

Legislative Journal

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1977

Session of 1977

161st of the General Assembly

Vol. 1, No. 98

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (LESTER K. FRYER)
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:

Almighty and Everlasting God, we thank Thee for the joys of fellowship we share with one another, we praise Thee for the goodness which Thou hast seen fit to bestow upon us, and we laud and magnify Thy name for the care and concern which Thou dost show to each of us. Mercifully grant to these stewards of Thine the depth and enrichment of cultivating the friendships they have made within these halls, fill the storehouses of their lives with the harvest of Thy bounty, and continue Thy guiding hand in their lives so that the experience of their daily lives may reflect Thy power and direction therein. Amen.

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, approval of the *Journal for Monday, November 14, 1977, will be postponed* until printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE GRANTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority whip.

Mr. GREENFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I request a leave of absence for Mr. A. K. HUTCHINSON for today's session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for leaves of absence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL RECORDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is about to take up the master roll call.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—196

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—4

Geesey Hamilton Hutchinson, A. Shelton

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

**HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND
REFERRED TO COMMITTEES**

No. 1846 By Messrs. GEORGE, ENGLEHART, WARGO, McCALL, SCHWEDER, B. F. O'BRIEN, GOODMAN, WANSACZ, ZITTERMAN, DeMEDIO, GEISLER, CAPUTO, RAVENSTAHL, M. M. MULLEN, A. K. HUTCHINSON, DUFFY, GAMBLE, ITKIN, YAHNER, LIVENGOOD, VALICENTI, TRELLO, ABRAHAM, MISCEVICH, NOVAK, FLAHERTY, MRKONIC, STAIRS, RENWICK, TAYLOR, SWEET, MILLIRON, STUBAN, S. E. HAYES, MUSTO, DOMBROWSKI and LEVI

An Act amending "The Pennsylvania Occupational Disease Act," approved June 21, 1939 (P. L. 566, No. 284), further providing for the running of certain statutes of limitation applicable to certain benefits.

Referred to Committee on Labor Relations.

No. 1847 By Mr. PICCOLA

An Act creating the Office of County Medical Examiners; granting certain powers and duties; abolishing the Office of Coroner; establishing a Statewide Board of Medical Examiners.

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare.

No. 1848 By Mr. GREENLEAF

An Act amending the "Inheritance and Estate Tax Act of 1961," approved June 15, 1961 (P. L. 373, No. 207), providing for a general exemption to be deductible.

Referred to Committee on Finance.

No. 1849 By Mr. J. L. WRIGHT

An Act amending "The Game Law," approved June 3, 1937 (P. L. 1225, No. 316), further providing for the issuance of licenses to hunt antlerless deer.

Referred to Committee on Game and Fisheries.

No. 1850 By Mr. J. L. WRIGHT

An Act amending the "Tax Reform Code of 1971," approved March 4, 1971 (P. L. 6, No. 2), providing for expenses of detection and punishment of frauds.

Referred to Committee on Finance.

No. 1851 By Messrs. A. K. HUTCHINSON, ABRAHAM, COHEN, DUMAS, GREENLEAF, Mrs. HONAMAN, Messrs. KNEPPER, NOYE, Miss SIRIANNI, Messrs. STAIRS and WIGGINS

An Act amending "The Permanent Registration Act for Cities of the Second Class, Cities of the Second Class A, Cities of the Third Class, Boroughs, Towns and Townships," approved April 29, 1937 (P. L. 487, No. 155), providing for the registration of certain electors confined in penal institutions and mental institutions.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

No. 1852 By Messrs. A. K. HUTCHINSON, ABRAHAM, COHEN, DUMAS, KNEPPER, Mrs. HONAMAN, Messrs. GREENLEAF, SCHWEDER, Miss SIRIANNI, Messrs. WIGGINS, NOYE and STAIRS

An Act amending the "Pennsylvania Election Code," approved June 3, 1937 (P. L. 1333, No. 320), redefining "political party" and "political body" and providing for the filing of oaths and papers by candidates for office.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

No. 1853 By Messrs. A. K. HUTCHINSON, ABRAHAM, COHEN, DUMAS, KNEPPER, SCHWEDER, Miss SIRIANNI, Messrs. WIGGINS, NOYE and STAIRS

An Act amending the "Pennsylvania Election Code," approved June 3, 1937 (P. L. 1333, No. 320), providing for residence requirements for registration and voting purposes for certain persons confined in a penal or mental institution.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

No. 1854 By Messrs. A. K. HUTCHINSON, ABRAHAM, COHEN, DUMAS, KNEPPER, Mrs. HONAMAN, Messrs. GREENLEAF, SCHWEDER, Miss SIRIANNI, Messrs. WIGGINS, NOYE and STAIRS

An Act amending the "Pennsylvania Election Code," approved June 3, 1937 (P. L. 1333, No. 320), providing for the composition of board of elections in home rule counties.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

No. 1855 By Messrs. A. K. HUTCHINSON, ABRAHAM, COHEN, DUMAS, KNEPPER, Mrs. HONAMAN, Messrs. GREENLEAF, SCHWEDER, Miss SIRIANNI, Messrs. WIGGINS, NOYE and STAIRS

A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, amending provisions establishing qualifications of voters.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

No. 1856 By Messrs. SCHWEDER, A. K. HUTCHINSON, ABRAHAM, COHEN, DUMAS, KNEPPER, Mrs. HONAMAN, Mr. GREENLEAF, Miss SIRIANNI, Messrs. WIGGINS, NOYE and STAIRS

An Act amending "The Permanent Registration Act for Cities of the Second Class, Cities of the Second Class A, Cities of the Third Class, Boroughs, Towns and Townships," approved April 29, 1937 (P. L. 487, No. 115), providing for the composition of registration commissions in home rule counties.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

No. 1857 By Messrs. A. K. HUTCHINSON, ABRAHAM, COHEN, DUMAS, KNEPPER, Mrs. HONAMAN, Messrs. GREENLEAF, SCHWEDER, Miss SIRIANNI, Messrs. WIGGINS, NOYE and STAIRS

An Act amending the "Pennsylvania Election Code," approved June 3, 1937 (P. L. 1333, No. 320), changing times for filing papers by political bodies; shortening the time for withdrawal of candidates and substituted nominations;***

Referred to Committee on State Government.

No. 1858 By Messrs. A. K. HUTCHINSON, ABRAHAM, COHEN, DUMAS, KNEPPER, Mrs. HONAMAN, Mr. SCHWEDER, Miss SIRIANNI, Messrs. WIGGINS, NOYE and STAIRS

An Act amending "The First Class City Permanent Registration Act," approved March 30, 1937 (P. L. 115, No. 40), providing for the registration of certain electors confined in penal institutions and mental institutions.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

No. 1859 By Messrs. GAMBLE, TRELLO, ABRAHAM, NOVAK, MISCEVICH, DUFFY, ITKIN, MRKONIC, FLAHERTY, CAPUTO, D. M. FISHER, PARKER AND KNEPPER

An Act amending "The Administrative Code of 1929," approved April 9, 1929 (P. L. 177, No. 175), authorizing a lease for gas rights at Woodville State Hospital.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

No. 1860 By Messrs. A. K. HUTCHINSON, DeVERTER, DORR, MADIGAN, ZELLER, PETRARCA, NOVAK, ZELLER, STEWART, DeMEDIO, MORRIS, KOLTER and LETTERMAN

An Act amending the "Volunteer Fire Company, Ambulance Service and Rescue Squad Assistance Act," approved July 15, 1976 (P. L. 1036, No. 208), providing for the refinancing of certain debt incurred by volunteer fire companies for equipment and facilities between November 4, 1975 and April 1, 1977 inclusive.

Referred to Committee on Appropriations.

No. 1861 By Messrs. DAVIES, W. D. HUTCHINSON, FREIND, WILSON, NOYE and HALVERSON

An Act amending "The Administrative Code of 1929," approved April 9, 1929 (P. L. 177, No. 175), requiring all State agencies to hold public hearings on certain changes in management practices for certain bodies of water.

Referred to Committee on Conservation.

No. 1862 By Messrs. BITTINGER, RENWICK, LIVENGOOD, ZITTEMAN, REED, GRAY, BORSKI, JONES and DeWEESE

An Act amending "The Game Law," approved June 3, 1937 (P. L. 1225, No. 316), increasing the penalty for failure to stop a vehicle at the direction of any officer of the commission.

Referred to Committee on Game and Fisheries.

No. 1863 By Mr. GREENLEAF

An Act authorizing the service of subpoenas by certified mail in criminal cases, and providing for the duration of subpoenas.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

No. 1864 By Mr. GREENLEAF

An Act amending "The Administrative Code of 1929," approved April 9, 1929 (P. L. 177, No. 175), providing for bicycle and jogging paths in State parks.

Referred to Committee on Conservation.

No. 1865 By Messrs. REED and PRATT

An Act requiring the recording of a conveyance of a fee simple title to land within ten days of delivery and providing a penalty.

Referred to Committee on Local Government.

No. 1866 By Messrs. SCIRICA, O'DONNELL and WASS

An Act declaring and adopting the song "Pennsylvania Geel It's Great!" music by Lou Leggieri and lyrics by Henry and Roberta Shaffner, as the State song of the Commonwealth.

Referred to Committee on State Government.

No. 1867 By Messrs. BITTINGER, STEWART, ENGLEHART, HALVERSON, DeWEESE, LETTERMAN and REED

An Act amending the act of July 6, 1961 (P. L. 515, No. 265), entitled, as amended, "An act authorizing the Governor to provide for disaster and emergency relief under circumstances; authorizing him to transfer certain funds in the General Fund for these purposes, and making an appropriation," providing for reimbursement to political subdivisions and authorities for repair or replacement of public facilities damaged, destroyed or made inoperable due to a natural disaster.

Referred to Committee on Conservation.

No. 1868 By Messrs. STEWART, BITTINGER, ENGLEHART, REED, DeWEESE, LETTERMAN and REED

An Act amending the "State Council of Civil Defense Act of 1951," approved March 19, 1951 (P. L. 28, No. 4), providing for coordination of Federal emergency highway assistance grants for both Federally aided highways and nonfederally aided highways and permitting State agencies to purchase materials and supplies during emergencies without bids.

Referred to Committee on Conservation.

No. 1869 By Messrs. CASSIDY, GRAY, JONES, MACKOWSKI, HOPKINS, DAVIES, LETTERMAN, WENGER, GIAMMARCO, HALVERSON, GALEN, CIMINI, NOYE, MILLIRON, GEESEY, W. D. HUTCHINSON, S. E. HAYES, PICCOLA, MANMILLER, GRIECO, D. M. O'BRIEN, R. R. FISCHER and ABRAHAM

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the crime of obscenity.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

No. 1870 By Messrs. CASSIDY, BROWN, CALTAGIRONE and MILLIRON

An Act amending the "Public Utility Law," approved May 28, 1937 (P. L. 1053, No. 286), requiring competitive bidding for the purchase of coal by public utilities.

Referred to Committee on Mines and Energy Management.

No. 1871 By Messrs. BITTINGER, STEWART,
ENGLEHART, REED, LETTERMAN,
DeWEESE and HALVERSON

An Act amending the act of July 6, 1961 (P. L. 515, No. 265), entitled, as amended, "An act authorizing the Governor to provide for disaster and emergency relief under certain circumstances; authorizing him to transfer certain funds in the General Fund for these purposes, and making an appropriation," providing for assistance for community development programs in political subdivisions affected by natural disasters.

Referred to Committee on Conservation.

SENATE MESSAGE

SENATE BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

The clerk of the Senate presented the following bills for concurrence:

SENATE BILL No. 539

An Act protecting race horses from abuse restricting the use of phenylbutazone stimulants or depressants on race horses creating a presumption providing for the appointment of an official State Veterinarian and providing penalties.

Referred to Committee on Agriculture and Rural Affairs.

SENATE BILL No. 1042

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes further providing for corruption of minors.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

HOUSE RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

By Messrs. DeWEESE, ENGLEHART, RENWICK,
BRUNNER, PRENDERGAST, FRYER, LETTERMAN,
DeMEDIO, VALICENTI, STUBAN, WENGER, MILLER,
MOEHLMANN, ARMSTRONG, STAIRS,
CALTAGIRONE, COLE, TAYLOR, LINCOLN, SWEET,
CESSAR, PARKER, D. M. FISHER, GOEBEL,
MELUSKEY, RITTER, ZWIKL, Mrs. WISE, Messrs.
BROWN, GATSKI, Mrs. HONAMAN, and Mr. PICCOLA

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 161

The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the Highway Trust Fund Act so that the maintenance of the Interstate Highway System will be funded upon the same basis as the system was originally constructed.

Referred to Committee on Federal-State Relations.

By Mr. CASSIDY

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 163

(Concurrent)

The General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress and President of the United

States to use the great influence of our country in Middle East Peace negotiations to procure from the Arab parties involved their pledge that they recognize the right of Israel to exist as a free and independent nation.

Referred to Committee on Federal-State Relations.

By Messrs. BITTINGER, STEWART, RITTER,
LETTERMAN, STUBAN, GEORGE, LIVENGOOD, D. R.
WRIGHT, FEE, ZITTEMAN, REED, GRAY, BORSKI,
DiCARLO, LINCOLN and DeWEESE

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 164

(Concurrent)

The General Assembly memorializes the Congress of the United States to require all Federal agencies to first employ available persons residing or regularly work in disaster areas before other persons are employed.

Referred to Committee on Federal-State Relations.

By Messrs. STEWART, BITTINGER, REED,
ENGLEHART, HALVERSON, DeWEESE and
LETTERMAN

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 165

The House of Representatives suggests that the Governor implement proposals coordinating the work of governmental agencies dealing with the Johnstown Flood of 1977.

Referred to Committee on Federal-State Relations.

By Messrs. BITTINGER, STEWART, REED,
ENGLEHART, HALVERSON, DeWEESE and
LETTERMAN

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 166

The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to direct the Department of Housing and Urban Development to take steps to rectify the injustice regarding repair and reconstruction work in a major disaster situation.

Referred to Committee on Federal-State Relations.

By Messrs. LINCOLN, TAYLOR, DeWEESE, BENNETT,
DiCARLO, FEE, ZELLER, STUBAN, ZWIKL, Mrs.
WISE, Messrs. BITTINGER, STEWART, RITTER,
MELUSKEY, REED, GRAY, JONES, DORR, COLE,
CALTAGIRONE, SHUMAN, PRATT, CIMINI, LEVI
AND MISCEVICH

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 167

The Speaker of the House of Representatives directs the House Committee on Consumer Affairs to investigate the fuel adjustment charge levied by the Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania.

Referred to Committee on Rules.

SENATE MESSAGE

AMENDED SENATE BILL CONCURRED IN

The clerk of the Senate informed that the Senate has concurred in House amendments to **SENATE BILL No. 334**.

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority whip.

Mr. GREENFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee has instructed me to make a motion to remove the following bills from the table and place them on the active calendar:

HB 1147; HB 1238; HB 1579; SB 377; SB 481; and HR 154.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

ADDRESS TO HOUSE

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

Mr. DeMEDIO. Mr. Speaker, as you are all well aware, last week the voters of the Commonwealth gave their overwhelming approval to the proposed amendment to the Constitution of Pennsylvania expanding the Veterans' Property Tax Exemption Program to include all 100-percent service-connected disabled veterans who could show a financial need.

In order to implement this overwhelming mandate on the part of our electorate, I am introducing today appropriate amendatory legislation. All members of the Military and Veterans Affairs Committee are cosponsors of this legislation, and I am going to place it on the front desk so that any other members who desire to cosponsor this legislation may affix their signatures thereto.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ADDRESS TO HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair, at this time, recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. Zeller. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. ZELLER. Mr. Speaker, to have the privilege to bring to the House some information in regard to the colleges and the letters we received, if I may proceed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman requests unanimous consent to address the members of the House. Without objection, the gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. ZELLER. Mr. Speaker, we as members have received letters from the presidents of the nonpreferred colleges and it has been in the news media, all phases of the news media — newspapers, radio and TV — as to their plight and the amount of interest they claim that they are paying upon borrowed money to stay open.

I was on Channel 3 the other evening, and at that time there were students there who had other information. The information we have received is that there is a movement afoot by these colleges in regard to a pressure tactic to total up all the interest they are paying on authority bonds, on all types of borrowing, and they are totaling this to a point to use scare tactics against the members.

What I am doing today is, sending a letter out to all these college presidents asking for a breakdown—with all respect to them—to kill any rumor as to a breakdown of what the interest is that they are paying exactly upon the money that they are borrowing due to this budget problem. I want a breakdown in regard to all of those interests. I think we have that right since they are nonpreferred, and they are, in effect, receiving tax-

payers' funds. I believe that we deserve that.

I have a clipping from an article in the paper, if it is true, that President Oswald of Penn State stated himself, following the budget, that they would not have to borrow money until January; that they are in good shape until January of 1978. Whether this is true or not, that appeared in the paper. I have the clipping and I want to know for a fact whether this is true. All I feel is that the whole thing is bannered as a bunch of scare tactics and the students have been riled up over it from the conditions that have been existing in these colleges and they feel it has been a direct rip-off on them by the abuse of funds by administrators. We want to know and I feel we deserve that reply.

Thank you very much for allowing me to bring it to the attention of the members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the lady from Centre, Mrs. Wise.

Mrs. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Mr. Zeller will receive his answers from the college presidents, but I can give him a very direct answer. I happen to serve on the board of trustees of the Pennsylvania State University. We completed a meeting on Friday. I know exactly where that interest is coming from and how it is coming. There was never any statement made by that president that we would not have to borrow until January. The funds for the universities are distributed to the universities monthly and when they do not get those monthly funds, they have to make it up. I can tell him the names of the banks; I can tell him the interest rates. I am sure the presidents will do that, but I think Mr. Zeller has been in politics long enough to know that everything that is printed in the paper is not always accurate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A very astute observation.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES AND TABLED

HB 1445, PN 1717

By Mr. YAHNER

An Act amending the act of December 27, 1951 (P. L. 1793, No. 475), referred to as the Liquefied Petroleum Gas Act, providing for the registration of agricultural producers in certain circumstances.

Agriculture and Rural Affairs.

HB 1821, PN 2219

By Mr. KNEPPER

An Act naming the convention center under construction in Pittsburgh the David Leo Lawrence Convention Center.

Business and Commerce.

ADDRESS TO HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair, at this time, recognizes the gentleman from Snyder, Mr. Thomas. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. THOMAS. I would like the unanimous consent of the House to put a few statements on record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, what I

have to talk about this afternoon is nothing new but I would certainly ask you for your undivided attention so that you might hear my remarks and know exactly what I say here today.

The few words I have to say are really in defense of my activity as a State Representative and as it pertains to the mail that is coming to my desk relative to satisfying the needs of the budget problems of this Commonwealth. What I am really talking about is getting the monkey off my back. The claws are digging in pretty deep by those who do not know.

I quote from the Governor's news release of August 19, for immediate release from the Governor's Office, when he signed HB 1349, the budget bill: "With my signing of this bill, Pennsylvania's financial agony will end."

July 12, when the Governor stood in this very hall and gave his State-of-the-State to the General Assembly, he said something to the effect that those who voted for taxes in past years were reelected. I would hate to see 102 people not get reelected to the House of Representatives again, and since July 12 until this time, I did not see 102 volunteers on this side of the aisle nor did I see 26 in the other august body volunteer to vote to settle the financial crisis that lays before us today, nor did I see, under the leadership of the Governor, any draft of 102 people on the floor of this House nor any draft of 26 from the body of the Senate. So it prompted me to do what I am doing here today.

I have just hand-carried a letter to the Governor and I want to read that letter to you right now. (Reading:)

Dear Governor Shapp:

Thine shall be the glory for your accomplishments under seven years of your leadership! I think it is a shame that the personal staff which surrounds you apparently continues to counsel against answering questions posed by the taxpayers of Snyder and Union Counties through their elected State Representative.

I get a feeling a black shroud will be placed over your name in the Pennsylvania history books because of the shameless arrogance, the political corruption, the aimless leadership, the blank check attitude, and the lazy attention to detail which your Administration has shown the people of Pennsylvania.

I remember one of your campaign slogans which you used during the 1970 elections, "Before things get worse, Vote Shapp/Kline." You are to be pitied if you don't realize that the condition of state government, the economic and business climate of Pennsylvania, and the reputation of our Commonwealth have gotten worse under your Administration instead of better.

Governor, you are to be pitied for your embarrassing search for a niche in national and international affairs at the expense of our rising roles of unemployed as well as the diminishing pocketbooks of our taxpayers. Some people point out that it is your stubbornness which has caused the hardships on first: state workers and welfare recipients; and, second: our colleges and universities during this year's Battle of the Budget. Your history in private and public life has shown that you either get your way or else. It's a shame the Commonwealth is suffering under that policy of your, "or else."

Based on common sense and a real purpose, I have made numerous attempts to express opinions and offer suggestions on how to pull our state out of the quagmire of inefficiency and stagnation, and the abuse of the taxpayers' dollars.

But, because I belong temporarily to the Minority Party in Pennsylvania, you have chosen to totally ignore the offers to sit down and reason together in order to reach a solution which is fair and equitable to everyone. A case in point is your refusal to even acknowledge that your Administration and your leadership in the Legislature is stymied as to how to resolve the current budget deficit of \$300 million for state-related colleges and universities.

You apparently don't want any suggestions from members or leadership of the Minority Party, even if our system of higher education is floundering in a morass of high interest loans to meet the day-to-day operating expenses until you decide who is going to be on your "hit parade" of higher taxes.

Governor, I have no reason to believe that the last year of your Administration will be any different from the first seven, and that's a shame for all Pennsylvanians. I have no reason to believe that you would accept any viable plans from the Minority Party on rebuilding our state.

But, I do have reason to believe that because of your lack of leadership, all of us will be made to pay for what your Administration has failed to do in our state. It's just a shame that the people have already been made to pay so dearly for what we have instead of what we might have had with the extra, yes, I said extra, three billion dollars you spent over and above what was spent when you took office.

Every Governor takes pride in the accomplishments of his Administration, and I say to you, Governor, thine shall be the glory for your seven years of leadership. When was this Commonwealth in a worse mess?

Sincerely,
RENO H. THOMAS

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted to make sure each one of my colleagues knew exactly how I felt and how I stand on the crisis that lays before us today.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Pievsky.

Mr. PIEVSKY. Mr. Speaker, at the call of the recess, there will be an Appropriations Committee meeting in the Appropriations Committee room, immediately upon the call of the recess.

RECESS REQUESTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority whip.

Mr. GREENFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that this House be now in recess until 3:30 p.m. We do have a calendar which we do intend to run. I urge all members to return promptly at 3:30 to the floor of the House.

INTERROGATION

Mr. S. E. HAYES requested and obtained unanimous consent to interrogate Mr. GREENFIELD.

Mr. S. E. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Could the gentleman tell us what his intentions are for tomorrow?

Mr. GREENFIELD. I cannot at this moment. I think that will

depend on further actions and activities within the halls of this legislature.

Mr. S. E. HAYES. You are a magic man, Roland.
Thank you.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, this House will now stand in recess until 3:30 p.m. The members are requested to report to the floor of the House at that time.

AFTER RECESS

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

THE SPEAKER (K. LEROY IRVIS) IN THE CHAIR

HB 217 TO BE CALLED UP

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. Mebus, who now has the correct amendment. Is that correct, Mr. Mebus?

Mr. MEBUS. I had the correct amendment yesterday but thought I had a bill to be reported from committee with amendments, not realizing the bill was already on the calendar. These are the agreed-to amendments, Mr. Speaker.

CALENDAR

FINANCE BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

Agreeable to order.

The House proceeded to third consideration of **House bill No. 217, printer's No. 686**, entitled:

An Act amending the "Co-operative Agricultural Association Corporate Net Income Tax Act" approved May 23, 1945 (P. L. 893, No. 360), further providing for the imposition of the tax.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. MEBUS offered the following amendment:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 3, page 2, line 3, by inserting after "tax." Nothing contained herein shall be construed to impose an excise tax upon any subject of taxation when such subject of taxation is specifically exempted under the statute levying the excise tax.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. Mebus, who will briefly explain the amendment under the rules of the House.

Mr. MEBUS. Mr. Speaker, the amendment has been distributed. In substance, all the amendment does is try to clarify further a statement which is already in the existing act, together with the bill itself, just to make it totally clear that none of the agricultural exemptions are to be eliminated by passage of this bill.

It really in a sense might even be stated as unnecessary, but there are those who feel a lot more comfortable with the bill

with this amendment in it.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—182

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—18

Belloff	Giammarco	Morris	Richardson
Cianciulli	Hamilton	O'Donnell	Scheaffer
Davies	Harper	Oliver	Shelton
Foster, W.	Hutchinson, A.	Rhodes	Valicenti
Geesey	Hutchinson, W.		

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

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

Mr. S. E. HAYES. Representative Thomas has an amendment

to this bill. He has it prepared and what he is waiting for is fiscal information concerning the amendment. He has not been delinquent in preparing this amendment.

The SPEAKER. What is the name of the Representative? Thomas?

Mr. S. E. HAYES. Representative Thomas, sir.

He does have the amendment. He is just awaiting fiscal data on that amendment.

HB 217 AND AMENDMENT PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. All right. In that case, HB 217, PN 686, as amended by the House of Representatives, will go over for today. That will give Mr. Thomas an opportunity at a later time to offer his amendment.

The Chair thanks the gentleman for bringing that to the attention of the Chair.

Without objection, HB 217, PN 686, together with the amendment, will go over for tomorrow. The bill will reappear on the calendar on third consideration exactly as it appears today. We will not reprint the bill as amended. That will give Mr. Thomas a chance to offer his amendment.

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of **House bill No. 813, printer's No. 917**, entitled:

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

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

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

The question is, Shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the roll call will now be taken.

YEAS—187

Abraham	Gallen	Manmiller	Schmitt
Anderson	Gamble	McCall	Schweder
Armstrong	Garzia	McClatchy	Scirica
Arthurs	Gatski	McGinnis	Seltzer
Bellomini	Geisler	McIntyre	Shuman
Beloff	George, C.	McLane	Shupnik
Bennett	George, M.	Mebus	Sirianni
Berlin	Giammarco	Meluskey	Smith, E.
Berson	Gillette	Milanovich	Smith, L.
Bittinger	Gleeson	Miller	Spencer
Bittle	Goebel	Milliron	Spitz
Borski	Gray	Miscevich	Stairs
Brandt	Greenfield	Moehlmann	Stapleton
Brown	Greenleaf	Morris	Stewart
Brunner	Grieco	Mowery	Stuban
Burd	Halverson	Mrkonic	Sweet
Burns	Harper	Mullen, M. P.	Taddonio
Butera	Hasay	Mullen, M. M.	Taylor, E.
Caltagirone	Haskell	Musto	Taylor, F.
Caputo	Hayes, D. S.	Novak	Tenaglio
Cassidy	Hayes, S. E.	Noye	Thomas
Cessar	Helfrick	O'Brien, B.	Trello
Cianciulli	Hoeffel	O'Brien, D.	Valicenti
Cimini	Honaman	O'Connell	Vroon

Cohen	Hopkins	O'Keefe	Wagner
Cole	Hutchinson, W.	Oliver	Wansacz
Cowell	Itkin	Pancoast	Wargo
Davies	Johnson	Parker	Wass
DeMedio	Jones	Petrarca	Weidner
DeVerter	Katz	Piccola	Wenger
DeWeese	Kelly	Pievsky	White
DiCarlo	Kernick	Pitts	Williams
Dietz	Klingaman	Polite	Wilson
Diminni	Knepper	Pott	Wilt
Dombrowski	Kolter	Pratt	Wise
Donatucci	Kowalshyn	Prendergast	Wright, D.
Dorr	Laughlin	Pyles	Wright, J. L.
Doyle	Lehr	Rappaport	Yahner
Duffy	Letterman	Ravenstahl	Yohn
Dumas	Levi	Reed	Zearfoss
Fee	Lincoln	Renwick	Zeller
Fischer, R. R.	Livengood	Rieger	Zitterman
Fisher, D. M.	Logue	Ritter	Zord
Flaherty	Lynch	Ruggiero	Zwilk
Foster, W.	Mackowski	Salvatore	
Freind	Madigan	Scanlon	Irvis,
Fryer	Manderino	Scheaffer	Speaker
Gallagher			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—13

Barber	Goodman	O'Donnell	Ryan
Englehart	Hamilton	Rhodes	Shelton
Foster, A.	Hutchinson, A.	Richardson	Wiggins
Geesey			

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

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

REMARKS ON VOTE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Schuylkill, Mr. Goodman.

Mr. GOODMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was involved in signing some important legislation on that vote. I would like to be recorded as voting in favor of HB 813.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of **House bill No. 1131, printer's No. 1337**, entitled:

An Act reenacting amending and revising the "Local Government Unit Debt Act" approved July 12, 1972 (P. L. 781, No. 185).

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

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

The question is, Shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the roll call will now be taken.

YEAS—182

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

NAYS—5

Hasay	Mullen, M. M.	Spitz	Zeller
Meluskey			

NOT VOTING—13

Barber	Hutchinson, A.	Richardson	Shuman
Donatucci	McIntyre	Scirica	Wiggins
Geesey	O'Donnell	Shelton	Yohn
Hamilton			

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

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

REMARKS ON VOTE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Franklin, Mr. Shuman. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SHUMAN. Could I indicate my vote on HB 1131 in the affirmative?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may put his remarks on the record. How would the gentleman have been recorded? In the affirmative?

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

Does the gentleman, Mr. Yohn, require recognition?

Mr. YOHN. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. YOHN. Mr. Speaker, on the vote on HB 1131, I was temporarily out of my seat. Had I been in my seat, I would have voted in the affirmative.

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

HB 1655 PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. HB 1655 will go over for today. It is quite likely that this bill will be taken up for amendment and debate tomorrow. The Chair anticipates that there may well be a lengthy debate on this bill.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Luzerne, Mr. Shupnik. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SHUPNIK. Mr. Speaker, that is what we said yesterday, and I was under the understanding that it was supposed to be brought up today.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman, Mr. Shupnik, object to the bill being brought up for a vote tomorrow?

Mr. SHUPNIK. Personally, I would rather get it over with, Mr. Speaker. If we are going home tomorrow, why delay it until tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. Who said we are going home tomorrow, Mr. Shupnik?

Mr. SHUPNIK. We all hope.

The SPEAKER. If I were you, I would not anticipate going home quite so early.

Mr. SHUPNIK. Is there any reason why we cannot bring it up today?

The SPEAKER. I do not have any reason on my calendar. But the majority leader apparently wants to schedule the House, and I am assuming that this is his scheduling. Now if the gentleman wishes to have the bill called up for debate today at quarter of 4 in the afternoon, that is the gentleman's privilege.

Mr. SHUPNIK. Mr. Speaker, I will certainly yield to the majority leader. But I have been yielding for the last week and I hope tomorrow is the last.

The SPEAKER. I would think that you may not have to yield beyond tomorrow.

Mr. SHUPNIK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. KOWALYSHYN. Mr. Speaker, would you pass the bill over?

Thank you.

HB 1288 PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. The Chair reconsiders its announcement that the question is, will the House agree to the bill, and HB 1288 at the request of Mr. Kowalyshyn will be passed over for today.

URBAN AFFAIRS BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of **House bill No. 815, printer's No. 919**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of August 22, 1961 (P. L. 1043, No. 475), entitled as amended "An act to ascertain and appoint the fees to be received by the prothonotary of the court of common pleas of the Commonwealth in counties of the third fourth fifth sixth seventh and eighth class; to provide the time of paying the same; and to repeal certain acts" extending provisions to include counties of the second class A and further providing for fees.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

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

The question is, Shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the roll call will now be taken.

YEAS—191

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

Englehart	Lincoln	Rhodes	Yohn
Fee	Livengood	Richardson	Zearfoss
Fischer, R. R.	Logue	Rieger	Zeller
Fisher, D. M.	Lynch	Ritter	Zitterman
Flaherty	Mackowski	Ruggiero	Zord
Foster, A.	Madigan	Ryan	Zwikl
Foster, W.	Manderino	Salvatore	
Freind	Manmiller	Scanlon	Irvis,
Fryer	McCall	Scheaffer	Speaker
Gallagher			

NAYS—1

Hasay

NOT VOTING—8

Barber	Geesey	Hamilton	O'Donnell
Donatucci	Gleeson	Hutchinson, A.	Shelton

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

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

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of **House bill No. 816, printer's No. 920**, entitled:

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.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. ITKIN offered the following amendments:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1), page 3, line 8, by striking out "three dollars" and inserting one dollar fifty cents

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 1), page 3, line 9, by striking out "five" and inserting two

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a comprehensive sheriff fee bill, and the amendment addresses itself only to a very minor section of the bill dealing with the fees to be charged for the issuance of affidavits.

Under the present law the affidavit for one person is 50 cents, and then for two persons it rises to 75 cents, and for three or more persons it rises to \$1. Under the bill it would be changed to \$1 for the first person, \$3 for two people, and \$5 for three or more people. This would mean that for a single person it would cost \$1 to have an affidavit, but if you had two people dividing the \$3, it would be \$1.50. So rather than being more economical to have an affidavit signed by two persons, it becomes more expensive, which does not seem to be reasonable.

So the amendment would just reduce the two persons from \$3 to \$1.50 and three or more to \$2. I think it has minimal impact on the bill.

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Washington, Mr. DeMedio.

Mr. DeMEDIO. Mr. Speaker, I have no objections to the amendment. It seems logical.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—190

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

NAYS—2

Letterman Mullen, M. M.

NOT VOTING—8

Barber	Geesey	Hamilton	O'Donnell
Dumas	Gleeson	Hutchinson, A.	Shelton

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

On the question,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

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

The question is, Shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the roll call will now be taken.

YEAS—180

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

NAYS—12

Dietz	George, C.	Pitts	Shuman
Fischer, R. R.	Goebel	Pott	Taylor, E.
Fisher, D. M.	Hasay	Renwick	Zord

NOT VOTING—8

Barber	Geesey	Hamilton	O'Donnell
Dumas	Gleeson	Hutchinson, A.	Shelton

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in

the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative.

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

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of **House bill No. 817, printer's No. 921**, entitled:

An Act establishing the fees to be charged and collected by the clerk of courts in second through eighth class counties.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

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

The question is, Shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the roll call will now be taken.

YEAS—180

Abraham	Gallagher	McCall	Scanlon
Anderson	Gallen	McClatchy	Scheaffer
Armstrong	Gamble	McGinnis	Schmitt
Arthurs	Garzia	McIntyre	Schweder
Bellomini	Gatski	McLane	Scirica
Beloff	Geisler	Mebus	Seltzer
Bennett	George, M.	Meluskey	Shupnik
Berlin	Giammarco	Milanovich	Sirianni
Berson	Gillette	Miller	Smith, E.
Bittinger	Goodman	Milliron	Smith, L.
Bittle	Gray	Miscevich	Spencer
Borski	Greenfield	Moehlmann	Spitz
Brandt	Greenleaf	Morris	Stairs
Brown	Gricco	Mowery	Stapleton
Brunner	Halverson	Mrkonic	Stewart
Burd	Harper	Mullen, M. P.	Stuban
Burns	Haskell	Mullen, M. M.	Sweet
Butera	Hayes, D. S.	Musto	Taddonio
Caltagirone	Hayes, S. E.	Novak	Tenaglio
Caputo	Helfrick	Noye	Thomas
Cassidy	Hoeffel	O'Brien, B.	Trello
Cessar	Honaman	O'Brien, D.	Valicenti
Cianciulli	Hopkins	O'Connell	Wagner
Cimini	Hutchinson, W.	O'Keefe	Wansacz
Cohen	Itkin	Oliver	Wargo
Cole	Johnson	Pancoast	Wass
Cowell	Jones	Parker	Weidner
Davies	Katz	Petrarca	Wenger
DeMedio	Kelly	Piccola	White
DeVerter	Kernick	Pievsky	Wiggins
DeWeese	Klingaman	Polite	Williams
DiCarlo	Knepper	Pott	Wilson
Dininni	Kolter	Pratt	Wilt
Dombrowski	Kowalshyn	Prendergast	Wise
Donatucci	Laughlin	Pyles	Wright, D.
Dorr	Lehr	Rappaport	Wright, J. L.
Doyle	Letterman	Ravenstahl	Yahner
Duffy	Levi	Reed	Yohn
Englehart	Lincoln	Rhodes	Zearfoss
Fee	Livengood	Richardson	Zeller
Fisher, D. M.	Logue	Rieger	Zitterman
Flaherty	Lynch	Ritter	Zwinkl
Foster, A.	Mackowski	Ruggiero	
Foster, W.	Madigan	Ryan	Irvis,
Freind	Manderino	Salvatore	Speaker
Fryer	Manmiller		

NAYS—12

Dietz	Goebel	Renwick	Taylor, F.
Fischer, R. R.	Hasay	Shuman	Vroon
George, C.	Pitts	Taylor, E.	Zord

NOT VOTING—8

Barber	Geesey	Hamilton	O'Donnell
Dumas	Gleeson	Hutchinson, A.	Shelton

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

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

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

Mr. S. E. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding this bill was to be held yet today.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker's calendar has not been so marked.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cambria, Mr. Englehart.

Mr. ENGLEHART. I concur in his request to pass it over.

HB 1600 PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. The Chair rescinds its announcement that the question is, will the House agree to the bill? Without objection, HB 1600, PN 1924, will go over for today. This bill will be available for a vote tomorrow.

The members will mark HB 1600 "hold," and the bill will not be called up for a vote tomorrow.

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of **Senate bill No. 116, printer's No. 1414**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of July 28, 1953 (P. L. 723, No. 230), entitled as amended "Second Class County Code" permitting advertisement of the titles and summarizations in lieu of the entire text of proposed ordinances.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

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

The question is, Shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the roll call will now be taken.

YEAS—161

Abraham	Freind	Manderino	Scheaffer
Anderson	Fryer	McCall	Schmitt
Armstrong	Gallagher	McClatchy	Schweder
Arthurs	Gallen	McGinnis	Scirica
Bellomini	Gamble	McIntyre	Seltzer
Beloff	Garzia	McLane	Shupnik
Bennett	Gatski	Mebus	Sirianni
Berlin	Geisler	Milanovich	Smith, E.

Berson	George, M.	Milliron	Smith, L.
Bittinger	Giammarco	Miscevich	Spencer
Bittle	Gillette	Moehlmann	Spitz
Borski	Goodman	Morris	Stairs
Brandt	Gray	Mowery	Stapleton
Brown	Greenfield	Mrkonic	Stewart
Brunner	Greenleaf	Mullen, M. P.	Stuban
Burd	Harper	Mullen, M. M.	Sweet
Butera	Hasay	Musto	Taddonio
Caltagirone	Hayes, D. S.	Novak	Taylor, E.
Caputo	Hayes, S. E.	Noye	Taylor, F.
Cassidy	Helfrick	O'Brien, B.	Tenaglio
Cessar	Hoeffel	O'Brien, D.	Thomas
Cianciulli	Honaman	O'Connell	Trello
Cimini	Hopkins	Oliver	Valicenti
Cole	Hutchinson, W.	Pancoast	Wansacz
Cowell	Itkin	Parker	Wargo
Davies	Johnson	Petrarca	Wass
DeMedio	Jones	Pievsky	Weidner
DeWeese	Katz	Pitts	Wenger
DiCarlo	Kelly	Polite	White
Dombrowski	Kernick	Pott	Wiggins
Donatucci	Kolter	Pratt	Williams
Dorr	Kowalyshyn	Prendergast	Wilson
Doyle	Laughlin	Pyles	Wilt
Duffy	Lehr	Rappaport	Wise
Dumas	Letterman	Ravenstahl	Zearfoss
Englehart	Levi	Rhodes	Zitterman
Fee	Lincoln	Richardson	Zwicl
Fisher, D. M.	Livengood	Rieger	
Flaherty	Logue	Ruggiero	Irvis,
Foster, A.	Lynch	Ryan	Speaker
Foster, W.	Madigan	Scanlon	

NAYS—28

Burns	Halverson	O'Keefe	Wagner
DeVerter	Haskell	Piccola	Wright, D.
Dietz	Klingaman	Reed	Wright, J. L.
Dininni	Knepper	Renwick	Yahner
Fischer, R. R.	Manmiller	Ritter	Yohn
George, C.	Meluskey	Shuman	Zeller
Goebel	Miller	Vroon	Zord

NOT VOTING—11

Barber	Gleeson	Hutchinson, A.	Salvatore
Cohen	Grieco	Mackowski	Shelton
Geesey	Hamilton	O'Donnell	

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

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

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of **Senate bill No. 657, printer's No. 1415**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 23, 1931 (P. L. 932, No. 317), entitled "The Third Class City Code" permitting advertisement of the titles and summarizations in lieu of the entire text of proposed ordinances.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

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

The question is, Shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the roll call will now be taken.

YEAS—145

Abraham	Foster, W.	Logue	Ruggiero
Armstrong	Freind	Lynch	Salvatore
Arthurs	Fryer	Mackowski	Scanlon
Bellomini	Gallagher	Madigan	Scheaffer
Beloff	Gallen	Manderino	Schmitt
Bennett	Gamble	McGinnis	Scirica
Berlin	Garzia	McIntyre	Seltzer
Berson	Gatski	Mebus	Sirianni
Bittinger	Geisler	Milanovich	Smith, E.
Bittle	George, M.	Milliron	Smith, L.
Brandt	Giammarco	Miscevich	Spencer
Brunner	Gillette	Moehlmann	Spitz
Burd	Goodman	Morris	Stairs
Butera	Greenfield	Mowery	Stapleton
Caltagirone	Greenleaf	Mrkonic	Stewart
Caputo	Grieco	Mullen, M. P.	Stuban
Cassidy	Harper	Mullen, M. M.	Sweet
Cessar	Hasay	Musto	Taddonio
Cianciulli	Hayes, D. S.	Novak	Taylor, E.
Cimini	Hayes, S. E.	Noye	Tenaglio
Cohen	Helfrick	O'Brien, B.	Thomas
Cole	Hoeffel	O'Brien, D.	Trello
Cowell	Honaman	Oliver	Valicenti
DeMedio	Hopkins	Pancoast	Vroon
DeWeese	Hutchinson, W.	Parker	Wass
DiCarlo	Itkin	Petrarca	Weidner
Dombrowski	Johnson	Pievsky	Wenger
Donatucci	Jones	Pitts	White
Dorr	Katz	Polite	Wiggins
Doyle	Kelly	Pratt	Williams
Duffy	Kernick	Prendergast	Wilson
Dumas	Kowalyshyn	Pyles	Wise
Englehart	Lehr	Rappaport	Zearfoss
Fee	Letterman	Ravenstahl	
Fisher, D. M.	Levi	Rhodes	Irvis,
Flaherty	Lincoln	Richardson	Speaker
Foster, A.	Livengood	Rieger	

NAYS—48

Anderson	Halverson	O'Connell	Wagner
Borski	Haskell	O'Keefe	Wansacz
Brown	Klingaman	Piccola	Wargo
Burns	Knepper	Pott	Wilt
Davies	Kolter	Reed	Wright, D.
DeVerter	Laughlin	Renwick	Wright, J. L.
Dietz	Manmiller	Ritter	Yahner
Dininni	McCall	Ryan	Yohn
Fischer, R. R.	McClatchy	Schweder	Zeller
George, C.	McLane	Shuman	Zitterman
Goebel	Meluskey	Shupnik	Zord
Gray	Miller	Taylor, F.	Zwicl

NOT VOTING—7

Barber	Gleeson	Hutchinson, A.	Shelton
Geesey	Hamilton	O'Donnell	

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

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

Agreeable to order,

The House proceeded to third consideration of **Senate bill No. 664, printer's No. 849**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 5, 1947 (P. L. 458, No. 208), entitled as amended "Parking Authority Law" providing further powers of investment.

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

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

The question is, Shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeable to the provision of the Constitution, the roll call will now be taken.

YEAS—190

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

NAYS—1

Knepper

NOT VOTING—9

Barber	Gleeson	Hutchinson, A.	O'Donnell
Bellomini	Hamilton	McGinnis	Shelton
Geesey			

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

Ordered, That the clerk return the same to the Senate with information that the House has passed the same without amendment.

HEALTH AND WELFARE BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

Agreeable to order.

The House proceeded to third consideration of **House bill No. 1294, printer's No. 1520**, entitled:

An Act amending "The Administrative Code of 1929" approved April 9, 1929 (P. L. 177, No. 175), further providing a choice of immunization for polio.

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

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

The question is, Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Itkin, on the final passage of the bill. The gentleman, Mr. Itkin, is awaiting the attention of the House.

The gentleman may now proceed.

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, this may seem like a very simple freedom-of-choice bill as to whether to permit the administering of Salk vaccine or Sabin vaccine and most of us would believe that the administration of either vaccine would be suitable, and, therefore, it seems no problem why we should not provide freedom of choice.

But the contrary is, in fact, true. In fact, the Department of Health has come out with a position paper very strongly opposing this particular legislation. And if I can have the attention of the House just for a few minutes, I would like to enumerate to the membership just why the department opposes this particular legislation.

First of all, the department claims that there is substantial scientific evidence that for all but a few children in the United States the Sabin oral polio vaccine is the vaccine of choice. So this whole question of freedom of choice becomes somewhat moot by the fact that most people, if not all people, really do not care whether to receive the Sabin or the Salk vaccine.

The Sabin vaccine provides a higher immunization rate obtainable in the United States so that from simply a medical physician, you get a far better immunity from the Sabin vaccine than you do from the Salk vaccine.

Now it is interesting to note that not only the Department of Health takes this approach but the National Center for Disease Control in Atlanta, Georgia, has also taken the position that they consider the Sabin vaccine that should be the primary vaccine in the United States. The Salk vaccine does not, unlike

Sabin vaccine, confer long-lasting immunity and three separate Salk injections are required. Now you should understand that the Sabin vaccine is taken just with a sugar cube and it is taken orally with some type of liquid. With respect to the Salk vaccine it is an injection-type process and, of course, you need more than one. In fact, you need three.

Most young children do not like injections, and so there is a natural element to refuse the taking of the Salk vaccine, which makes the Sabin a far better vehicle to inoculate the patients.

Sabin confers protection for 50 percent of the children after the first oral dose. It is a far greater protection. In other words, if a person takes the Sabin, the chances are that he is protected from getting poliomyelitis. If he takes the first shot of the Salk, he is still very much susceptible to getting poliomyelitis.

There is some concern that there are risks associated with the Sabin vaccine and it is real and it is defined, but the instances of poliomyelitis occurring from the administration of the Sabin vaccine are, indeed, rare. In fact, in over 200,000,000 doses of the Sabin oral vaccine, only 44 cases of the paralytic disease were discovered; and talking about prior to the vaccines being offered, we had something like 30,000 cases of polio.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman apparently is not talking into the microphone.

Mr. ITKIN. We had 30,000 cases of poliomyelitis before the use of these vaccines and now we are down to about eight. In fact, we only had eight cases throughout the United States in 1976.

Another advantage of the Sabin vaccine over the Salk vaccine—

QUESTION OF INFORMATION

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DeMEDIO. Is the gentleman speaking on the amendment, and, if so, what is the amendment?

The SPEAKER. No. The gentleman is speaking on the—

Mr. DeMEDIO. Bill itself?

The SPEAKER. —final passage of the bill.

Mr. DeMEDIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On the final passage of the bill.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. ITKIN. Another interesting thing about the Sabin vaccine is the effect on that percentage of the population that is not vaccinated. For example, if there are not polio viruses around, then even if you are not inoculated, you are not going to get it.

Now what happened in the administration of the Salk vaccine because it has a low tolerance and while it might protect the individual from getting poliomyelitis, that individual may still be a carrier and can infect noninoculated persons with poliomyelitis.

It is interesting to point out that while it may be assumed that almost all of the people in the United States have been inoculated against this dreaded disease, only about 60 percent

of the entire population has been so inoculated, which also is another reason why the Sabin vaccine provides a prevention to those people who have not yet been inoculated from the polio viruses.

Now, right now the reason why this bill is being introduced is because the Advisory Committee of the Department of Health has promulgated rules and regulations saying that the Sabin vaccine ought to be the primary vaccine used and that the Sabin vaccine only ought to be used in those cases where for some reasons the patient, for medical reasons, is unable to take the Sabin vaccine, and, therefore, the Salk vaccine is administered.

The department feels that it is best to keep that type of discretion with respect to our Public Health Committee that can then alter its position on the basis as to what the recent medical evidence is with respect to the state of the art in that particular medical area.

Now before I conclude, I have just received a copy of a very eminent person who happens to be the dean of the School of Public Health at the University of North Carolina and I did not have enough time to distribute it and duplicate it, but I think it is so significant that I would like the opportunity to read it at this time. It is only about a page and a quarter long, but I think it drives home the fact that it is not just a simplistic approach to freedom of choice and that there are very serious public health problems associated with this change.

This was a letter sent to Dr. Bachman, our Secretary of Health, and the letter states: (Reading:)

I assume it was you who raised the question earlier this morning when I presented the report of the Institute of Medicine on the evaluation of poliomyelitis vaccines. Your report that the Pennsylvania Legislature is making it mandatory to require the use of only the inactivated poliomyelitis virus vaccine leaves me greatly disturbed.

Apparently he is in error because really what we are doing is giving him freedom of choice. But if I go on further, you will see the reason why he is so disturbed.

Such an action flies in the face of scientific knowledge and is completely antithetical to the recommendations of the Institute of Medicine. As I pointed out during the lecture, the IPV—

and that is the Sabin—

is effective in preventing poliomyelitis in the community provided at least 90% of the eligible persons are vaccinated. With the national figures on polio vaccination running in the neighborhood of only 60%, there is a real possibility that the Pennsylvania lawmakers are inviting a pandemic of poliomyelitis within the next year or two.

Now this is a professional, a prominent dean of a school of public health in this country.

Remember, we used to have 25,000 cases a year before the vaccines, and with the OPV—

which is the Sabin—

we have had only 44 in 8 years!

Although there is a risk of a vaccine-associated case of poliomyelitis for a recipient of OPV—

the Sabin—

at the rate of 1 for every 11½ million persons vaccinated, this risk is trivial in comparison to the risk of allowing wild polio virus to reestablish itself in Pennsylvania because less than 90% of the population will be vaccinated. Moreover, this one case among 11 1/2 million persons vaccinated is almost always in an immuno-deficient child who is likely to have all kinds of health problems anyway.

Another disadvantage of the IPV—

that is the Sabin—

is that the child is fairly susceptible to the risk of the disease between the ages of 2 months and 6 months, that is the period between the first and third shots of the inactivated virus. The first doses of trivalent OPV—

the Sabin—

gives a much higher antibody response and protects the infant almost immediately.

The vaccine-associated cases among household contacts of those who receive OPV will disappear if the Committee's recommendation—

and this is our own Health and Welfare Committee's recommendation—

is followed by vaccinating children entering the seventh grade with one dose of trivalent OPV.

All of these considerations plus the probable impossibility of importing adequate quantities of IPV—

that is the Salk—

approved by FDA make the Pennsylvania action tantamount to inviting poliomyelitis back to your state. I hope—

and this is extremely important—

reason can prevail and you can persuade the legislators that their proposed action is contrary to the advice of all the world's experts on poliomyelitis.

And he says—

If I may be of help in this regard, please do not hesitate to let me know.

The only one that I understand who is objecting to this is that Mr. Troan, the editor of the Pittsburgh Press, has written an article about polio and has said, I do not see why we should not be able to use the Salk vaccine.

Representative DeMedio has introduced this legislation on the basis of discovering that article. I think, on the basis of this type of medical information, that we ought not to be foolhardy and we ought to defeat the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington, Mr. DeMedio.

Mr. DeMEDIO. Mr. Speaker, although my first thought about this bill was a result of an article by Mr. Troan, it most certainly was not controlling. We did considerable research and, for example, just recently the National Academy of Sciences Institute of Medicine made this comment:

The United States should continue to rely mainly on oral polio vaccine for its immunization programs, but also should keep some injectable polio vaccine available for special situations and those few persons who refuse inoculation unless it's done with a needle.

Now the gentleman cannot refute the unalterable facts that in the last 8 years there were associated with the Sabin oral vaccine 44 cases of polio. In fact, I think my colleague, Mr. DiCarlo, will point out that in one Federal case there was a recovery against a drug outfit that put out the Sabin oral vaccine for not cautioning the recipients that there is a possibility to contact polio because this is live virus.

Now Salk is dead virus and therefore cannot contaminate. For example, even with one who takes Sabin there may be a danger of infection. Nothing speaks more favorably or strongly for the use of Salk than the experience in Norway and Sweden where Salk vaccine has been used for a number of years and the disease has been entirely eradicated.

Now I am not speaking for the institution of Salk as the main or only vaccine. I am saying that we should merely give a right to a responsible parent to request a better vaccine. It would permit in some cases for someone who lacks complete immunization to various drugs to take the Salk vaccine and therefore possibly prevent the contacting of polio in the first instance.

As I say, I am not saying that we should do away with the Sabin oral vaccine, but I am saying that in those instances, because of the physical makeup of a child, we should permit that parent to make the responsible decision and request the better of the two vaccines, the Salk vaccine.

Now if my colleague wants to talk about authorities, I could cite a number of them. For example, in Harvard University the microbiological professor there speaks strongly in favor of Salk.

Senator Edward Kennedy, after his Health Committee held a number of hearings on the Salk as opposed to the Sabin vaccine, strongly supports the permission of people to be given the option of using Salk if they feel that that is best for their child.

To simplify what this bill does—and I am going to repeat it again because I think it is important—it gives a responsible parent the right to choose the better of two vaccines, the Salk vaccine.

Thank you very much.

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, it is really amazing to realize that a man like Mr. Itkin has done quite a bit of research on this, apparently, and no one really cares. Nobody is listening very carefully. It is amazing to see 203 legislators sitting here against the advice of our own Health Department in the State of Pennsylvania and really not paying any attention to the letter from the Dean of Medicine and Public Health from the University of North Carolina.

We are being swayed by some words that say freedom of choice. Freedom of choice has always been a favorite catchword in this country, but I contend that sometimes maybe people should not be free to choose because they do not know enough about what they are choosing. I think this is what Representative Itkin tried to point out in his dissertation. It is simply the fact that the best minds in the medical profession say this is the way to go. They are saying that Sabin is the best way to go for a lot of reasons. Yes, there are risks, as Mr. DeMedio points out. There are many risks but they are within the acceptable range

of practicing medicine, at least according to the people who are communicating with myself and with Mr. Itkin.

That being the case, there seems to be another point that people maybe are missing, that is, the immunization factor that comes about from the youngster to the adult through the injection of the live vaccine. It is my understanding that many people who have never taken either vaccine have become immune to polio because of the youngsters taking the live vaccine and passing it on in a contact situation. If the Salk vaccine is used this will never happen. The 44 cases that Mr. DeMedio spoke about may be multiplied by 10 had those adults never been accidentally vaccinated.

I understand that the real problem worldwide is that we cannot eliminate a disease until we have that type of thing happening. I am not an expert on oral or Salk vaccine. I only know a limited amount, in a very limited time, of the information I have been able to gather. But I contend that Mr. Itkin is absolutely correct and people better listen to him and quit worrying about one newspaper editor in one city in one Commonwealth, really. I have never heard from anybody anything about this, but a newspaper editor has an idea and, all of a sudden, because of his idea is going to change the law of the Commonwealth against the best advice of the medical authorities that we have. That to me is amazing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Erie, Mr. DiCarlo, on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. DiCARLO. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if perhaps the gentleman, Mr. Burns or Mr. Itkin, would submit to a brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Itkin, indicates that he will stand for interrogation.

The gentleman, Mr. DiCarlo, is in order and may proceed.

Mr. DiCARLO. Mr. Speaker, just for the record, can you inform this House how many cases of polio have resulted from people who have been inoculated with the Sabin vaccine or have been given the Sabin vaccine?

Mr. ITKIN. How many cases have been reported?

Mr. DiCARLO. Yes.

Mr. ITKIN. I think it is 44 over the past 8 years.

Mr. DiCARLO. Mr. Speaker, can you tell this House how many people have contracted polio who have been inoculated with the Salk vaccine?

Mr. ITKIN. How many people have been inoculated?

Mr. DiCARLO. How many people have come down with polio that have been inoculated?

Mr. ITKIN. I do not think any have come down with polio, I am sure.

Mr. DiCARLO. That is right, Mr. Speaker, there has not been one case.

Can you tell me, Mr. Speaker, if you as a parent go to your private physician to have your child immunized, do you have the choice on the type, whether it is Salk or Sabin vaccine, that is administered to your child?

Mr. ITKIN. Would you repeat the question?

Mr. DiCARLO. If you take your child to your private physician to be immunized against polio, do you have the choice of asking for a Salk or Sabin vaccine?

Mr. ITKIN. Right now the only reason for the requirement of the Sabin vaccine is that, in terms of admission to school, the health code requires or the School Code requires that the children be immunized for a variety of communicable diseases. One happens to be polio. The department—

Mr. DiCARLO. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the question very specifically again. When you do go to your private physician, do you have the choice of the immunization that will be granted to your child?

Mr. ITKIN. Yes. Yes, you do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DiCARLO. All right. Mr. Speaker, can you tell me if the State or the Federal Government, such as with the Swine Flu programs that were initiated last year or 2 years ago, in this State, does a parent have a choice whether their child will receive the Salk vaccine or the Sabin vaccine?

Mr. ITKIN. What do you mean a parent? A parent can receive any vaccine that they would like to have.

Mr. DiCARLO. I am talking about a program that is administered by either the Federal Government or the Department of Health in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Right now does the parent have the choice in a public-funded program?

Mr. ITKIN. If there is some medical reason why the Sabin vaccine will be deleterious to the health of that individual, the Salk vaccine may be administered.

Mr. DiCARLO. Mr. Speaker, there is no freedom of choice under a public program, and that is exactly what we are saying in this bill: Under any public agency that initiates any kind of immunization program, that family shall have the choice. That is all we are asking.

Mr. ITKIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DiCARLO. Oh, one more question, Mr. Speaker. Can you tell me, in a public program where the immunization is carried out, for example, using Sabin vaccine and the child does come down with polio, who would be liable?

Mr. ITKIN. I do not think there is any liability. Usually what they do is they grant immunity in those cases.

Mr. DiCARLO. Can you tell me, Mr. Speaker, if you take your child to a private physician and that private physician administers the Sabin vaccine, can that physician be held liable?

Mr. ITKIN. Can that physician be held liable? I doubt it. If it was the best medical knowledge at the time, no.

Mr. DiCARLO. Mr. Speaker, can the family perhaps go after the drug company that manufactured that product and sue?

Mr. ITKIN. It would depend on what was the reason that caused the disease. If it was—

Mr. DiCARLO. Why, Mr. Speaker, I just would like to reiterate that there has been a case where a family has sued laboratories. The family won the award because the child had received the Sabin vaccine and the family was not warned of the consequences of the vaccine, and thus they were made awards.

However, you are absolutely right, if a public program is carried out by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, if it is carried out by the Federal Government, such as in the Swine Flu inoculations, they are immune. You do not have any recourse at all to the courts for an award of damages.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to state for the record and reiterate just a couple of things that Representative DeMedio did say.

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

Mr. DiCARLO. Not all the experts agree with the position that the State Department of Health is now embarking on. There are experts in this area, scientific experts, who are pushing very heavily that people should have the choice of whether Sabin or Salk is used. It has been brought out, and the evidence is conclusive, that there is no chance, no chance at all, of a child or a person using the Salk vaccine coming down with any type of polio.

The third thing, in front of the United States Senate Health and Welfare Hearings, in front of Senator Kennedy's committee, that has been brought out and that Senator Kennedy himself feels very strongly about is that the choice ought to be granted per person as to what type of—whether it is the Salk or the Sabin—vaccine that ought to be administered in public programs.

The last thing and I think the most important thing as to why perhaps public programs that are involved in immunization programs might be pushing the Sabin vaccine is only one, and that issue is one of cost. They can administer the Sabin vaccine perhaps for only 20 or 22 cents a dose, whereas to immunize an individual with the Salk vaccine costs up to \$1 a dose. And from the very simple economic point of view they are looking at it, and if you watch health care today, the trend is not toward quality of care that is being administered to people but the cost that is being administered. And because of that, Mr. Speaker, I would support the passage of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Itkin, who speaks for the second time on the issue.

Mr. ITKIN. Mr. Speaker, just to rebut some of the remarks of my colleague from Erie County: We really cannot make a statistical comparison between the Salk vaccine and the Sabin vaccine in terms of any medical problems that may result. For instance, in the case of the Sabin vaccine, we have detected in very, very minor, minor instances, trace instances, where Poliomyelitis has been developed, because over the past 8 to 10 years the Sabin vaccine has been the only vaccine that has been used. So the number of cases of inoculation of the Sabin compared to the Salk are so far greater that you really cannot make such a statistical comparison. If we went back to the Salk and were on that for 10 years and we administered 200 million doses, we would probably find out that there would be a lot of other complications.

For example, one of the things we do know about the Salk vaccine is that it does produce, in hypersensitive persons, an adverse allergic reaction to certain individuals. Now what would happen if we administered the Salk vaccine and that produced an allergenic reaction in which the individual ultimately died? Who would be responsible? You see, that particular type of a situation is real with respect to the Salk vaccine, which is practically minimal in respect to the Sabin vaccine.

In addition, I would like to clear up some misconceptions. Number one, nothing in the Commonwealth prohibits the issuance of the Sabin or the Salk vaccine. Any individual can go to

a physician and say, I want the Salk vaccine, and if that physician wishes to do so, he can administer the Salk vaccine. Any adult can get the Salk vaccine today if the physician has the Salk vaccine and if the physician is willing to administer it. It even applies to children. There is nothing in the law that prohibits a child from being immunized using the Salk vaccine, going to a private physician and getting the Salk vaccine.

What is required is that when a child enters school, he must be immunized against a certain number of contagious diseases. The reason for that is not necessarily to protect the child per se but to protect the entire community from those contagious diseases, and the reason why the Sabin vaccine is administered in one major way is because it not only affords protection to the individual receiving the vaccine but it provides protection to the rest of the community and to those members of the family who may not have had any vaccinations and who could be susceptible to polio. So that the administering of Sabin vaccine to a potential carrier in the family will mitigate or minimize that transmittal of polio to the rest of the family. That is one of the main reasons why the public-health authorities, who are responsible for the totality of health in the Commonwealth, want to stick with the Sabin vaccine.

In any circumstances where a child, because of medical reasons, finds the Sabin vaccine to be unacceptable, then the physician is well within his bounds to administer the Salk vaccine, and the school authorities will not prohibit the admission of that child on the basis of the Salk vaccine being administered.

The Advisory Committee of the Department of Health would like to continue to review all of the evidence in this area, but they feel that this type of decision on a public-health matter ought to rest with the public-health authorities and not be part of the statute which can not be easily changed, depending upon how the medical evidence develops. For these reasons this bill ought to be opposed and defeated. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington, Mr. DeMedio.

Mr. DeMEDIO. Mr. Speaker, the case of my colleague, the gentleman from Allegheny, falls down in the statement that he made in answer to the question of whether or not a parent has a right to choose Salk if that parent, on the advice of medical authority, feels that Salk is the most appropriate vaccine for that child. He answered that they have that right. If that were true, I would not be presenting this bill to this body for passage, but that is not true. In fact, as I pointed out to you previously, after 2½ months' study by the National Academy of Sciences Institute of Medicine Committee, they came up with the conclusion that Salk should be made available for such immunably deficient persons who should have the choice to take the safer vaccine.

If you want to speak of authorities, for example, before the Senate Health Committee, after hearing Salk's testimony and that of another witness, Harold S. Ginsberg, professor of microbiology at Columbia University, who called it ill advised to continue use of the Sabin vaccine, the committee found that it was amazing that the government had not reversed its field and permitted the reinstatement of the Salk vaccine.

As I pointed out before, all I am asking is that in those cases where it becomes necessary for a responsible parent, upon medical advice, to request that Salk vaccine be permitted, that they be given the choice of the better of the two vaccines.

When Mr. Itkin claims that we cannot tell how many cases might have occurred if Salk were being used, let me first point out that it was the Salk vaccine that eradicated the many, many cases of polio in the first instance and then was replaced by Sabin, but then again I reiterate that the example demonstrated in Norway and Sweden where for many years the only polio used was Salk and where they had completely eradicated the disease is the strongest argument for passage by this body of this bill, and I request that both sides vote in the affirmative.

MOTION TO TABLE HB 1294

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Allegheny, Mrs. Kernick.

Mrs. KERNICK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think the debate here today has proven to most of us that there are a lot of unanswered questions on this particular bill. I, for one, would like to have more time to check with some health authorities. I would like to move at this time that the bill be tabled.

The SPEAKER. It has been moved by the lady from Allegheny County that HB 1294, PN 1520, be tabled. The motion is not debatable.

The Chair will allow the gentleman, Mr. DeMedio, as the chief sponsor of the bill, to make one statement of one sentence only as to his position on the motion.

Mr. DeMEDIO. I merely oppose the motion to table because we set it aside 2 weeks ago for the very purpose which the lady is requesting — a study of the matter — and they had 2 weeks for that. So I oppose the motion to table.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Erie is standing. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, but this is not a debatable motion. The Chair did allow the chief sponsor to make his statement in opposition to the motion.

Mr. DiCARLO. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I thought the motion was to recommit. I apologize.

The SPEAKER. No, it is not a debatable motion.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—62

Table with 4 columns of names: Anderson, Armstrong, Borski, Brandt, Burns, Caltagirone, Cowell, DeVerter, Dietz, Dininni, Goebel, Hayes, S. E., Honaman, Hopkins, Itkin, Kernick, Laughlin, Lehr, Levi, Lynch, Mowery, Mrkonic, Musto, O'Connell, Pancoast, Piccola, Pitts, Pott, Pyles, Reed, Shupnik, Sirianni, Smith, L., Spencer, Taddonio, Taylor, E., Thomas, Wargo, Wenger.

Table with 4 columns of names: Duffy, Fisher, D. M., Fryer, Gallen, Gamble, Gillette, Manmiller, McGinnis, Mebus, Meluskey, Miller, Moehlmann, Rhodes, Richardson, Salvatore, Scheaffer, Scirica, Wilson, Wright, J. L., Yohn, Zearfoss, Zord.

NAYS—132

Table with 4 columns of names: Abraham, Arthurs, Bellomini, Beloff, Bennett, Berlin, Berson, Bittinger, Bittle, Brown, Brunner, Burd, Butera, Caputo, Cassidy, Cessar, Cianciulli, Cimini, Cohen, Cole, Davies, DeMedio, DeWeese, DiCarlo, Dombrowski, Donatucci, Dorr, Doyle, Dumas, Englehart, Fec, Fischer, R. R., Flaherty, Foster, A., Foster, W., Freind, Gallagher, Garzia, Gatski, Geisler, George, C., George, M., Giammarco, Gleeson, Goodman, Gray, Greenfield, Greenleaf, Grieco, Halverson, Harper, Hasay, Haskell, Hayes, D. S., Helfrick, Hoeffel, Hutchinson, W., Johnson, Jones, Katz, Kelly, Klingaman, Knepper, Kolter, Kowalyshyn, Letterman, Lincoln, Livengood, Logue, Mackowski, Madigan, Manderino, McCall, McClatchy, McIntyre, McLane, Milanovich, Milliron, Misceovich, Morris, Mullen, M. P., Mullen, M. M., Novak, Noye, O'Brien, B., O'Brien, D., O'Keefe, Oliver, Parker, Petrarca, Pievsky, Polite, Pratt, Prendergast, Rappaport, Ravenstahl, Renwick, Rieger, Ritter, Ruggiero, Ryan, Scanlon, Schmitt, Schweder, Seltzer, Shuman, Smith, E., Spitz, Stairs, Stapleton, Stewart, Stuban, Sweet, Taylor, F., Tenaglio, Trello, Valicenti, Vroon, Wagner, Wansacz, Weidner, White, Wiggins, Williams, Wilt, Wise, Wright, D., Yahner, Zeller, Zitterman, Zwinkl, Irvis, Speaker.

NOT VOTING—6

Table with 4 columns of names: Barber, Geesey, Hamilton, Hutchinson, A., O'Donnell, Shelton.

The question was determined in the negative and the motion was not agreed to.

On the question recurring, Shall the bill pass finally?

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

YEAS—161

Table with 4 columns of names: Abraham, Anderson, Armstrong, Arthurs, Bellomini, Beloff, Bennett, Berlin, Berson, Bittinger, Bittle, Borski, Brandt, Gallen, Garzia, Gatski, Geisler, George, C., George, M., Giammarco, Gillette, Gleeson, Goebel, Goodman, Gray, Greenfield, Mannmiller, McCall, McClatchy, McIntyre, McLane, Mebus, Meluskey, Milanovich, Miller, Milliron, Misceovich, Morris, Ryan, Salvatore, Scanlon, Scheaffer, Schmitt, Schweder, Scirica, Seltzer, Shuman, Sirianni, Smith, E., Smith, L., Spencer.

Brown	Greenleaf	Mowery	Stairs
Brunner	Grieco	Mrkonic	Stapleton
Burd	Halverson	Mullen, M. P.	Stewart
Butera	Harper	Mullen, M. M.	Sweet
Caltagirone	Hasay	Musto	Taylor, F.
Caputo	Haskell	Novak	Tenaglio
Cassidy	Hayes, D. S.	Noye	Thomas
Cessar	Hayes, S. E.	O'Brien, B.	Trelo
Cianciulli	Helfrick	O'Brien, D.	Valicenti
Cimini	Hoefel	O'Connell	Vroon
Cohen	Honaman	O'Keefe	Wansacz
DeMedio	Hopkins	Oliver	Wass
DeVerter	Johnson	Pancoast	Weidner
DeWeese	Jones	Parker	Wenger
DiCarlo	Katz	Petrarca	White
Dietz	Klingaman	Pievsky	Wiggins
Dininni	Knepper	Polite	Williams
Dombrowski	Kolter	Pratt	Wise
Donatucci	Laughlin	Prendergast	Wright, D.
Dorr	Lehr	Pyles	Yahner
Englehart	Levi	Rappaport	Zeller
Fee	Lincoln	Ravenstahl	Zitterman
Fischer, R. R.	Livengood	Reed	Zord
Flaherty	Logue	Renwick	Zwinkl
Foster, A.	Lynch	Richardson	
Foster, W.	Mackowski	Rieger	Irvis,
Freind	Madigan	Ritter	Speaker
Gallagher	Manderino	Ruggiero	

NAYS—32

Burns	Gamble	Piccola	Taylor, E.
Cole	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Wagner
Cowell	Itkin	Pott	Wargo
Davies	Kelly	Rhodes	Wilson
Doyle	Kernick	Shupnik	Wilt
Duffy	Kowalshyn	Spitz	Wright, J. L.
Fisher, D. M.	Letterman	Stuban	Yohn
Fryer	Moehlmann	Taddonio	Zearfoss

NOT VOTING—7

Barber	Geesey	Hutchinson, A.	Shelton
Dumas	Hamilton	O'Donnell	

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

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

REMARKS ON VOTE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Mrs. Kelly. For what purpose does the lady rise.

Mrs. KELLY. I voted in error on HB 1294, Mr. Speaker. I would like to be recorded in the affirmative.

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

DECISION OF CHAIR RECONSIDERED

The SPEAKER. The Chair instructs the members to turn to page 4 where the Chair announced that HB 1106, PN 2081, would be passed over for today. There has been a request on the part of the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Rhodes, the chief sponsor, that the bill be called up. So the Chair recinds its announcement that HB 1106, PN 2081, would be passed over, and, without objection, HB 1106, PN 2081, will now be con-

sidered by the House of Representatives.

JUDICIARY BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

Agreeable to order.

The House proceeded to third consideration of **House bill No. 1106, printer's No. 2081**, entitled:

An Act amending "The Pennsylvania Civil Procedural Support Law" approved July 13, 1953 (P. L. 431, No. 95), requiring support of a child born out of lawful wedlock requiring the action to be brought within certain time limits requiring trial by the court or by jury in a civil action and making repeals.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. W. D. HUTCHINSON offered the following amendment:

Amend Sec. 2 (Sec. 5), page 2, line 25, by striking out "SIX" and inserting two

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Schuylkill, Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. W. D. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which would make a significant and generally, I think, desirable change in the support law of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I am a sponsor of the bill and I support the principle.

What the bill does basically is to take the support problem for illegitimate children out of the criminal courts, where I think it does not belong, and it puts it on the civil side of the matter so that it can be disposed of more quickly and more expeditiously.

However, the bill does make one change as it now exists. It makes one change in existing law which I oppose because I believe that it poses some threat to social stability and perhaps to family stability. That change is that under current law, if a person wishes to bring a charge against a man for fathering an illegitimate child, they must do so within 2 years of the birth of that child or within 2 years of the last time the father made a contribution to the support of the child, or within 2 years of the time he acknowledged in writing that the child was his.

The bill as it now stands would extend that period to 6 years, so that at any particular time 6 years after a child was born, the mother of that child could come to court and, in a civil proceeding, accuse a person of being the father of that child even though he had no contact with the mother for that 6-year period, even though he may have himself within that time contracted a stable marriage and made a stable family relationship himself. I think that time is too long. I think it leaves open the possibility of permitting suits of paternity that may serve as a means of blackmail, that may serve to the detriment of otherwise stable families.

We are already, with the bill, removing certain significant protections that the accused would have, the person accused of being the father of the child, by saying that when we make it a civil proceeding, it is no longer necessary to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he is the father of the child. We are also taking away from him the right to a jury trial on this issue. I think those are reasonable changes that in light of current society we should make to try to reach this problem, and I support them.

However, I think that we insert a great deal of mischief into the situation when we say that that action to declare him a father, where he does not have the benefit of these protections, can be brought 6 years after the birth of the child or 6 years after he had last paid support, and so on.

Therefore, my amendment simply does one thing. It says that the action must be brought within 2 years of the birth of the child or 2 years of the time he last contributed to the support of the child or 2 years of the time he acknowledged the paternity of the child. That is current law in the criminal sections, and I believe we should leave it that way in this new bill. I urge support of the amendment. Thank you.

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues in the House will pay attention to the amendment. You never know when you might be directly involved.

My colleague from Schuylkill has pointed out that he generally agrees with the thrust of this legislation. It is needed legislation. Let us go to the heart of what we are trying to accomplish. We are trying to streamline the procedure to move it out of the criminal courts, where it obviously does not belong. District attorneys around the Commonwealth have not supported bringing criminal charges for paternity suits. It really is not a procedure which should be in criminal court, and Representative Hutchinson agrees with that.

The question here is really a narrow one — whether or not we should allow a statute of limitations of 6 years or 2 years from the date of birth. There is no difference between the language of the amendment and the language of the bill as it is now drafted on the question of the statute of limitations after an acknowledgement of paternity or after some support payment has been made. That is the same between the amendment and the bill.

Just to further clarify where we are in dispute, some of the protections which Representative Hutchinson pointed out as having been excluded are not excluded from the bill. The defendant still has the right to a jury trial if he so chooses, as is pointed out on line 5 of page 3 of the bill.

Now let us go to the heart of why the Judiciary Committee of the House chose to pick 6 years as opposed to 2 years from the date of birth. The original legislation, as drafted by the Welfare Department and by our committee staff, called for a statute of limitations that would run from the date of birth throughout the age of minority, that is, until the age of 18; not 6 years but 18 years. After careful consideration of Representative Hutchinson's point of view in the Judiciary Committee, the committee voted that 18 years was too long; 2 years was too short, and we compromised on 6 years as being reasonable. I think the House ought to know that that is how we came to the number six. There is nothing magic about that.

Secondly, why do we have a statute of limitations at all from the date of birth? What we are talking about here, generally speaking, are conditions where people are living out of wedlock and have children. There are all kinds of reasons why a woman in that situation might not want to bring a paternity action within the 2-year statute of limitations. Let me review a couple

of cases which are very practical, very reasonable, which I think the membership will understand.

Take the case where a mother is fearful that the institution of a paternity proceeding would terminate her relationship with the father. Often these are tenuous relationships anyway. There is no marriage bond, and there are reasons why, after the child is born, the mother of the child might now want to bring a paternity action instantly, right after the child is born. We are talking about very delicate human relationships, and that is one reason why they might not bring suit within 2 years.

Another case: The mother, for example, is 19 years old and does not institute a paternity suit because the father is the same age and is unemployed and could not afford to make any payments. Three years later the father has found employment and could afford his child.

Another example: The mother, after the birth of the child, has a secure financial situation, so she does not bring paternity action. Four years after, the statute would run, and 2 years after, under Representative Hutchinson's amendment, she suffers a setback in employment and needs the support of the father.

Another example: At the birth of the child, the mother feels that filing for support would be unnecessary in light of a stable financial situation. However, 4 years later her financial needs greatly increase because of inflation or some other reasons, and that is why she brings the paternity action against the father.

One final example: One or both of the parents are married and paternity proceedings are not instituted. In other words, it is a child born out of wedlock and one of the parents is married to someone else. You can imagine how delicate that would be, where a child has been born and one of the parents is married to somebody else. They do not bring a paternity action, thinking a divorce is going to happen. Three years pass and no divorce happens. Under the amendment, she could not bring a paternity action.

These are all examples, Mr. Speaker, where a mother of a child born out of wedlock would be excluded from taking advantage of the provisions of this act if we have only a 2-year statute of limitations on civil determination of parentage.

One final thought for the membership: Right now the Commonwealth is required by Federal law to seek as strenuously as it can through the courts to establish paternity because many of these cases involve welfare payments for the child if the father of the child cannot be ascertained. It is the estimate of the Welfare Department, if we accept this amendment, that it will cost the Commonwealth somewhere around \$4¼ million annually because the 2-year statute would have run in cases where it absolutely is clear who the father is and, for one of the reasons I have given you, the mother did not choose to bring the paternity action in the first 2 years.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, for the integrity of this act, for the Commonwealth to do its duty and to protect, really, the rights of the child, I oppose the amendment. If, for example, the fathers of these children are not determined, these children are not eligible for all kinds of benefits — death benefits, social security benefits and other benefits — that should rightfully come to these children who are fathered by citizens of the Commonwealth.

So in summation, Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment. I think the bill is a proper compromise as it is currently drafted and I urge my colleagues to vote it down.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes, for the second time on the amendment, the gentleman, Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. W. D. HUTCHINSON. Just very briefly, Mr. Speaker, in response to the remarks of the gentleman, Mr. Rhodes, I believe that the time proposed of 6 years is too long.

I would like to comment specifically, however, on the situation with respect to the Department of Welfare and its role in this proceeding. I, for one, strongly favor having the Department of Welfare pursue those fathers, be they married or unmarried, who fail to support their children. I think, however, that the Department of Welfare is simply not doing that job now. I think that what they ought to do is get out and do that job within the 2-year period and not just take an additional 4 years to get around to doing it. I do not think that under those circumstances we are really going to do anyone any favor and I think the department may just delay some of the prosecutions. I urge support of the amendment. Thank you.

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

Mr. BERSON. Mr. Speaker, I share Representative Hutchinson's desire to see issues as delicate as contested paternity matters settled promptly, but I think the issue that faces the House today, and the reason I am opposing the amendment, is a question of that desire, the desire to settle contested paternity matters quickly, and the other competing desire and the one which we are going to decide on, and that is, to lift some of the burden from the taxpayers of this state.

Federal law currently requires the Department of Welfare to institute paternity actions where there is an allegation that the father of an illegitimate child is capable of paying. The department had given us an estimate for the three counties of Dauphin, Philadelphia and Allegheny in January of 1977 of approximately 705 paternity cases which could have been brought but were not brought because the statute of limitations had expired. The total annual average cost for those, assuming recovery by the Department of Welfare, was \$4,513,000.

Now the competing policy considerations are: Do we want to extend the statute of limitations in the hope that the department, which, in fact, is the plaintiff in 90 percent of these cases and maybe more than 90 percent of these cases, is going to be able to recover some of this money from the natural fathers of these children? Or do we want to adopt Representative Hutchinson's view that we want to settle this issue of paternity promptly?

I think, frankly, that the 6-year statute is a reasonable compromise between the original bill, which said that you could bring the action any time up to the termination of minority, and the original 2-year statute, which is costing the taxpayers an enormous amount of money. Therefore, I would advocate that we reject this amendment and keep the bill in its present form. Thank you.

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

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Allegheny consent to interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Rhodes, indicates he will stand for interrogation. The gentleman, Mr. Rappaport, is in order and may proceed.

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman inform the House as to what effect, if any, this bill will have upon intestate succession in Pennsylvania?

Mr. RHODES. I did not hear the end of your question, Mr. Speaker. Would you repeat the question?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Rappaport, confine his interrogation to the amendment? The bill is not yet before the House.

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman inform the House as to the effect of this amendment and the problems of establishing paternity under the provisions of this amendment on the problems of intestate succession in Pennsylvania?

Mr. RHODES. I am told by our staff that we have a series of bills coming out of the Judiciary Committee on the question of illegitimacy. This amendment does not directly affect them.

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman inform us, what would be the result in this particular case—

Mr. RHODES. I did not catch the question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RAPPAPORT. I have not yet come to the question, Mr. Speaker. Let us assume that a man and woman at one time have had a relationship and some years later the man inherits quite a bit of money and then dies. Would an action started under the provision of this bill establish paternity for the purposes of intestate succession?

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, if your question is, would that affect inheritance because of the amendment, the amendment only establishes the period of the statute of limitations to be 4 years longer from the date of birth than what is already in the bill. The standards of proof for determination of paternity would be the same under the amendment or without the amendment.

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Mr. Speaker, I would like an answer to my question as to whether paternity established under this amendment or under the bill is paternity for the purposes of inheritance. The gentleman apparently is unable to answer my question. I would like an answer before I vote either on the amendment or the bill.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, my impression is that it does not have the effect you are suggesting it would, but I will yield to Representative Berson.

Mr. BERSON. The answer to Representative Rappaport's question is no. This bill is an amendment to the Civil Procedural Support law. It does not affect the establishment of paternity for inheritance purposes. It simply is an amendment that would enable the establishment of paternity in the narrow area of determining the right to receive support under the Civil Procedural Support law. It has no effect on inheritance, in my opinion.

Mr. RHODES. I second that.

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Mr. Speaker, I thank both gentlemen for their help. I hope that that will be remembered by every member of the House as well as any courts that may interpret this.

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

Mr. RHODES. To speak briefly for the second time.

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

Mr. RHODES. I just want to point out for the membership's knowledge that this establishment of a 6-year statute of limitations from the date of birth on civil determination of paternity does not put Pennsylvania way out of line with other states. California has the age of minority as the statute of limitations, that is, up to the age of 18. There are several states that are much longer than 6 years. This will bring us in line with the majority of the states of the nation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—150

Abraham	Gallen	McClatchy	Shuman
Anderson	Gamble	McGinnis	Shupnik
Armstrong	Garzia	Mebus	Sirianni
Arthurs	Geisler	Meluskey	Smith, E.
Bellomini	George, C.	Milanovich	Smith, L.
Bennett	George, M.	Miller	Spencer
Berlin	Gillette	Milliron	Spitz
Bittinger	Gleeson	Miscevich	Stairs
Bittle	Goebel	Moehlmann	Stapleton
Brandt	Goodman	Mowery	Stewart
Brunner	Gray	Mullen, M. P.	Stuban
Burd	Greenfield	Mullen, M. M.	Sweet
Burns	Greenleaf	Musto	Taddonio
Butera	Grieco	Novak	Taylor, E.
Caltagirone	Halverson	Noye	Taylor, F.
Caputo	Hasay	O'Brien, B.	Tenaglio
Cassidy	Haskell	O'Brien, D.	Thomas
Cessar	Hayes, S. E.	O'Connell	Trello
Cimini	Helfrick	O'Keefe	Valicenti
Cole	Hoefel	Pancoast	Vroon
Davies	Honaman	Parker	Wansucz
DeMedio	Hopkins	Petrarca	Weidner
DeVerter	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Wenger
DeWeese	Katz	Polite	Wilson
Dietz	Kelly	Pott	Wilt
Dininni	Klingaman	Prendergast	Wise
Dorr	Knepper	Pyles	Wright, D.
Doyle	Kolter	Rappaport	Wright, J. L.
Duffy	Laughlin	Ravenstahl	Yahner
Englehart	Lehr	Renwick	Yohn
Fee	Letterman	Ritter	Zearfoss
Fischer, R. R.	Livengood	Ryan	Zeller
Fisher, D. M.	Logue	Salvatore	Zitterman
Foster, A.	Lynch	Scheaffer	Zord
Foster, W.	Mackowski	Schmitt	Zwinkl
Freind	Madigan	Schweder	
Fryer	Manniller	Seirica	Irvis,
Gallagher	McCall	Seltzer	Speaker

NAYS—38

Beloff	Gatski	McIntyre	Rhodes
Berson	Giammarco	McLane	Rieger
Brown	Harper	Morris	Ruggiero
Cianciulli	Hayes, D. S.	Mrkonie	Scanlon
Cohen	Irkin	O'Donnell	Wagner
Cowell	Johnson	Oliver	Wass
Dombrowski	Jones	Piccola	White
Donatucci	Kernick	Pievsky	Wiggins

Dumas Flaherty	Kowalyshyn Levi	Reed	Williams
-------------------	--------------------	------	----------

NOT VOTING—12

Barber	Geesey	Lincoln	Richardson
Borski	Hamilton	Manderino	Shelton
DiCarlo	Hutchinson, A.	Pratt	Wargo

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?

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

Mr. WAGNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to make some remarks, but I want to address this to Representative Rhodes. I am going to ask that the bill be held so I can prepare some amendments for tomorrow and this is the reason: It was brought out here, and I had forgotten this, that we are shifting this action from the criminal side to the civil side of the court. Consequently, the amount of evidence needed to prove it is less. That is fine with me. What you are also doing is shifting it from the district attorney's office, which offers free service to mothers, into the civil branch where the private bar is going to have to represent the mother. I really have no basic problem with that. The mothers could not go to Legal Services because it is fee-generating. They will be getting money. So they are going to have to retain some private lawyers.

What I would like to do is prepare an amendment here which would prohibit contingent fees on any sort of award which might go to the mother, because I envision a possibility of some attorney charging contingent fees and you might have actions brought that might be in the nature of harassment to get people to settle so the attorney might get a contingent fee.

So what I am asking, Mr. Speaker, is whether you would hold the bill so I can prepare an amendment this evening so we can present it tomorrow, which would prohibit contingent fees.

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

Mr. RHODES. If the member wishes to prepare an amendment, we will hold the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was unable to distinguish the last words of the gentleman. Did the gentleman say he has agreed to hold the bill?

Mr. RHODES. I will agree to hold the bill, Mr. Speaker, if the member wishes to prepare an amendment.

The SPEAKER. All right. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

HB 1106 PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, HB 1106, PN 2081, as amended, will be passed over for today.

The bill will not be reprinted until we have had an opportunity to hear Mr. Wagner's amendment and see whether or not that is entered into the bill. Therefore, the bill will reappear

on the calendar on third consideration tomorrow, and Mr. Wagner is instructed to have his amendment drafted immediately.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEES

HB 175, PN 2290 (Amended) By Mr. PIEVSKY

An Act amending the act of May 25, 1933 (P. L. 1050, No. 242), referred to as the Second Class City Fireman Relief Law, further providing for employe contributions and cost of living increments.

Rereported from Committee on Appropriations.

HB 394, PN 432 By Mr. PIEVSKY

An Act amending the "Public Defender Act," approved December 2, 1968 (P. L. 1144, No. 358), adding a further provision for the legal defense of persons subject to commitment.

Rereported from Committee on Appropriations.

HB 941, PN 1083 By Mr. PIEVSKY

An Act amending the "Local Tax Collection Law," approved May 25, 1945 (P. L. 1050, No. 394), further providing for penalties.

Rereported from Committee on Appropriations.

HB 814, PN 918 By Mr. PIEVSKY

An Act amending the act of May 16, 1923 (P. L. 207, No. 153), referred to as the Municipal Claim and Tax Lien Law, extending the period for revival of suggestions and averments of nonpayment and default and the time for filing and renewal of all taxes and municipal claims to twenty years.

Rereported from Committee on Appropriations.

HB 885, PN 1965 By Mr. PIEVSKY

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the establishment of an advisory council for each State veterans' home.

Rereported from Committee on Appropriations.

HB 953, PN 2291 (Amended) By Mr. PIEVSKY

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, creating the Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing, establishing guidelines for criminal sentencing to be used by trial courts, and further providing for sentencing alternatives and appellate review of sentence.

Rereported from Committee on Appropriations.

HB 1124, PN 1967 By Mr. PIEVSKY

An Act amending "The County Code," approved August 9, 1955 (P. L. 323, No. 130), making certain audits mandatory and making an editorial change.

Rereported from Committee on Appropriations.

HB 1570, PN 1891 By Mr. PIEVSKY

An Act amending the "Tax Reform Code of 1971," approved March 4, 1971 (P. L. 6, No. 2), further providing for an emergency exclusion from the tax for education.

Rereported from Committee on Appropriations.

HB 1633, PN 2193 By Mr. PIEVSKY

An Act amending the "Tax Reform Code of 1971," approved March 4, 1971 (P. L. 6, No. 2), further defining "dividends."

Rereported from Committee on Appropriations.

HB 1761, PN 2137 By Mr. PIEVSKY

An Act amending the act of July 25, 1961 (P. L. 857, No. 372), entitled "An act regulating the manufacture of stuffed toys intended for sale, *** and prescribing penalties," exempting charitable and nonprofit organizations from payment of the registration fee, amending the criminal penalties, providing equitable relief and civil penalties and making editorial changes.

Rereported from Committee on Appropriations.

SB 106, PN 1314 By Mr. PIEVSKY

An Act amending the act of July 28, 1953 (P. L. 723, No. 230), entitled as amended "Second Class County Code" requiring mandatory audits of the minor judiciary.

Rereported from Committee on Appropriations.

SB 236, PN 1457 (Amended) By Mr. PIEVSKY

An Act to increase the number of judges of the Commonwealth Court and providing for their appointment and to provide three additional judges of the Traffic Court of Philadelphia.

Rereported from Committee on Appropriations.

SB 305, PN 307 By Mr. PIEVSKY

An Act authorizing local taxing authorities to provide for tax exemption for certain deteriorated industrial commercial and other business property; providing for an exemption schedule and establishing standards and qualifications.

Rereported from Committee on Appropriations.

SB 402, PN 406 By Mr. PIEVSKY

An Act amending the act of June 28, 1947 (P. L. 1110, No. 476), entitled "Motor Vehicle Sales Finance Act" increasing certain license fees.

Rereported from Committee on Appropriations.

SB 480, PN 1391 By Mr. PIEVSKY

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

Rereported from Committee on Appropriations.

SB 748, PN 1458 (Amended) By Mr. PIEVSKY

An Act amending the Act of June 2, 1915 (P. L. 736, No. 338), entitled as amended "The Pennsylvania Workmen's Compensation Act" further defining employe to include volunteers in the State Parks and Forests Program, deputy game protectors, special waterway patrolmen and to volunteers in connection with forest fire protection and providing benefits.

Rereported from Committee on Appropriations.

SB 888, PN 960 By Mr. PIEVSKY

An Act amending the act of September 18, 1961 (P. L. 1389, No. 615), entitled "County and Municipal State Highway Law" deleting a route in York County.

Rereported from Committee on Appropriations.

RESOLUTION REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**HR 154, PN 2191**

By Mr. GREENFIELD

That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania authorizes the creation of a steering committee herewith known as the Benjamin Franklin Symposium Committee.

Rules.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES AND TABLED**HB 1785, PN 2292 (Amended)**

By Mr. COHEN

An Act amending the "Public Utility Law," approved May 28, 1937 (P. L. 1053, No. 286), providing procedures for discontinuing service to landlords and providing for rights of tenants.

Consumer Affairs.

HB 1834, PN 2293 (Amended)

By Mr. COHEN

An Act providing for notice and the right to cure landlord's default to avoid the termination of utility service to tenants.

Consumer Affairs.

ANNOUNCEMENTS**INSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Northampton, Mr. Kowalyszyn, to make an announcement.

Mr. KOWALYSHYN. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the members of the Insurance Committee that the Insurance Committee will have a meeting tomorrow morning, Wednesday, 10 o'clock, in room 246.

Thank you.

POLICE TRAINING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

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

Mr. RUGGIERO. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Police Training will meet tomorrow morning at 11 a.m., in room 149.

Thank you.

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that there is a meeting of the Rules Committee in the majority leader's office at 12 noon tomorrow.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Also, the Chair wishes to announce that there is a meeting immediately following the adjournment motion being placed today. That meeting is in the Speaker's office. It is for all Democratic leaders and the chairman of the Finance Committee and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

SENATE MESSAGE**TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

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

In the Senate, November 14, 1977.

RESOLVED, (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate adjourns this week it reconvene on Monday, November 21, 1977 unless sooner recalled by the President Pro Tempore, and when the House of Representatives adjourns this week it reconvene on Monday, November 21, 1977 unless sooner recalled by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

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

On the question,

Will the House concur in the resolution of the Senate?

Resolution was concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER

Bill numbered and entitled as follows was prepared for presentation to the Governor:

SENATE BILL No. 334

An Act amending the act of February 1, 1974 (P. L. 34, No. 15), entitled "Pennsylvania Municipal Retirement Law" further providing for selection of the chairman and vice chairman of the board for designation of alternates by certain board members for audits for the credit of excess interest and surplus allocations for administrative expenses and for interest paid while vesting and changing the date of the itemized estimate to municipalities.

Whereupon,

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

WELCOMES

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pleased to announce the presence of Mrs. Betty Benander and her two children. She is the Republican committeewoman from Cumberland County and the guest of Representative Scheaffer of Cumberland County.

The Chair has an announcement from Representative Theodore Berlin in regards to a tour of students at the beginning of the session, 1 o'clock. They are students in the Gifted Program at the Bucks County Intermediate Unit. Approximately 65 students will be here under the supervision of Mrs. Abarbanel, Mrs. Allen, Mrs. Flanagan, and the wife of the Representative, Mrs. Berlin. Also, Representative Berlin's two daughters, Pamela and Alyson, will be with the group.

The Chair is pleased to welcome Mary McGarvey, who is the guest of Representative DiCarlo from Erie.

The Chair welcomes to the House the son of Representative Musto, Raphael Musto, Jr.

The Chair welcomes Miss Monica Moore of North Wales, Pennsylvania, and Miss Maggie Coleman of Church Point, Louisiana.

They are seniors at Chestnut Hill College and are assisting Representative Freind during this semester in a legislative intern program.

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I heard you announce that there is a meeting after the session today of the Democratic leadership and the chairman of the Finance Committee. I am wondering if under the Sunshine law we are permitted to send representatives to that meeting.

The SPEAKER. It depends upon how many votes are going to be taken by the Republican Party and handed over on the floor of the House for the tax bills.

Mr. RYAN. We would not know what the tax bills would be without attending that meeting though.

The SPEAKER. Well, we would be delighted to have you come if you pledge a minimum of 10. That would be your entry fee.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURD moved that this House do now adjourn until Wednesday, November 16, 1977, at 1 p.m., e.s.t.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and (at 5:13 p.m., e.s.t.) the House adjourned.