowalyszyn to explain the amendments.

On page 7, none of the resolutions is called for today. Incidentally, that is the correct grammar in case anyone is listening. "None is" is correct. "None are" would be incorrect, for the edification of those members who are still interested in the English language. It has not too often been heard in the House.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. Mebus. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MEBUS. As a grammarian, I think I am not at the bottom of the heap, but I would certainly not wish to take issue with the Chair when he says that "is" is the right thing to say. I think it is fine that there is somebody exercising leadership in this direction, for God knows and any English teacher knows, that we need it.

CALENDAR

TRANSPORTATION BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

Agreeable to order,

The House resumed consideration of **House bill No. 1171, printer's No. 1534**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes making omnibus changes.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. MEBUS offered the following amendments:

Amend Sec. 1, page 2, line 4, by inserting after "3367(b)," 3368,

Amend Bill, page 77, by inserting between lines 13 and 14 § 3368. Speed timing devices.

(a) Speedometers authorized.—The rate of speed of any vehicle may be timed on any highway by a police officer using a motor vehicle equipped with a speedometer. In ascertaining the speed of a vehicle by the use of a speedometer, the speed shall be timed for a distance of not less than three-tenths of a mile.

(b) Testing of speedometers.—The department may appoint stations for testing speedometers and may prescribe regulations as to the manner in which the test shall be made. Speedometers shall have been tested for accuracy within a period of 60 days prior to the alleged violation. A certificate from the station showing that the test was made, the date of the test and the degree of accuracy of the speedometer shall be competent and prima facie evidence of those facts in every proceeding in which a violation of this title is charged.

(c) Mechanical, electrical and electronic devices authorized.—

(1) The rate of speed of any vehicle may be timed on any highway by a police officer using a mechanical or electrical speed timing device.

(2) Electronic devices such as radio-microwave devices (commonly referred to as electronic speed meters or radar) may be used [only] by members of the Pennsylvania State Police and by members of municipal police forces comprised of ten or more full-time officers employed by a municipality with a population, as determined by the latest United States Census, of 20,000 or more. No electronic device shall be used by a municipal police officer until such time as the officer has successfully completed a training course in the use of such electronic device as prescribed by the Commissioner of the Pennsylvania State Police and has been certified as a qualified operator of said electronic device by the commissioner. Qualified operators of eligible municipal police forces may time the rate of speed of any vehicle using electronic devices on any highway, excluding the Pennsylvania Turnpike System, limited access highway and free access divided highways, except where such facilities are patrolled by municipal police forces under the terms of an agreement with the Pennsylvania State Police. All electronic speed timing devices purchased by the Pennsylvania State Po-

lice or any authorized municipal police force shall be of a type approved by the department. No person may be convicted upon evidence obtained through the use of such devices unless the speed recorded is six or more miles per hour in excess of the legal speed limit.

(d) Approval and testing of mechanical, electrical and electronic devices.—All mechanical, electrical or electronic devices shall be of a type approved by the department, which shall appoint stations for calibrating and testing the devices and may prescribe regulations as to the manner in which calibrations and tests shall be made. The devices shall have been tested for accuracy within a period of 60 days prior to the alleged violation. A certificate from the station showing that the calibration and test were made within the required period, and that the device was accurate, shall be competent and prima facie evidence of those facts in every proceeding in which a violation of this title is charged.

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 6505), page 110, line 13, by removing the comma after "parking" and inserting immediately thereafter and except as provided in subsection (d),

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 6505), page 110, by inserting between lines 23 and 24

(d) Local police enforcement by electronic device.—When prosecution under the provisions of this title is obtained by local police by the use of an electronic device as authorized by section 3368 (c) (2) (relating to speed timing devices), all fines and penalties and all bail forfeited shall be transmitted to the State Treasury and credited to the Motor License Fund. All of such revenue shall be paid to municipalities in the same ratio provided in section 4 of the act of June 1, 1956 (P. L. 1944, No. 655), relating to partial allocation of liquid fuels and fuel use tax proceeds.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. MEBUS. Mr. Speaker, I think that this is an amendment which will be of interest to the members of this House, those who want to support it, particularly, and, conceivably, even those who wish to oppose it.

I am prepared to describe what this amendment does and does not do, but I would like to feel that I am talking to somebody when I do so. At the moment, I see few if any present and, therefore, until there is a greater number of members here I would prefer to hold off rather than repeat myself and bore those who are present at this time.

Mr. BELLOMINI. We have the votes to defeat it.

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

Mr. BELLOMINI. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I am going to rise to oppose his amendments, but is he not going to explain his amendments first, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman, Mr. Mebus, care to explain the amendment?

Mr. MEBUS. The amendment I have before me, Mr. Speaker, would permit certain limited number of police forces in the Commonwealth to employ radar as a means of determining whether or not a driver was exceeding the speed limit. There are several conditions that are involved that limits the number of police forces that could use it, one being that the police force

must have at least 10 full-time officers, not less than one of whom is trained to the satisfaction of the State Police Department in the operation and maintenance of the radar equipment. Further, that it can only be operated by a certified operator.

Another condition lies in the fact that the municipality whose police force attempts to use radar or wishes to use radar must be at least 20,000 in population or greater as determined by the last decennial census.

And, lastly, another matter which I think is of some interest to people here who objected to the radar concept last year is the fact that all of the fines would be turned over to the motor license fund and not be used by the municipality. In this way there would be a deterrent to the possibility of creation of fining mills by certain of the less urban municipalities that might try to employ it.

The reason for the 20,000 minimum population of the municipality lies in the fact that those areas that are in excess of 20,000 people do have a problem with using a chase car to catch speeders. It is bad enough to have somebody going 70 miles an hour down a residential street, but to send two cars down the street doing that speed is ridiculous.

Therefore, the only thing that you can do in municipalities to build up municipalities is use radar or you can catch somebody and charge them with driving too fast for conditions. The fine for driving too fast for conditions is ridiculous, minimal, and does not have any effect as compared to that which is involved for speeding.

So if we are serious about trying to maintain safety in our urban streets, this is a means to accomplish it. My concern is primarily with those urban municipalities. And, therefore, that limitation of 20,000 population is included in the amendment.

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

Mr. BELLOMINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this amendment for reasons that in the municipalities and townships where there are roads that have enforcement, speeding violations, we should call the state police in who I feel are qualified to enforce a radar system.

In a community where there are not enough policemen to enforce other crimes in the area, we feel that the police have their own position to take to cover these crimes instead of setting up speed traps. It has always been a custom in the past to call in the state police when we find abused drivers on certain roads in the municipalities and townships and boroughs.

Thank you.

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

Mr. DININNI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this amendment and ask all the members to vote "no."

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

Mr. ZELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment as I did in the last session and I would like to bring up, too, what Mr. Bellomini has stated that 2 years ago I went on vacation. I traveled through several states. One of them particularly that had radar for all the local police was Ohio. Talking to legis-

lators from Ohio, it has not done a darn thing to cut down speeders. As a matter of fact, you remember the incident in the northwestern part of Ohio where a gang of children were on the road looking over a car that had been stalled and some individual flying through at 70 miles an hour hit them and killed several of the kids.

They could cite incident after incident where radar has been a mockery out there, because with the walkie-talkies today and CB's they know where they are at. There is no problem with it. All they have done in the communities is that the police have used it in areas to, in other words, take it out on responsible people. The responsible person in the community who got caught in the long run was an individual who just happened to step on it for just that moment and he is caught, and the actual habitual speeders, they know how to get around them. It has been nothing but mockery in the State of Ohio. They have tried with legislation after legislation to get it out and they have failed.

So, if you want to put this in, you will never get it out because they have the police departments, once they get it in, the powerful lobbying you are going to have. I fight for policemen, you know that. This is the only area I have ever went against policemen. I feel that the policemen here in this particular case are going to have nothing but arresting mills. If you want this upon your people, the responsible people are going to get hurt. I say get out, as Mr. Bellomini has said, get out and do your job in fighting crime and protecting people, but we do not need them sitting around dusting cars and arresting responsible people. Besides that, they are not effective, with the CB units today; they make mockery of them. It is a waste of money.

Thank you.

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

Mr. FRYER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this amendment as I have opposed it many times in the past. It is one of the few things that Representative Mebus and I disagree upon. I would like to share my thinking with you for a moment.

As we all know the state police presently have radar. Now—

The SPEAKER. That was not indicated for your speech that was indicated because of a certain lady who has a banner which she is exposing to the Chair and other members. I assume she does not want to make it part of the official record.

Miss SIRIANNI. Assume that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. FRYER. I thank the Speaker.

Now in the case of the state police, when a motorist is stopped by a member of the state police using radar, you have the situation, I daresay, where possibly the great majority of people that that officer is dealing with he does not know on a personal basis. Let us assume, however, that this state police officer does know that person. It might be, let us say, the wife of another state police officer. It might be even a relative. Now what do you suppose that state police officer does in that particular case? He would do exactly what I think any rational being would do. He would issue probably a warning and "please do not do that again because this is highway safety." Now if you accept that premise, then let us go and take, as Mr. Mebus sug-

gests, and place radar with the local local police.

Now, here the situation is somewhat different because of the fact that that officer using radar on the local level, in many cases, knows the person that he has apprehended. What if that person is the wife of a councilman from that municipality or possibly the mayor's wife? What do you suppose would happen? I think we can assume that they would deal with it as the state police do when they run into the situation. What you would have then is a very uneven hand of justice that is not fair.

I further submit that on the local level where the inhabitants know one another, there are people who, let us say, any group likes and there are others that they have a dislike for. I can just see that if you should happen to be on that list that the local police feel that there is a score to be settled with, I can just imagine the time that would be spent with radar in trying to even that score which constitutes to me another faulty administration of the so-called even hand of justice.

I say that there are laws, as Mr. Bellomini pointed out, to cover speeding. I say do not, do not tempt the local police with this weapon.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. COWELL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the Mebus amendment. Some of the criticism that has been directed at the proposed amendment today has been based on the assumption that it would be abused, this power, if it were given to local police. If we take those same arguments, it would provide, perhaps, an argument why we should take the power to use radar away from our state police. But no one is really proposing that. So I do not think that is really solid ground on which to argue that we should not give this similar power to local police or certain local police departments.

In that same vein some people have argued that motorists can circumvent the policeman who is using radar because of CB. Well, again those same individuals could use the CB radio or other means, perhaps, to circumvent the radar on the Turnpike or the radar on some of our other state highways that might be set up by the state police, but nobody is using that as an argument to take the radar away from the state police.

So once again, although it might be circumvented by some motorists who willfully violate the law, that is no reason not to give this particular tool to our local police.

What I hear so often on this floor, because we have debated this on another occasion last year, are arguments from individuals who really do not have a local police force of their own. In their particular communities they rely on the state police. When there might be a problem in their particular community in terms of speeding, the police force that protects their particular community and that might deal with the regulation of traffic in their particular community does have this pull.

I represent communities where we have a local police force. I represent several suburban communities where there is a severe problem right now because of the growth of those suburban communities and neighboring suburban communities where some of our former residential roads have become

throughways. Right now we have got situations—and I am sure this exists in many areas of the state—where residential roads or roads that were intended to be residential streets are now throughways from one community to another. Usually, if you hit some of those roads at 8 and 8:30 in the morning or 4:30 and 5:00 in the evening, they have become racetracks.

I have a situation only a block from my own home where during the past 2 years two children have been hit right in front of their homes. The kids cannot play in front of their own house right now. The difficulty that we are presented with is that when those residents in those communities and in those neighborhoods go to our local police now and say, do something about it, slow the traffic down, put up a radar trap if that is what you have to do, but let people know that they cannot speed by our homes through a 20-mile-an-hour zone at 40 and 50 miles an hour. Our local police cannot do anything about it.

I think that this is a pull that we ought to give to those police forces as defined in this bill. I would also remind our colleagues that the Mebus amendment removes that financial incentive for local police forces to abuse this, if they might abuse it for a financial reason, because the fines would be sent to the state. A local community would not benefit financially through a speed trap or overuse or abuse of the radar trap. So that incentive is removed.

I think it is an important tool that we ought to give to our police forces and I think it can control a major and a growing problem in many of our suburban communities in particular.

Thank you.

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

Mr. BITTINGER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I could not help but note when my colleague, Representative Fryer, was speaking about those possible exceptions to arrests for speeding and he noted the state troopers, I do not recall him mentioning the possibility of exceptions for legislators who get picked up in radar. There have been one or two legislators known to be picked up for radar and if anyone is going to be excepted, you might expect them maybe to be excepted.

I do support the amendment. I think that the speed limit, whether local or on the turnpike, is the law. We expect the police to enforce that law and we have got to give them the tools to enforce it. There are always going to be exceptions made which probably should not be made because the police are human. There are safeguards that the use of radar by a local police department of a given size and a given size community will not be abused.

As for the use of citizen band radio to avoid being picked by radar, that does happen, yes, but the overall effect is that traffic is slowed down, and that, I hope, is the ultimate aim of our speed-control laws and our speed-control devices. When a CB radio comes on and tells you there is a "smoky" at mile post 154, that "smoky" may have been on the move for the last 10 minutes, but traffic coming through that area is going to slow down anyway.

I urgently urge your support for this amendment. Let us give the police the tools to do the job that we demand that they do.

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

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment. I just wanted to point out that there are only four states in this nation that do not allow local police to use radar, and certainly Pennsylvania is one of those four. I think they are Oklahoma, North Dakota, and I cannot recall the other one. It is a rather small state. Two states, Massachusetts and California, do not allow state police to use radar; only local police. I think that the municipal police in Pennsylvania with their municipal police training programs are able to do an adequate job with radar.

In some of our congested cities such as the one I come from in Allentown, we need to have this kind of weapon on our major arteries so that we can do something about the speeding that occurs without having a police officer chase that vehicle for an eighth of a mile on crowded city streets.

I think the amendment is a good amendment. The population must be at least 20,000. You must have 10 or more uniformed full-time police officers. So I do not think that every little borough and township will be able to use it, but certainly in the major metropolitan areas can use it. I would ask support for the amendment.

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, if the members would look at the amendment, they would see that I am a cosponsor of this amendment with Charlie Mebus and I rise briefly to support it.

It is curious, I find, the arguments against it, because under the philosophy that the radar would be abused, you could also apply that to the other weapons that the local police forces have. We should not allow them to carry guns because they are liable to shoot their enemies. We should not allow them to carry flashlights because they will shine it in somebody's eyes.

I do not pretend that we will change too many minds by this argument. I think it boils down to this: If we are going to pass the laws here and expect our local police to enforce them, then for goodness sakes, we should give them the tools that we know are applicable so that they can do the adequate job that we expect them to do.

Many areas in my district in the suburban areas, we do not have the availability of state police. We have to rely on our local police to check the speed going past school zones at 15 miles per hour, and that is important to us. So I would urge a positive vote on the amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. MISCEVICH. Mr. Speaker, all the moneys that are collected by the local enforcement agencies with the use of radar goes back to the state motor license fund.

This amendment also stipulates that there must be at least 10 members to a police department before radar can become legal in that municipality. Now these people who have eight or nine policemen will be fighting to get another policeman on the payroll so they can qualify for the radar. Many of these police officers do a good job and many of them do not do a good job. But

we are always up here—and a good example is HB 919—forcing stuff down their throats. We are passing laws up here, even if it is a “may” bill, to give them the right to use radar; it is going to cost the local municipality the moneys to buy this radar; It is going to cost them moneys to put two policemen, one in the radar car and one in the chase car, to apprehend a convicted speeder. We cannot keep forcing this onto our people. Every-time we say that this money will be paid back. But it will be paid back to all municipalities through the liquid fuel taxes. Some municipalities that do have radar do have over 10 members on the police force will be spending money to purchase this equipment, purchase extra cars and have extra people on the payroll. They will have to submit it to communities that do not even have a police force.

Representative Cowell made a statement before that at some periods of time — 5:30 to 8 o'clock — in his district it is nothing but a racetrack. Radar is available from the state police. If you have a community that is having a problem like that, you can contact the state police. The state police will come in and run a radar trap for you.

I do not think that we should be telling our communities that you have to buy this expensive equipment; you have to harass your citizens. These people are all well known in the community to every policeman.

Now, I know of certain instances where these people harass certain individuals just because they do not like the way he combs his hair. I think that this would just give them a free lunch to go ahead and write tickets for everybody and anybody, although it will be recorded on the radar, the speed they are doing, and they will be able to convict them. But these people will be laying for certain individuals in the community, and I highly oppose this.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Pratt.

Mr. PRATT. Mr. Speaker, may I interrogate the gentleman, Mr. Fryer, please?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Fryer, stand for interrogation?

The gentleman, Mr. Fryer, indicates that he will. The gentleman, Mr. Pratt, may proceed.

Mr. PRATT. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Local Government Committee of the House, have you been in contact over the past couple of years that we have been attempting to put this particular amendment in the Vehicle Code as to whether or not local government officials oppose or support this particular type of amendment?

Mr. FRYER. The House Local Government Committee has considered similar proposals several times. We did receive a certain amount of correspondence both pro and con.

Mr. PRATT. In your estimation, Mr. Speaker, has the feedback from the local government officials been the majority in favor or the majority opposed to this type of legislation?

Mr. FRYER. It would be my consideration that the majority opposed possibly because of the effect that they did not have probably the interest in some communities; that is, it was not a problem.

I must admit to the fact that I was more impressed with those who shared my viewpoint and read them more intently.

Mr. PRATT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have no further questions for this particular individual.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. PRATT. I would like to interrogate either Mr. Bellomini or Mr. Dininni, please.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Bellomini, indicates that he will stand for interrogation. The gentleman, Mr. Pratt, may proceed.

Mr. PRATT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, could you tell me whether or not in our statutes in Pennsylvania local police have any tools whatsoever other than radar to enforce the speed limits in local municipalities?

Mr. BELLOMINI. Yes, they have.

Mr. PRATT. Could you elaborate on those, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. BELLOMINI. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it in the code, they are allowed to use stopwatches and they are allowed to follow you at least three-tenths of a mile. And if they want to use helicopters, they can do that too.

Mr. PRATT. They can use helicopters? They can follow you and time you and they can use a stopwatch?

Mr. BELLOMINI. That is correct.

Mr. PRATT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

May I make a statement, Mr. Speaker?

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

Mr. PRATT. I have gotten the information that I asked for, Mr. Speaker, and it seems to me that I was told that this particular amendment only covers municipalities of 20,000 population or more. I am just wondering why the sponsors of this amendment did not include the municipalities below that particular figure.

In my particular district, all of my municipalities are below that. So, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, if it is not good enough for those municipalities below the population of 20,000, I do not see why it should be provided for those municipalities above that figure and I oppose this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. Zeller, who rises to speak to this point for the second time.

Mr. ZELLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is correct.

Earlier when I spoke on this, I do not know if all the members were in here at the time, but I mentioned the Ohio problem. When I went there 2 years ago, I talked to not only local police, local officials but I talked to legislators.

They have been trying through bill after bill to get rid of radar for local police. One of the problems that they have is the abuse. And they are not effective. They have not cut down on speeding or the accident problem.

With all respect to some of the people who spoke, and I will mention some names — Mr. Bittinger here on my right and Mr. Ritter on my left and others — as I mentioned the other day when Mr. Bittinger spoke, we do not seem to learn from history. And, I thought he brought out a very good point. I wish that would be heeded now. We do not seem to learn from his-

tory because the records are there to prove that it just does not work.

Now, they are trying to smooth this over by saying communities of 20,000 or more and the money would not be used as an arresting mill because it would not go to the communities, and all that. That is a foot in the door. Once they get it in the communities, Mr. Speaker, with all respect to you, sir, and I agree with you, once that foot is in the door, then it is very simple. Once it is a law in this Commonwealth, it is very simple to amend it. They can slip that amendment through anytime they want to and bring it down to those areas that want it. That is no problem. This is a foot in the door, merely a smoothing over to get the thing started.

Mr. Misceovich brought out a very good point on the cost to local municipalities. When Mr. Fryer was being interrogated by Mr. Pratt, this is what I get from the local communities. They are plagued now with costs. They are having an awful problem with their costs, the local communities now.

This is going to make an added burden to them. And they have found out that it just does not work. Politically, if you want to get the political end of it too, I know some will probably question me on that, about what is more important, safety or the political end of it. I am not speaking on that issue. I am speaking on the popularity of why local officials do not want it either. It becomes a very unpopular issue because police have abused it. Ohio can prove it. Therefore, the whole burden then falls on the local mayor and the local councilmen, the local supervisors and the city council, and they get nailed for it because of the abuse on this. So if you want to get into that area, you are going to get into a real hot potato on that issue.

So these are areas that I wanted to call to your attention. I think before you vote on it, consider all this and what kind of terrible ramifications you are going to cause your local community, and you are not going to get the people you think you are going to get. Please vote the issue down.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. CAPUTO. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CAPUTO. Mr. Speaker, these are very important votes. Looking around the House, I suggest we may not have a quorum present. I do not want to move for a recess or adjournment, if the members are in the Capitol and can be brought to the floor. But unless they are brought to the floor, unless they are here, we cannot have any intelligent votes without wholesale violations of the rules of this House. There are certainly many, many empty desks here today, and I suggest the call of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. Would the gentleman, Mr. Caputo, take the microphone?

Mr. CAPUTO. I will, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CAPUTO. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. CAPUTO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to withdraw my motion relative to the calling of a quorum and my suggestion that a quorum is not present and would like to be recognized for another motion immediately.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman for withdrawing the motion on the absence of a quorum.

DEBATE POSTPONED

The Chair recognizes the gentleman to place another motion before this House.

Mr. CAPUTO. I would move that the debate on the amendments to this bill and the bill, itself, be postponed until Monday.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—138

| | | | |
|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------|
| Abraham | Fryer | Logue | Salvatore |
| Anderson | Gallagher | Lynch | Scanlon |
| Armstrong | Gallen | Mackowski | Schmitt |
| Arthurs | Gamble | Manderino | Scirica |
| Bellomini | Garzia | McCall | Seltzer |
| Beloff | Gatski | McClatchy | Shuman |
| Bennett | Geisler | McGinnis | Shupnik |
| Berson | George, C. | McIntyre | Sirianni |
| Bittinger | George, M. | Mebus | Smith, E. |
| Bittle | Gillette | Meluskey | Smith, L. |
| Brandt | Gleeson | Moehlmann | Spencer |
| Brown | Goebel | Morris | Stewart |
| Brunner | Goodman | Mrkonic | Sweet |
| Burd | Gray | Mullen, M. P. | Taylor, E. |
| Butera | Greenfield | Musto | Taylor, F. |
| Caltagirone | Greenleaf | Novak | Tenaglio |
| Caputo | Hamilton | Noye | Thomas |
| Cessar | Harper | O'Brien, B. | Trello |
| Cianciulli | Hasay | O'Connell | Valicenti |
| Cohen | Haskell | Oliver | Vroon |
| Cole | Hayes, D. S. | Parker | Wagner |
| Cowell | Hayes, S. E. | Petrarca | Wansacz |
| DeMedio | Helfrick | Pievsky | Weidner |
| DiCarlo | Honaman | Pitts | Wenger |
| Dietz | Hopkins | Pratt | White |
| Dininni | Hutchinson, A. | Prendergast | Wiggins |
| Dombrowski | Itkin | Pyles | Williams |
| Donatucci | Jones | Rappaport | Wise |
| Doyle | Kelly | Ravenstahl | Wright, D. |
| Duffy | Kernick | Reed | Yohn |
| Englehart | Kolter | Renwick | Zord |
| Fee | Kowalyshyn | Rhodes | Zwinkl |
| Fisher, D. M. | Letterman | Rieger | |
| Flaherty | Levi | Ritter | Irvis, |
| Freind | Lincoln | Ruggiero | Speaker |

NAYS—54

| | | | |
|----------|----------------|---------------|-----------|
| Berlin | Hoeffel | Miscevich | Stairs |
| Burns | Hutchinson, W. | Mowery | Stapleton |
| Cassidy | Katz | Mullen, M. M. | Stuban |
| Cimini | Klingaman | O'Brien, D. | Taddonio |
| Davies | Knepper | O'Keefe | Wargo |
| DeVerter | Laughlin | Pancoast | Wass |

| | | | |
|----------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| DeWeese | Lehr | Piccola | Wilson |
| Dorr | Livengood | Polite | Wilt |
| Fischer, R. R. | Madigan | Richardson | Wright, J. L. |
| Foster, A. | Manmiller | Ryan | Yahner |
| Foster, W. | McLane | Scheaffer | Zearfoss |
| Geeseey | Milanovich | Schweder | Zeller |
| Grieco | Miller | Spitz | Zitterman |
| Halverson | Milliron | | |

NOT VOTING—8

| | | | |
|--------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Barber | Dumas | Johnson | Pott |
| Borski | Giammarco | O'Donnell | Shelton |

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

SENATE MESSAGE

AMENDED HOUSE BILL RETURNED FOR CONCURRENCE

The clerk of the Senate returned HOUSE BILL NO. 207, with the information that the Senate has passed the same with the following amendments in which concurrence of the House of Representatives is requested:

Amend Bill, page 14, line 22, by striking out after "Any" the word "unincorporated" and inserting in lieu thereof "incorporated"

Amend Bill, page 40, lines 15 and 16, by striking out all of said lines; line 17, by striking out at the beginning of the line "THE ENTIRE CONTRACT;" and inserting "Entire Contract.;" line 18, by inserting after "the" where it appears the first time "Society's bylaws, the"

Amend Bill, page 67, line 29, by inserting at the beginning of the line "not"; page 68, line 1, by inserting at the beginning of the line "not"

On the question,
Will the House concur in the Senate amendments?

Mr. KOWALYSHYN. Mr. Speaker, I request that the House do concur in the Senate amendments.

On the question recurring,
Will the House concur in the Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Northampton, Mr. Kowalyshyn.

Mr. KOWALYSHYN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You will recall that the House unanimously passed HB 207, which codifies the law dealing with fraternal benefits societies. The bill exempts fraternal benefits societies from the general insurance laws and sets forth provisions relating to their operation.

The Senate made three changes which are corrective in nature. They do not change the substance of the bill as passed by the House. For example, as to the provision exempting agents from licensing, the Senate clarified the language which says that agents which sell less than \$100,000 of life policies during any year are to be exempt from licensing.

Another amendment simply changed the definition of a fraternal benefits society as an incorporated association rather than what was mistakenly stated in our bill as an unincorporated association.

There was another amendment which stated that as far as any life insurance contract is concerned, all of the provisions of the contract would constitute the entire contract. So that these are just corrective changes and I believe should be accepted.

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

Mr. ZEARFOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would concur with the statements made by Mr. Kowalyshyn that the House should concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate.

I have a little trouble, however. I can only find two of the amendments, Mr. Speaker, that you talk about — the one on page 14 and the one on page 40. I find no amendment with respect to the agents' licenses, that would be the only one that would have any controversy attached to it, it seems to me.

The other two amendments are purely technical. They do not change the bill at all. Since I cannot find the one on agents' licensing, I would suggest that we concur.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in the Senate amendments?

Agreeable to the provisions of the Constitution, the following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abraham | Fryer | Madigan | Scheaffer |
| Anderson | Gallagher | Manderino | Schmitt |
| Armstrong | Gallen | Manmiller | Schweder |
| Arthurs | Gamble | McCall | Scirica |
| Barber | Garzia | McClatchy | Seltzer |
| Bellomini | Gatski | McGinnis | Shuman |
| Beloff | Geisler | McIntyre | Shupnik |
| Bennett | George, C. | McLane | Sirianni |
| Berlin | George, M. | Mebus | Smith, E. |
| Berson | Giammarco | Meluskey | Smith, L. |
| Bittinger | Gillette | Miller | Spencer |
| Bittle | Gleeson | Milliron | Spitz |
| Borski | Goebel | Miscevich | Stairs |
| Brandt | Goodman | Moehlmann | Stapleton |
| Brown | Gray | Morris | Stewart |
| Brunner | Greenfield | Mrkonic | Stuban |
| Burd | Greenleaf | Mullen, M. P. | Sweet |
| Burns | Grieco | Mullen, M. M. | Taddonio |
| Butera | Halverson | Musto | Taylor, E. |
| Caltagirone | Hamilton | Novak | Taylor, F. |
| Caputo | Harper | Noye | Tenaglio |
| Cassidy | Haskell | O'Brien, B. | Thomas |
| Cessar | Hayes, D. S. | O'Brien, D. | Trello |
| Cianciulli | Hayes, S. E. | O'Connell | Valicenti |
| Cimini | Helfrick | O'Keefe | Vroon |
| Cohen | Hoeffel | Oliver | Wagner |
| Cole | Honaman | Pancoast | Wansacz |
| Cowell | Hopkins | Parker | Wargo |
| Davies | Hutchinson, A. | Petrarca | Wass |
| DeMedio | Hutchinson, W. | Piccola | Weidner |
| DeVerter | Itkin | Pievsky | Wenger |
| DeWeese | Johnson | Pitts | White |
| DiCarlo | Jones | Polite | Wiggins |
| Dietz | Katz | Pratt | Williams |
| Dininni | Kelly | Prendergast | Wilt |
| Dombrowski | Kernick | Pyles | Wise |
| Donatucci | Klingaman | Rappaport | Wright, D. |
| Dorr | Knepper | Ravenstahl | Wright, J. L. |
| Doyle | Kolter | Reed | Yahner |
| Duffy | Kowalyshyn | Renwick | Yohn |
| Dumas | Laughlin | Rhodes | Zearfoss |
| Englehart | Lehr | Richardson | Zeller |
| Fee | Letterman | Rieger | Zitterman |
| Fischer, R. R. | Levi | Ritter | Zord |

| | | | |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Fisher, D. M. | Lincoln | Ruggiero | Zwicl |
| Flaherty | Livengood | Ryan | |
| Foster, A. | Logue | Salvatore | Irvis, |
| Foster, W. | Lynch | Scanlon | Speaker |
| Freind | | | |

NAYS—4

| | | | |
|--------|-----------|--------|--------|
| Geesey | Mackowski | Mowery | Wilson |
|--------|-----------|--------|--------|

NOT VOTING—5

| | | | |
|------------|-----------|------|---------|
| Hasay | O'Donnell | Pott | Shelton |
| Milanovich | | | |

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments were concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

BILLS SIGNED BY SPEAKER

Bills numbered and entitled as follows were prepared for presentation to the Governor:

SENATE BILL No. 701

An Act making an appropriation from the Public School Employee's Retirement Fund to provide for expenses of the Public School Employees' Retirement Board for the fiscal period July 1, 1977 to June 30, 1978 and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal period ending June 30, 1977.

SENATE BILL No. 871

An Act regulating the titling of and the perfection of security interests in mobile homes sold in the Commonwealth and imposing powers and duties on the Department of Community Affairs in connection therewith.

SENATE BILL No. 927

An Act making an appropriation from the State Employees' Retirement Fund to provide for expenses of the State Employees' Retirement Board for the fiscal period July 1, 1977 to June 30, 1978 and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal period ending June 30, 1977.

Whereupon,

The SPEAKER, in the presence of the House, signed the same.

RECONSIDERATION OF VOTE
ON HB 780

Mr. RENWICK moved that the vote by which HB 780, PN 1600, was defeated on final passage on Wednesday, July 6, 1977, be reconsidered.

Mr. VALICENTI seconded the motion.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

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

Mr. BRANDT. Mr. Speaker, could we have a brief description of what HB 780 is?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Elk, Mr. Renwick. The query is, will the gentleman, Mr. Renwick, refresh the memory of the House as to what the substance of HB 780 was, before we take a vote on reconsideration.

Mr. RENWICK. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that would allow musical groups between the ages of 16 and 18 to perform in liquor establishments.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. PYLES. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PYLES. Mr. Speaker, are the rules of the House such that we cannot reconsider a vote on a bill that is no longer in possession of this House?

The SPEAKER. The rules of the House are that we no longer may consider any bill which is out of the possession of the House.

Mr. PYLES. Is this bill not passed to the Senate already, sir?

The SPEAKER. This bill is a House bill, sir, and was defeated. Therefore, it remains in the possession of the House. That is the reason why the House may reconsider it.

Mr. PYLES. Thank you very much, sir.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—102

| | | | |
|-------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Anderson | Foster, A. | Livengood | Schmitt |
| Barber | Freind | Lynch | Schweder |
| Bellomini | Gallagher | Manderino | Scrica |
| Beloff | Garzia | McGinnis | Shupnik |
| Berlin | Gatski | McIntyre | Smith, L. |
| Berson | Geesey | McLane | Spitz |
| Bittinger | Geisler | Mebus | Stewart |
| Borski | George, C. | Milanovich | Stuban |
| Brunner | Giammarco | Milliron | Sweet |
| Burd | Gillette | Morris | Tenaglio |
| Burns | Gleeson | Mullen, M. P. | Valicenti |
| Butera | Goebel | Musto | Wansacz |
| Caltagirone | Goodman | O'Brien, B. | Wargo |
| Caputo | Greenfield | O'Connell | White |
| Cassidy | Greenleaf | Oliver | Wiggins |
| Cianciulli | Halverson | Petrarca | Williams |
| Cowell | Harper | Pievsky | Wilson |
| Davies | Hoeffel | Prendergast | Wise |
| DeMedio | Honaman | Rappaport | Wright, D. |
| DeWeese | Hopkins | Renwick | Wright, J. L. |
| Dombrowski | Hutchinson, A. | Richardson | Yahner |
| Donatucci | Jones | Rieger | Yohn |
| Dorr | Kelly | Ritter | Zearfoss |
| Doyle | Kolter | Ruggiero | |
| Dumas | Kowalyszyn | Salvatore | Irvis, |
| Engelhart | Lehr | Scanlon | Speaker |

NAYS—93

| | | | |
|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Abraham | Gray | McCall | Scheaffer |
| Armstrong | Grieco | McClatchy | Seltzer |
| Arthurs | Hamilton | Meluskey | Shuman |

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------|---------------|------------|
| Bennett | Hasay | Miller | Sirianni |
| Bittle | Haskell | Miscevich | Smith, E. |
| Brandt | Hayes, D. S. | Moehlmann | Spencer |
| Brown | Hayes, S. E. | Mowery | Stairs |
| Cessar | Helfrick | Mrkonic | Stapleton |
| Cimini | Hutchinson, W. | Mullen, M. M. | Taddonio |
| Cohen | Itkin | Novak | Taylor, E. |
| Cole | Johnson | Noye | Taylor, F. |
| DeVerter | Katz | O'Brien, D. | Thomas |
| Dietz | Kernick | O'Keefe | Trello |
| Dininni | Klingaman | Pancoast | Vroon |
| Duffy | Knepper | Parker | Wagner |
| Fee | Laughlin | Piccola | Wass |
| Fischer, R. R. | Letterman | Pitts | Weidner |
| Fisher, D. M. | Levi | Polite | Wenger |
| Flaherty | Lincoln | Pratt | Wilt |
| Foster, W. | Logue | Pyles | Zeller |
| Fryer | Mackowski | Ravenstahl | Zitterman |
| Gallen | Madigan | Reed | Zord |
| Gamble | Manmiller | Ryan | Zwikl |
| George, M. | | | |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | | |
|-----------|------|--------|---------|
| DiCarlo | Pott | Rhodes | Shelton |
| O'Donnell | | | |

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

HB 780 PLACED ON FINAL PASSAGE POSTPONED CALENDAR

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

Mr. RENWICK. Mr. Speaker, I move that HB 780 be placed upon the final passage postponed calendar.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KNEPPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A few days ago, Mr. Speaker, I had complained about the fact that the Conference Committee had been meeting in secret and apparently continued to meet in secret. We have not, apparently, had the benefit of all the wheeling and dealing that went on, but apparently whatever happened, it did not succeed in the closed-door sessions. So I would suggest that perhaps all of us might be more enlightened as to what this administration is proposing and what types of figures are being bandied around in the budget these days if, perhaps, we could have those meetings open to the members of the legislature and to the public in the future.

However, that is not the prime purpose for my getting up today. I am kind of distressed over some of the tactics that certain members of the Shapp administration have had to orchestrate particularly during this past week and perhaps for the past several weeks. I think that members on both sides of

the aisle have been intimidated in many instances by a lot of misinformation and by some shoddy practices of cabinet members, whom a lot of us have a great amount of respect for, but who apparently are having to read press releases that have been prepared probably in the Governor's office.

I guess that the one that really hits home most to me is the statement or the statements of Secretary Wilson from PennDOT, and I happen to have a very high personal regard for Secretary Wilson. But it kind of distressed me last week when I read a statement to the effect that he indicated, and he did not exactly explain it, but he announced the cancellation of all future bond financed highway construction and a possibility of furloughing up to 1,000 PennDOT employes. He further said that this move stemmed from a failure of the legislature to provide necessary funds to continue this work on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Now I do not know about the rest of you in other parts of the State, but District 11 in western Pennsylvania happens to be in my district. We have a number of PennDOT employes there. We have a lot of other people who are concerned about PennDOT and our highways, and a lot of citizens felt that as a result of this information over the past weekend, the members of this General Assembly, by not doing anything on the budget and not resolving the budget crisis, were contributing to the potholes and to the lack of road maintenance in this Commonwealth. I think that it was a pretty doggone misleading statement.

I am certain that the Secretary knows where he gets his funds from. If he does not, then maybe somebody ought to inform him. If he, in fact, was referring to a plan to increase the gas tax by 2 cents, then that is a different matter. But when he made the statement, we did not even have a bill in front of us, in fact I do not think that we have a bill in front of us yet to increase the gas tax by 2 cents or whatever.

It is kind of distressing to me to see that type of information get out to the public. I think that all of us as members of this General Assembly have a hard enough time trying to retain our credibility, particularly in tough budget times such as we have. But to start confusing highway problems with general fund budget problems, I think is just totally unconscionable.

For instance, right in my own district—and I share a lot of bridge problems, as many of you do in your districts, with others. In fact, there is one bridge which Representative Trello and I share together, which is in a final design stage, and the darn bridge will probably fall into the river before they complete the final design. It is that bad. We were informed just last week the total final design was being scrapped even though the money had been appropriated in the last capital funds budget. Our local officials and the public back home had, through the Pittsburgh Press, been informed of this.

You know I think that these are kind of unfair tactics, and I frankly do not see how any of us on this side of the aisle or on that side of the aisle can ever hope to have any credibility at home. I do not see how we can ever hope to have any faith in statistics which are coming out of the administration's office if we do not get a little more credibility.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion that I think it

would be well of this House to demand from the Governor's office that we get a copy of this House—not secondhand from the media or somewhere else, but that we get a copy in this House—of every news release that generates out of the Governor's office relative to the State's spending and the taxes, so that we can examine them and we can check them out for their accuracy and for the content. Maybe if we get that kind of information and maybe if we get the Conference Committee meetings out in the public, maybe some of us will know what we are talking about in terms of dollars and cents and maybe we can resolve this budget crisis in Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE REMARKS PRESENTED FOR THE RECORD

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CIMINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to correct a record vote. I am going to submit some written comments for the record with regard to the vote printout sheet on HB 656 on July 13, 1977, regarding amendments.

Thank you.

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

Mr. CIMINI presented the following comments for the Journal: I want to note for the record an error in the recording of my vote on the amendment offered by Representative Herbert K. Zearfoss to House Bill 656 dated July 13, 1977, which deleted the requirement that a campaign contributor's occupation and employer be disclosed. The vote print-out has me as being recorded in the affirmative. I should be recorded in the negative and I want to correct the record.

I also want to note for the record an error in the recording of my vote on Representative Joseph Hoeffel's amendment to House Bill 656, dated July 13, 1977, to re-insert the requirement that a contributor's occupation be disclosed. I am recorded in the negative and I would like the record to show an affirmative vote.

Thank you.

STATEMENT

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

Mr. BENNETT. To make a statement for the record, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. BENNETT. I address my remarks directly to Representative Earl Smith and ask his personal attention and also the attention of the members of the House.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, Representative Earl Smith made statements for the record relative to a news story that he read concerning his district. He made mention of the Business and

Commerce Committee during those statements, and I rose then as the chairman of that committee and said to this House that I would make a thorough investigation of that allocation and would report back to the House. Mr. Speaker, I would like now to address those remarks that were made.

The remarks were made about Lukens Steel Company, and I would like to say first that the Lukens Steel Company application for a PIDA — Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority — loan to help in its expansion of plant facilities which would have created sorely needed jobs in Chester County, has not been rejected; I repeat, has not been rejected. All PIDA loans which would have come from PIDA's general fund have been temporarily postponed by the PIDA board until that board determines how much money they will have to work with this fiscal year.

PIDA has two sources of funding. First is the bond market. However, IRS — Internal Revenue Service — rulings have prohibited PIDA from issuing more than \$1 million in bonds for any one project.

The two steel companies had applications for a combined \$11.3 million to be approved at this week's PIDA board meeting. That money must come from PIDA's general fund. This fund receives its funding from previous loans proceeds that are paid back throughout the year plus—and I say plus—any appropriations approved as part of the Department of Commerce budget.

This year PIDA expects a cash flow from previous loans of \$20 million. In the absence of a definite idea of how much funding to expect as a part of this year's general budget, the PIDA board was reluctant to jeopardize its financial stability by approving two loans which would deplete its money supply by more than half, at its first meeting in the fiscal year. This action would have severely limited stability to fund future projects later this year.

The PIDA board indicated at the meeting to Lukens vice president, Mr. E. K. Myers, that they would be willing to consider Lukens' application as early as next month, if additional funding was available. Mr. Myers of Lukens Steel Company indicated that he understood the reason for the board's actions and said that Lukens would try to delay its construction schedule pending final outcome of PIDA's decisions.

I must note at this time, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Commerce's commitment to Lukens Steel expansion by its approval last month of \$2.5 million in tax-free revenue bonds for construction at the company's facility.

I should also mention that at Tuesday's meeting PIDA did approve nine loans totaling \$1.6 million which could be funded by bond issues.

Several other statements that were made yesterday about PIDA which I would like to comment upon. The PIDA board did adopt a resolution in October of 1976 which stated that PIDA would not commit more than \$3 million out of general fund revenues until June 30 of this year simply because Volkswagen had taken a large chunk of its money. However, not one single application was turned down for lack of money during that period. PIDA had previously approved an additional \$6.6 million to needy companies between July of 1976 and September of 1976.

While PIDA's financial statement for the period ending June 30, 1977, shows a paper deficit of \$12.2 million, it is a part of \$31.5 million in loans committed for which the funds have not yet been requested by the applicants.

Cash flow projections for the current fiscal year, with limited expenditures, of course, indicate a balance at the end of the fiscal year. PIDA is constantly receiving money through bond issues and from payments on outstanding loans. These cash flow projections enable the board to plot and plan for future commitments. Additional budget funding for the legislature enables the board to have more leverage in committing PIDA funds.

Finally, it was stated yesterday that the PIDA board action was an attempt to scare the legislature into supporting a new tax program. I must say, Mr. Speaker, if that was their intention, it would have been a lot easier for the board to conditionally approve Lukens Steel request for \$5.8 million contingent on the legislature's passage of the \$8-million appropriation requested by the Governor for PIDA this year. That would have put the rejection of Lukens PIDA loans squarely on our shoulders. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the PIDA board did not act in this manner but kept the responsibility firmly as their own. Their decision was based solely on fiscal considerations, considerations I believe that were perfectly justified and commendable.

I hope, as they do, that PIDA will receive the additional appropriations necessary to retain Pennsylvania's industry, attract new businesses and provide jobs for our citizens. It has done an outstanding job creating over 181,000 jobs since its inception 22 years ago. I know that it will continue to serve as the catalyst for Pennsylvania's economic expansion.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that that answers the concerns of Representative Earl Smith. He came to me privately and had asked that I would do this. I indicated to the House that I would and that is my reason for taking the floor at this time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blair, Mr. S. E. Hayes.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am sure that Mr. Smith and others in this House appreciate Mr. Bennett's efforts to get more information concerning the Lukens Steel application and what action is being anticipated by PIDA. I do not believe that Mr. Smith's basic concern was with the PIDA board. Mr. Smith shared with us a wire service story which quoted Norval Reece widely.

We all know that this is budget season. We all know that cabinet officers have become involved in this budget process and that statements are being issued. Cabinet officers are supportive of the Governor's position, and that is understandable. But when a cabinet officer goes into an area and makes statements about things like PIDA loans and PIDA applications and somehow very conveniently blends it in with the current process which we are laboring under here right now, it would have it appear as though the General Assembly in some way is blocking the PIDA application filed by Lukens Steel, and we ought not to have cabinet officers walking around this Commonwealth making those kinds of comments.

Norval Reece should not in any way whatsoever confuse the current budget controversy with Lukens' status as far as their PIDA application is concerned. The message that Mr. Smith was trying to convey was that cabinet officers ought to quit participating in that kind of skulduggery. Let this General Assembly consider the budget and let us not have every state program somehow held hostage by a cabinet officer, or whatever the case may be while we consider this matter.

We would like to thank Mr. Bennett for enlightening this House and bringing to us information concerning the application.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

STATEMENT

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

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Speaker, to make a brief statement.

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

For the information of the House, there is yet one other vote this afternoon, so the members are asked not to leave.

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Speaker, the Reading Eagle Newspaper in the city of Reading on Tuesday, July 12, 1977, wrote an editorial entitled "Rubber bandmen" in which they said, "We have often wondered whether there would be a salutary effect on the General Assembly if all state legislators were zapped in the head with a large rubber band." And it goes on, and the last paragraph is, "We're worried about our legislators, though, they are our children. We only get concerned when they start sucking their thumbs."

I will not go into my answer to the editor. I will just read the last paragraph of my letter to the editor in reply. I have distributed some to the members and I will submit the rest of it for the records. (Reading:)

I take personal offense at your efforts to cast aspersions upon all of the hard-working Legislators with your editorial bile. Better get off your duff and into our Chambers so you can give your readers some first-hand reporting. Sincerely.

I would like to submit the rest of it, sir, for the record.

The SPEAKER. I read the gentleman's reply and I am delighted to have it filed for the record.

LETTERS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. DAVIES presented the following letter for the Journal:

Dear Editor:

The people of Berks County certainly are better informed by your editorial efforts directed at the few rubber band delinquents we have in the House of Representatives. What really disturbs me is your last paragraph which casts the inference we are all only a few shots away from being thumb-sucking idiots. How you do stretch (pun intended) a point to paint us all with your Fourth Estate brush of literary license.

It seems a shame, or almost an injustice, that two newspapers with the same ownership can't afford part-time daily coverage of the Capitol. Since Sunshine Legislation has opened the House Committee process for news media coverage, your papers have chosen to do less first-hand reporting on State government. I would gladly supply the daily transportation for your staff if you share my concern for your

readers. Direct reporting may afford you first-hand information on how your Legislators are faring in the rubber band war or which thumb they are about to suck.

In my short time in the House, I haven't seen any Berks Legislator shoot one rubber band or suck either thumb. In fact, I would have to rate their attendance and performance excellent. I speak with some prejudice because I am one of those members.

I take personal offense at your efforts to cast aspersions upon all of the hard-working Legislators with your editorial bile. Better get off your duff and into our Chambers so you can give your readers some first-hand reporting.

Sincerely,

HR 92 TO BE CALLED UP

The SPEAKER. The Chair reconsiders its announcement that on page 7, HR 92, will be passed over.

The Chair is informed that this resolution has already gone into effect, that the Health and Welfare Committee is already investigating the possibility of closing the Mental Health Unit at Embreeville State Hospital and that there is a general agreement among the members of that committee that this resolution should pass immediately.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED

Mr. PITTS called up **HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 92.**

Speaker urge Health and Welfare Committee investigate closing of Embreeville State Hospital.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

| | | | |
|-------------|----------------|---------------|------------|
| Abraham | Gallagher | Madigan | Schmitt |
| Anderson | Gallen | Manderino | Schweder |
| Armstrong | Gamble | Manmiller | Scirica |
| Arthurs | Garzia | McCall | Seltzer |
| Barber | Gatski | McClatchy | Shuman |
| Bellomini | Geesey | McGinnis | Shupnik |
| Beloff | Geisler | McIntyre | Sirianni |
| Bennett | George, C. | McLane | Smith, E. |
| Berlin | George, M. | Mebus | Smith, L. |
| Berson | Gillette | Meluskey | Spencer |
| Bittinger | Gleeson | Milanovich | Spitz |
| Bittle | Goebel | Miller | Stairs |
| Borski | Goodman | Milliron | Stapleton |
| Brandt | Gray | Miscevich | Stewart |
| Brown | Greenfield | Moehlmann | Stuban |
| Brunner | Greenleaf | Morris | Sweet |
| Burd | Grieco | Mowery | Taddonio |
| Burns | Halverson | Mrkonic | Taylor, E. |
| Butera | Hamilton | Mullen, M. P. | Taylor, F. |
| Caltagirone | Harper | Mullen, M. M. | Tenaglio |
| Caputo | Hasay | Musto | Thomas |
| Cassidy | Haskell | Novak | Trello |
| Cessar | Hayes, D. S. | Noye | Valicenti |
| Cimini | Hayes, S. E. | O'Brien, B. | Vroon |
| Cohen | Helfrick | O'Brien, D. | Wagner |
| Cole | Hoeffel | O'Connell | Wansacz |
| Cowell | Honaman | O'Keefe | Wargo |
| Davies | Hopkins | Pancoast | Wass |
| DeMedio | Hutchinson, A. | Parker | Weidner |
| DeVerter | Hutchinson, W. | Petrarca | Wenger |

| | | | |
|----------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|
| DeWeese | Itkin | Piccola | White |
| DiCarlo | Johnson | Pievsky | Wiggins |
| Dietz | Jones | Pitts | Williams |
| Dininni | Katz | Polite | Wilson |
| Dombrowski | Kernick | Pott | Wilt |
| Donatucci | Klingaman | Pratt | Wise |
| Dorr | Knepper | Prendergast | Wright, D. |
| Doyle | Kolter | Pyles | Wright, J. L. |
| Duffy | Kowalshyn | Ravenstahl | Yahner |
| Dumas | Laughlin | Reed | Yohn |
| Englehart | Lehr | Renwick | Zearfoss |
| Fee | Letterman | Richardson | Zeller |
| Fischer, R. R. | Levi | Ritter | Zitterman |
| Fisher, D. M. | Lincoln | Ruggiero | Zord |
| Flaherty | Livengood | Ryan | Zwinkl |
| Foster, A. | Logue | Salvatore | |
| Foster, W. | Lynch | Scanlon | Irvis, |
| Freind | Mackowski | Scheaffer | Speaker |
| Fryer | | | |

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Burd | Greenfield | Moehlmann | Sweet |
| Burns | Greenleaf | Morris | Taddonio |
| Butera | Grieco | Mrkonic | Taylor, E. |
| Caltagirone | Halverson | Mullen, M. P. | Taylor, F. |
| Caputo | Hamilton | Mullen, M. M. | Tenaglio |
| Cassidy | Harper | Musto | Thomas |
| Cessar | Hasay | Novak | Trello |
| Cimini | Haskell | Noye | Valicenti |
| Cohen | Hayes, D. S. | O'Brien, B. | Vroon |
| Cole | Hayes, S. E. | O'Brien, D. | Wagner |
| Cowell | Helfrick | O'Connell | Wansacz |
| Davies | Hoeffel | O'Keefe | Wargo |
| DeMedio | Honaman | Pancoast | Wass |
| DeVerte | Hopkins | Parker | Wenger |
| DeWeese | Hutchinson, A. | Petrarca | White |
| DiCarlo | Hutchinson, W. | Pievsky | Wiggins |
| Dietz | Itkin | Pitts | Williams |
| Dininni | Johnson | Polite | Wilson |
| Dombrowski | Jones | Pott | Wilt |
| Donatucci | Katz | Pratt | Wise |
| Dorr | Kernick | Prendergast | Wright, D. |
| Doyle | Klingaman | Pyles | Wright, J. L. |
| Duffy | Knepper | Ravenstahl | Yahner |
| Dumas | Kolter | Reed | Yohn |
| Englehart | Kowalshyn | Renwick | Zeller |
| Fee | Laughlin | Richardson | Zitterman |
| Fischer, R. R. | Lehr | Rieger | Zord |
| Fisher, D. M. | Letterman | Ritter | Zwinkl |
| Flaherty | Levi | Ruggiero | |
| Foster, A. | Lincoln | Ryan | Irvis, |
| Foster, W. | Livengood | Salvatore | Speaker |
| Freind | | | |

NAYS—1

Rappaport

NOT VOTING—8

| | | | |
|------------|-----------|--------|---------|
| Cianciulli | Kelly | Oliver | Rieger |
| Giammarco | O'Donnell | Rhodes | Shelton |

The question was determined in the affirmative and the resolution was adopted.

**RULES SUSPENDED
TO ADD AND DELETE SPONSORS**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority whip.

Mr. GREENFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the rules of the House be suspended so that I may add or delete sponsors to certain bills:

Addition:

House bill No. 1486—Messrs. Geesey, Dorr, Lehr, A. C. Foster and Anderson.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—187

| | | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Abraham | Fryer | Logue | Scanlon |
| Anderson | Gallagher | Lynch | Scheaffer |
| Armstrong | Gallen | Mackowski | Schmitt |
| Arthurs | Gamble | Madigan | Schweder |
| Barber | Garzia | Manderino | Scirica |
| Bellomini | Gatski | Manmiller | Seltzer |
| Beloff | Geesey | McCall | Shuman |
| Bennett | Geisler | McClatchy | Shupnik |
| Berlin | George, C. | McGinnis | Sirianni |
| Berson | George, M. | McLane | Smith, E. |
| Bittinger | Giammarco | Mebus | Smith, L. |
| Bittle | Gillette | Meluskey | Spencer |
| Borski | Gleeson | Milanovich | Stairs |
| Brandt | Goebel | Miller | Stapleton |
| Brown | Goodman | Milliron | Stewart |
| Brunner | Gray | Miscevich | Stuban |

NAYS—6

| | | | |
|---------|-----------|---------|----------|
| Mowery | Rappaport | Weidner | Zearfoss |
| Piccola | Spitz | | |

NOT VOTING—7

| | | | |
|------------|-----------|--------|---------|
| Cianciulli | McIntyre | Oliver | Shelton |
| Kelly | O'Donnell | Rhodes | |

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

NO FURTHER BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Does the majority whip have any further business?

Mr. GREENFIELD. No. I do not at this time.

The SPEAKER. Does the minority leader have any further business?

For the information of the members, the House is about to be adjourned until Monday at 1 o'clock. The report of the Committee of Conference would not be available to the House today and if it were available tomorrow, it would take 8 hours to print, and, therefore, the House could not act upon it until possibly Sunday afternoon. The House would not be empowered to act that early unless and until the Senate had acted, this being a Senate bill. The Chair has been informed that the Senate will not act that soon and, therefore, there is no sense in the House remaining. That Committee of Conference report will be, hopefully, before the members of this House by Monday.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to interrogate someone from the leadership to get some clarity.

The SPEAKER. Will the majority whip stand for interrogation by the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Richardson?

The gentleman, Mr. Greenfield, indicates that he will stand for interrogation. The gentleman, Mr. Richardson, may proceed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this week we received a letter in the mail indicating that we would be in session until we passed the budget. I think that this crisis is very important and I just want to get a fill-in on the readout from you as to where things are standing relative to the budget and whether or not it is true that we must pass a budget before the 18th unless we are going to pass stopgaps again to fund certain programs so that they may stay funded in this Commonwealth. I would like to get your feeling first on that question.

Mr. GREENFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I can elaborate any more on what the Speaker has already told you as far as where we stand with regard to the Senate's action and the necessity for the bill to go to the Senate before it comes here and the necessity of it being in print by Monday when we hope to have the version before us.

What was your second question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Whether or not it would necessitate a stopgap budget in order to fund those individual persons whom we funded on June 30 and not operate in the state unless there was such a funding? I am asking whether or not that date is the 18th, and was that not the necessity of us being here for 5 days this week, hopefully, with the hope of trying to get something passed so that we could more or less take the burden off of those individuals?

Mr. GREENFIELD. The Governor has so indicated in his statements, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Pardon me?

Mr. GREENFIELD. I said, the Governor has so indicated that the money would run out approximately July 18, I believe, in his statements.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then what would happen?

Mr. GREENFIELD. Well, I believe that it is incumbent upon us to get a budget out of here before that date. Or if not—

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that, you know, I am really concerned that we have been here all week. Today is the 15th. If I am understanding correctly, tomorrow is the 16th, Sunday is the 17th, and then Monday is the 18th. Now it would seem to me that we are right down to the final wire. Some people think it is funny; I do not. Some people have indicated that if we come back on Monday and we do not pass something, and there are no proposals up and there are no stopgaps up, I just want to know what we are going to do in the event that there is not a budget passed then by Monday. As a member, and I am sure that the members would want to know, what would be the position then of this House?

Mr. GREENFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the only answer that I can give to that is that I think Mr. Richardson knows as well as I do that it is the responsibility of the legislature to have a budget

and to fund this Commonwealth and I am hopeful that we will meet that responsibility. Whether it is by a deadline situation, by a crisis situation, I am hopeful that we will act in accordance with our responsibility and meet that deadline.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to more or less get this on the record.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Richardson. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

And I raise that question, Mr. Speaker, because I felt and still feel that something needs to be done about our situation. I think that everybody knows how serious it is, but I just think that when you are going and facing your State workers and those individuals who are concerned about their paychecks and whether or not they want to get paid after next week, that maybe some initiative should be exerted by some of the members in this House to try and force this situation.

We have been arguing since January 4, and I just think that it is important every time it comes up that it looks like there is a deviation away from the more responsibilities to bring it to the attention of the members. So that is why we are a service of the people and that is our responsibility. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, all remaining bills and resolutions on today's calendar will be passed over. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was not trying to really interrogate Mr. Greenfield. I hope that he did not take it personal. What I am saying is that it seems to me that the Senate has left and gone home and that perhaps maybe there was some way that we, as House members, could move to have them come back so that we do not get forced with the same type of situation that we have been forced with before waiting until the last minute.

I think the situation that is in front of us, to me, presents a clear-cut, serious problem and one that seems to me that I do not think the members who have come this week came to play games. I think that they came to really take care of some serious business, plus the fact that there are a number of state workers who have been at our doors and have been knocking on them very hard concerning this budget crisis.

It would just seem to me that since we have heard that the Senate has gone home already and not acted and that we have to move and wait until Monday, perhaps there are some moves that could be taken by this House in order to try and help get the Senate back so that perhaps if it meant late Saturday or Sunday, we would know exactly where we stood. At least we will be acting before time.

WELCOMES

The SPEAKER. The Chair is delighted to welcome to the hall of the House, Mr. and Mrs. David Silk and the Silk family of

Mount Pleasant Township.

They are the guests of Representative Jess Stairs of Westmoreland County.

The Chair thanks the family for coming and hopes that the family has enjoyed its trip to Harrisburg and to the hall of the House.

The Chair also welcomes Mr. Timothy MacIntire and Mr. Art Chamberlain, who are here as the guests of Representatives Cassidy and Milliron.

The Chair welcomes them to the hall of the House and hopes

that their visit has been a warm one and an informative one.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BENNETT moved that this House do now adjourn until Monday, July 18, 1977, at 1 p.m., e.d.t.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and (at 2:25 p.m., e.d.t.) the House adjourned.