

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Legislative Journal

MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1980

Session of 1980

164th of the General Assembly

No. 17

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

THE SPEAKER (H. JACK SELTZER) IN THE CHAIR

PRAYER

THE HONORABLE MARY ANN ARTY, member of the House of Representatives and guest chaplain, offered the following prayer:

Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to Reverend William Elbert, Pastor of St. Matthew Evangelical Lutheran Church, Springfield, for the preparation of the prayer which I give today.

Lord, preserve Thy people; maintain truth, righteous justice and government in our Commonwealth; so that all things may take place in an orderly way and that the peace of our citizens may not be destroyed by secret enmity, by plotting or rebellion, nor the external good order be corrupted by debased and impure living, or be disturbed by other offenses against righteousness. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(The Pledge of Allegiance was enunciated by the members.)

JOURNAL APPROVAL

The SPEAKER. Without objection, approval of the Journal for Wednesday, January 30, 1980, is now in print, and if there are no corrections, the Journal will stand approved as read. The Chair hears none.

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, approval of the Journal for Wednesday, February 27, 1980, will be postponed until printed. The Chair hears none.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MAJORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the members who are still in their offices but within hearing of my voice, the first vote today will be on HB 2044.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE GRANTED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority whip. Mr. S. E. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I request leaves of absence for Mr. FREIND for today's session; for Messrs. ALDEN, WEIDNER and MADIGAN for the week's session.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, there are no leaves of absence for the Democrats for today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, leaves are granted.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 2319 By Representatives SIRIANNI AND PICCOLA.

An Act prescribing the size and physical characteristics of paper to be used by the Commonwealth, its agencies and in documents filed with them.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, February 29, 1980.

No. 2320 By Representative ZITTERMAN.

An Act amending "The Library Code," approved June 14, 1961 (P. L. 324, No. 188), further providing for aid to district library centers.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, February 29, 1980.

No. 2321 By Representatives REED, CIMINI, B. F. O'BRIEN, STEWART, JONES, KOWALYSHYN AND J. J. JOHNSON.

An Act requiring the Governor's Energy Council to set standards for fuel burner nozzles and furnaces and providing for their applicability.

Referred to Committee on MINES AND ENERGY MANAGEMENT, February 29, 1980.

No. 2322 By Representatives RICHARDSON, BARBER, OLIVER, J. J. JOHNSON, RHODES, STREET, DUMAS, HARPER AND IRVIS.

An Act amending the "Public Welfare Code," approved June 13, 1967 (P. L. 31, No. 21), further providing for the definition of assistance; hearing requirements; encouraging self-support and employment; providing for emergency assistance, rent security deposits; utility deposits; and further providing for county boards and supplemental assistance payments.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH AND WELFARE, February 29, 1980.

No. 2323 By Representatives WILSON, J. L. WRIGHT, JR., SIEMINSKI, TRELLO, REED, LIVENGOOD, KOLTER, PUCCIARELLI, COCHRAN, E. Z. TAYLOR, CESSAR, CALTAGIRONE, B. D. CLARK, McINTYRE, MICOZZIE, MRKONIC, TELEK, DeWEESE AND COSLETT.

A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, further providing for the real property tax exemption of disabled veterans.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, February 29, 1980.

No. 2324 By Representatives C. GEORGE, L. E. SMITH, A. K. HUTCHINSON, FEE, SHUPNIK, HALVERSON, STAIRS, STEIGHNER, LEVI, McCALL, STUBAN, WARGO, BURNS, BENNETT, YAHNER, LEVIN, DeWEESE, WACHOB, SWEET, LIVENGOOD, D. R. WRIGHT, TRELLO, NOVAK, KNIGHT, ITKIN, SEVENTY, GRAY, SCHMITT, MUSTO, KUKOVICH, GAMBLE, DUFFY, STEWART, GALLAGHER, DAVIES, ZITTERMAN, LEHR, EARLEY, M. R. CLARK, BURD, KLINGAMAN AND LETTERMAN.

An Act amending the act of August 23, 1961 (P. L. 1068, No. 484), entitled, as amended, "An act to provide for the creation and administration of a Coal and Clay Mine Subsidence Insurance Fund within the Department of Environmental Resources for the insurance of compensation for damages to subscribers thereto; *** and making an appropriation," further providing compensation for property damage due to blasting.

Referred to Committee on MINES AND ENERGY MANAGEMENT, February 29, 1980.

No. 2325 By Representatives BOWSER, KANUCK, PETERSON, DOMBROWSKI, MOWERY, CAPPABIANCA, KLINGAMAN, DiCARLO, PYLES, HALVERSON, WASS, BRANDT, W. W. FOSTER, MILLER AND GLADECK.

An Act amending "The Administrative Code of 1929," approved April 9, 1929 (P. L. 177, No. 175), further providing for the powers and duties of the State Board of Education.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, February 29, 1980.

No. 2326 By Representatives CORNELL, ALDEN, VROON, POLITE, E. Z. TAYLOR AND MILLER.

An Act amending the "Tax Reform Code of 1971," approved March 4, 1971 (P. L. 6, No. 2), exempting interest income of certain individuals from income tax.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, February 29, 1980.

No. 2327 By Representative BURNS.

An Act authorizing and directing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Department of Public Welfare and the Governor to convey to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for a consideration to be determined by an appraisal, 1.68 acres of land, more or less, situate in the Township of Bensalem, Bucks County, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, February 29, 1980.

No. 2328 By Representative RODGERS.

An Act amending "The Game Law," approved June 3, 1937 (P. L. 1225, No. 316), authorizing free licenses to be issued to residents sixty-five years of age or older and to permanently disabled residents.

Referred to Committee on GAME AND FISHERIES, February 29, 1980.

No. 2329 By Representative RODGERS.

An Act amending "The Fish Law of 1959," approved December 15, 1959 (P. L. 1779, No. 673), providing free licenses to persons sixty-five years of age or older and to permanently disabled persons.

Referred to Committee on GAME AND FISHERIES, February 29, 1980.

No. 2330 By Representatives MANDERINO, IRVIS, PIEVSKY, COCHRAN, BROWN, JONES, HOEFFEL, STUBAN, ZORD, O'DONNELL, M. H. GEORGE, MICHLOVIC, ZITTERMAN, DOMBROWSKI, PRATT, McINTYRE, GALLAGHER, LAUGHLIN, REED, KUKOVICH, DUFFY, FEE, LEVIN AND BORSKI.

An Act amending Title 66 (Public Utilities) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, empowering the commission to conduct certain annual studies on Federal tax credits and deferrals.

Referred to Committee on CONSUMER AFFAIRS, February 29, 1980.

No. 2331 By Representative WILSON.

An Act regulating invention development services, providing for enforcement and civil penalties.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, February 29, 1980.

No. 2332 By Representatives A. K. HUTCHINSON, MANDERINO, KUKOVICH, SCHMITT, FEE, LEVI, E. R. LYNCH, W. D. HUTCHINSON, COSLETT, SHUPNIK, MRKONIC, CAPPABIANCA, DOMBROWSKI, CALTAGIRONE, GATSKI, B. F. O'BRIEN AND EARLEY.

An Act amending "The Third Class City Code," approved June 23, 1931 (P. L. 932, No. 317), providing for vesting for police officers.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 29, 1980.

No. 2333 By Representative GLADECK.

An Act authorizing the Department of General Services, with the approval of the Department of Public Welfare and the Governor to grant an easement on a tract of land in East Norriton Township, Montgomery County to Joseph Russell for a sanitary sewer line.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, February 29, 1980.

No. 2334 By Representatives MADIGAN, SERAFINI, BURD AND M. H. GEORGE.

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 transfer of facilities and equipment to a political subdivision.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, February 29, 1980.

No. 2335 By Representative McCLATCHY.

An Act amending the "Federal Augmentation Appropriation Act of 1979," approved July 4, 1979 (No. 10A), changing appropriations and adding appropriations.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, February 29, 1980.

HOUSE RESOLUTION INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 189 By Representatives PISTELLA, McCALL, McMONAGLE, HELFRICK, RODGERS, JONES, DAWIDA, MICHLOVIC, COHEN, MULLEN, BROWN AND SALVATORE.

General Assembly extend its support to United States Congressional Resolutions for a peaceful solution to problems in Northern Ireland.

Referred to Committee on RULES, February 29, 1980.

SENATE MESSAGE

SENATE BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 681, PN 1519

Referred to Committee on Appropriations, February 29, 1980.

SB 1003, PN 1180

Referred to Committee on Health and Welfare, February 29, 1980.

SB 1043, PN 1241

Referred to Committee on Transportation, February 29, 1980.

SB 1119, PN 1354

Referred to Committee on Transportation, February 29, 1980.

SB 1240, PN 1541

Referred to Committee on Appropriations, February 29, 1980.

COMMUNICATION

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication from the Auditor General:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA OFFICE OF AUDITOR GENERAL HARRISBURG 17120

February 29, 1980

The Honorable H. Jack Seltzer Speaker of the House Commonwealth of Pennsylvania 139 Main Capitol Building Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Dear Representative Seltzer:

In accordance with the provisions of Article VIII, Section 7 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and Section 4 of the Capital Facilities Debt Enabling Act as amended, the Auditor General is required on or before each March 1 and September 1 to make a certification to the Governor and the General Assembly.

A duplicate original of my certification is enclosed herewith.

Sincerely, Al Benedict Auditor General

AB/mi Enclosure

AUDITOR GENERAL'S CERTIFICATE

Pursuant to

ARTICLE VIII, Section 7(a) (4) and (c) of the

CONSTITUTION OF PENNSYLVANIA and the

Act of July 20, 1968, Act No. 217, as amended

To the Governor and the General Assembly:

I, AL BENEDICT, Auditor General of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, pursuant to the Constitution of Pennsylvania and Section 4(b) of Act No. 75 of July 24, 1969, known as the Capital Facilities Debt Enabling Act certify as follows:

The average annual tax revenues deposited in all funds in the five fiscal years ended next preceding the date of this certificate \$6,110,030,332.00

- (i) The amount of outstanding net debt as of the end of preceding fiscal year 4,078,386,000.00
(ii) The amount of such net debt as of the date of this certificate 3,994,866,000.00
(iii) The difference between the limitation upon all net debt outstanding

	as provided in Article VIII, Section 7(a) (4) of the Constitution of Pennsylvania and the amount of such net debt as of the date of this certificate	6,697,687,082.00
(iv)	The amount of such debt scheduled to be repaid during the remainder of fiscal year 1979-1980	43,470,000.00
(v)	The amount of debt authorized by law to be issued, by not yet incurred	1,183,583,773.00
(vi)	The amount of outstanding obligations excluded from outstanding debt as self sustaining pursuant to Article VIII, Section 7(c) (1), (2), and (3) of the Constitution of Pennsylvania	750,599,000.00

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have set my hand and affixed the seal of the Auditor General, this 1st day of March, 1980.

AL BENEDICT
Auditor General
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

BILLS SIGNED BY SPEAKER

The following bills, having been prepared for presentation to the Governor, were signed by the Speaker:

HB 725, PN 2413

An Act amending the "Pennsylvania Farmland and Forest Land Assessment Act of 1974," approved December 19, 1974 (P. L. 973, No. 319), adding definitions, and further providing for continuation of preferential use assessments when the division of land does not result in a use change, recordation of preferential use assessment agreements and for transfers on the death of the owner.

HB 1256, PN 2187

An Act amending the "Liquid Fuels Tax Municipal Allocation Law," approved June 1, 1956 (1955 P. L. 1944, No. 655), further providing for the use of the tax for drainage purposes.

HB 1384, PN 2278

An Act amending "The First Class Township Code," approved June 24, 1931 (P. L. 1206, No. 331), increasing the expense allowance.

HB 1385, PN 2279

An Act amending "The Borough Code," approved February 1, 1966 (1965 P. L. 1656, No. 581), increasing the expense allowance.

HB 1512, PN 2567

An Act amending the "Second Class County Code," approved July 28, 1953 (P. L. 723, No. 230), redefining the term of "county employe," and providing for members of the employe's retirement system in certain cases.

SB 274, PN 1510

An Act amending the act of June 1, 1956 (1955 P. L. 1959, No. 657), entitled, as amended, "Public Official Compensation Law," making a technical correction.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. The members will please report to the floor. The Chair is about to take the master roll call.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—189

Anderson	Foster, Jr., A.	McCall	Salvatore
Armstrong	Fryer	McClatchy	Scheaffer
Arty	Gallagher	McIntyre	Schmitt
Austin	Gallen	McKelvey	Schweder
Barber	Gamble	McMonagle	Serafini
Belardi	Gannon	McVerry	Seventy
Beloff	Gatski	Mackowski	Shadding
Bennett	Geesey	Manderino	Shupnik
Berson	Geist	Manmiller	Sieminski
Bittle	George, C.	Michlovic	Sirianni
Borski	George, M. H.	Micozzie	Smith, E. H.
Bowser	Gladeck	Milanovich	Smith, L. E.
Brandt	Goebel	Miller	Spencer
Brown	Goodman	Moehlmann	Spitz
Burd	Grabowski	Mowery	Stairs
Burns	Gray	Mrkonic	Steighner
Caltagirone	Greenfield	Mullen	Stewart
Cappabianca	Grieco	Murphy	Street
Cessar	Gruppo	Musto	Stuban
Chess	Halverson	Nahill	Sweet
Cimini	Harper	Novak	Swift
Clark, B. D.	Hasay	Noye	Taddonio
Clark, M. R.	Hayes, Jr., S.	O'Brien, B. F.	Taylor, E. Z.
Cochran	Helfrick	O'Brien, D. M.	Taylor, F.
Cohen	Hoeffel	O'Donnell	Telek
Cole	Honaman	Oliver	Thomas
Cornell	Hutchinson, A.	Perzel	Trello
Coslett	Hutchinson, W.	Peterson	Vroon
Cowell	Irvis	Petrarca	Wachob
Cunningham	Itkin	Piccola	Wargo
DeMedio	Johnson, E. G.	Pievsy	Wass
DeVerter	Johnson, J. J.	Pistella	Wenger
DeWeese	Jones	Pitts	White
DiCarlo	Kanuck	Polite	Williams
Davies	Klingaman	Pott	Wilson
Dawida	Knight	Pratt	Wilt
Dietz	Kolter	Pucciarelli	Wright, D. R.
Dininni	Kowalshyn	Punt	Wright, Jr., J.
Dombrowski	Kukovich	Pyles	Yahner
Dorr	Lashinger	Rappaport	Yohn
Duffy	Laughlin	Reed	Zeller
Dumas	Lehr	Rhodes	Zitterman
Durham	Letterman	Richardson	Zord
Earley	Levi	Rieger	Zwikl
Fee	Levin	Ritter	
Fischer	Lewis	Rocks	Seltzer,
Fisher	Livengood	Rodgers	Speaker
Foster, W. W.	Lynch, E. R.	Ryan	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—7

Alden	Giammarco	Knepper	Weidner
Freind	Hayes, D. S.	Madigan	

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

WELCOME

The SPEAKER. The Chair welcomes to the balcony Lance Metz and Angelo Spinosa, graduate students from Lehigh University, who are here today as the guests of Mr. Zwikl.

**BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED**

SB 414, PN 1600 (Amended)

By Rep. WENGER

An Act protecting race horses from abuse, restricting the use of phenylbutazone or any drug, medicament, stimulant, depressant, narcotic, hypnotic or steroid on race horses, creating a presumption, creating the position of Official State Veterinarian, creating the Equine Drug Control Committee, establishing the Pennsylvania Race Horse Testing Laboratory and providing penalties.

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS.

ADDITIONS OF SPONSORS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, Mr. Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the record, in accordance with the rules, the following list of additions of sponsors:

HB 2137, Bittle; HB 2265, Zord; HB 2265, Irvis; and HB 2265, Itkin.

WELCOME

The SPEAKER. The Chair welcomes to the balcony a group of ministers from the area of Greencastle, Franklin County, who are here today as the guests of Mr. Terry Punt.

SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, Mr. Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up as a special order of business, House Bill 2044.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair takes up as a special order of business from today's calendar, page 10, HB No. 2044. This will be the first roll call of the day.

CALENDAR

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2044, PN 2583**, entitled:

An Act amending the "Public Welfare Code," approved June 13, 1967 (P. L. 31, No. 21), limiting general assistance to chronically needy persons and transitionally needy persons.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Irvis.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair recognize first on this debate, the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Barber, who has a motion which ought to be placed before any amendments.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, HB 2044, PN 2583, I would like to make a motion that we recommit the bill. Then I would like to speak on the recomittal.

The SPEAKER. It is moved by the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Barber, that HB 2044 be recommitted to the Committee on Health and Welfare.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Barber, on the motion to recommit. The gentleman, Mr. Barber, may proceed.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I have been in the House now approximately 12 years, and the procedures that were used on HB 2044, this is the first time I have seen this happen in 12 years. Mr. Speaker, we were sitting in the committee room for approximately 15 to 20 minutes waiting for them to draft the bill. We did not even know what bill we were sitting there for.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the committee people were not there. On the Democratic side, there were at least four members that did not even know about the meeting. I did not know until approximately 15 minutes before the meeting was called off the floor. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is too important for a meeting to be called to release a bill to put 80,000 people off welfare. I am not going into the merits of the bill, but there are so many irregularities in this particular bill that I think even the Republicans that voted for the bill, many of them are my friends, stated to me, "It was unfair, Jim." Mr. Speaker, I beg the members to recommit this bill to give us ample time to study the bill and improve the bill.

I do not think there is anyone here on the floor who wants people not to work. But I think it is a terrible thing when you say take 80,000 people off welfare and you do not have jobs. They are laying off all across the state. Each and every person knows that. We are begging today with a country we defeated in the war, Japan, and we are begging Japan to help us with our automobiles. We are importing more than we are exporting. I cannot understand that we are sending our jobs out of the country but we expect people to work without jobs in this country. You cannot buy a television set made in America.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the majority leader, Mr. Ryan rise?

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, we have been put on notice through the Philadelphia Inquirer, which I do not always believe, that a filibuster is intended in connection with this bill. Under the circumstances and in order to preserve the decorum in the House, I am going to ask that the rules be strictly abided by and that Mr. Barber limit his debate to the question that is before the House, and that is recomittal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. The Chair would ask Mr. Barber to please confine his remarks to the reasons for which he would like to see the bill recommitted. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ryan, the majority leader, is absolutely right. I think that we should have obeyed the rules the day that we had the committee meeting, and this bill would not be on the floor today. I think that we should have hearings on this bill. That is another reason that I am for recommitting the bill. I think that this bill is important to every citizen in the Commonwealth. I cannot believe that Mr. Ryan, my friend, would make that statement today when he knows that we were called off the floor for HB 2044 and that we did not know anything about it. Just a few Republican members knew about it. I would like the House to please give us ample time to improve this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery, Mr. Hoeffel, on the recommittal motion.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support the recommittal motion by Mr. Barber. Everything that Mr. Barber said is absolutely correct concerning the committee meeting of the Health and Welfare Committee that considered HB 2044. I should not even say we considered it because we did not. We were called off the floor without notice. The bill was not even in print. The day we gathered at the committee meeting, the bill was introduced and was reported out of committee that afternoon or evening, and reported by a majority vote of the committee, with little debate, with no consideration of the complexities of the question or of the definitions included in the bill, and so forth.

If the procedures of this House are going to mean anything, if the committee structure that we have is going to count for anything up here, then this kind of recommittal motion has to be supported. When a complex, complicated bill, that is going to drastically affect the lives of an awful lot of Pennsylvanians, is coming up for consideration without any debate in committee, without any consideration in the committee system that is supposed to handle the complicated and controversial aspects, then our procedures have just broken down. I very strongly recommend that we recommit this bill. We all know it is controversial. There is a blizzard of amendments that have been prepared. We are not going to be able to handle those amendments properly on the floor of the House. We should recommit the bill, consider the amendments in committee, perhaps hold some hearings to allow the citizenry to step forward and express their views. Clearly we should not push forward today, so I strongly support the recommittal. Thank you.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in moving for recommittal of this bill. Mr. Barber indicated in his length of time he has never seen anything like this, and I would agree with him.

Mr. Speaker, I am in my eighth term—almost 16 years in this great body—and I think it is disgraceful the way that HB 2044 is being treated. I am a firm believer in the committee system, and all those who know me know what I believe and what I say. This bill ought to be returned to the Health and Welfare Committee. It ought to be fully studied. If need be, it ought to go to public hearings for the kind of input that it needs. Mr. Speaker, there is no one on the floor of this House that wants to vote any more than I do for welfare reform. We in the legislature are attacked from many areas and asked why we do not do something about the disgrace of welfare. We want to do something, but, Mr. Speaker, it ought to be done in the way that is befitting the House of Representatives. It ought not to be railroaded through. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly, respectfully ask every member of this House, regardless of your political affiliation, to vote for recommitment of this most important piece of legislation.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the recommittal motion.

I have real concerns that the bill has not been looked at for the impact it may have or even in the definitions of what is in the bill. Upon inquiry to the Department of Public Welfare, the Bureau of Employment Security, I asked what "vocationally unable to obtain employment" meant? That is an important part of this bill, and I was informed that they did not have a definition or criteria for that yet, that they were working on it.

I think that it is absurd that we are considering a bill of this impact when the definitions in the bill are not even ready yet. I urge us to recommit this to give it adequate public hearings and consideration before we vote on it. Thank you.

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

Mr. STREET. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion for recommittal mainly because of the article that appeared in the Inquirer that Mr. Ryan had alluded to a little earlier. That article has impaired my ability to be able to raise legitimate concerns on the floor of this House and have the full attention of the House without a foregone conclusion that Milton Street, because he is a member of the Black Caucus, has one intention and one intention alone, and that is to filibuster the bill. That is not my intention. I have legitimate concerns about the bill. I have concerns that I have raised here that I cannot get from the Health and Welfare Committee. I have contradictions from the Governor's speech in terms of the content of the budget itself, and I would not want to try to bog down the members of this House going through the stack of figures that I need answers to on the floor of this House. It would be much easier for us to get the answers to the figures; to the \$34 million, for example. There is a contradiction there—savings in the first year. And I do not think that I can be dealt with legitimately on the floor of this House now

raising those questions in view of the Inquirer article. And I would, for that reason, request that this bill be recommitted so that we can deal with it legitimately.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been on our calendar since the 3d day of December. That is three months. For the past month—and I am guessing that, but at least three or four weeks now—we have put everyone on notice that HB 2044 is going to be called for a vote. It strikes me as strange that when it finally comes up on our board for a vote on final passage, the bill that has been on the calendar for 3 months all of a sudden should go back to committee. That was a proper motion any one of the days of the past 3 legislative months, and to raise it now is in keeping, I believe, with what I read in the Inquirer, and that is, that the plan is delay, delay, delay. If it was a legitimate concern that the bill should go to committee, it could have happened anytime in the last 3 months; and why it is being called up today, this recommittal motion, in my opinion, is just in keeping with the plan to tack on the bill of delay and filibuster. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, because it has been here for 3 months on our calendar, I would oppose any action to recommit or further delay the consideration of this bill. I would ask for a “no” vote on the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader is well aware as I am and you are, and everybody who is a veteran member on the floor of the House, that motions to recommit are not raised generally until a decision has been made to call the bill before the House. It is at that point in time when all motions on the bill are raised. So to argue that because the motion to recommit was not raised earlier than today is really not a proper argument, at least it is not an argument a great deal of weight needs to be given to.

I support the motion to recommit. There has been plainly, in my mind, a violation of rules of this House by the Committee on Health and Welfare, which considered this bill very briefly.

There are a great number of amendments to be offered. I do not believe that the number of amendments indicate a dilatory attitude on the part of those offering the amendments. I am not prepared to prejudge those people who are offering amendments until I see the amendments.

I think it would be very wise on the part of the floor of the House to instruct the committee to give more careful attention to this particular piece of legislation and to the prepared amendments thereto, and at that point in time, when the committee has carefully considered, if it chooses then to rereport the bill, fine. But I think it is unwise for us to proceed further with this particular piece of legislation.

I would point out to the members that what the Chair has said is the very argument which I am making. Every member is entitled to be heard, and I suspect strongly that if we proceed with this matter, under the conditions on the

floor of this House and with the number of amendments to be offered, every member will not be heard, the arguments will not be heard and they will not be listened to on a most important piece of legislation.

I very earnestly—and not simply as a party leader. I very earnestly—urge the House to recommit this particular piece of legislation. I expect to see it again, because it is a popular piece of legislation for any administration. But I think it is not in proper condition to be considered on the floor of the House today and I think it would be unwise of us to proceed further. I strongly support Mr. Barber's motion to recommit. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. TRELLO. Mr. Speaker, I also rise to recommit the bill.

In October of 1978, I read an article in the paper about Utah having the lowest percentage of welfare recipients of any state in the Union. I immediately wrote the chief clerk in Utah and asked for a copy of their legislation, which they most happily obliged and sent to me. I had it redrafted in the form of HB 81. That was drafted in February of 1979. Of course, my bill did not get out of committee. But I think that my bill is a very good bill, but the fact that it is not being considered, even if it was, I still think that it should have proper hearings in the committee and also hearings throughout the Commonwealth because of the impact that it would have on all Pennsylvanians throughout the Commonwealth. So I urge everybody to reconsider voting this back into committee for consideration. Thank you.

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

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, much is going to be said today and tonight, perhaps longer. Welfare reform is nothing new. This has been discussed and talked about since Robert Carlson, then U.S. Commissioner of Welfare, dating back to 1973.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Punt, yield?

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman is not speaking to the recommittal motion. And since you have already declared that we are going to abide by the rules, I would ask the gentleman to do the same.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman. The Chair was listening diligently to the member and the Chair had also doubts at the time that the member might be wavering from the rule. The Chair would ask Mr. Punt to please abide by the rules of the House and confine his

remarks to the question at hand, the recommittal motion. With those constraints, the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. PUNT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The taxpayers are opposed to this recommittal motion, I am opposed to it, and I encourage that we go on with the vote on the recommittal motion, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

The SPEAKER. On the recommittal on HB 2044, those in favor of recommittal will vote "aye;" opposed, "no." The members will proceed to vote.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—83

Austin	Fee	McIntyre	Rieger
Barber	Gallagher	McMonagle	Ritter
Beloff	Gamble	Manderino	Rodgers
Bennett	Gatski	Michlovic	Schmitt
Berson	Goodman	Mrkonic	Seventy
Borski	Grabowski	Mullen	Shadding
Cappabianca	Harper	Murphy	Shupnik
Chess	Hoeffel	Musto	Stewart
Clark, B. D.	Hutchinson, A.	Novak	Street
Cochran	Irvic	O'Brien, B. F.	Sweet
Cohen	Itkin	O'Brien, D. M.	Taylor, F.
Cole	Johnson, J. J.	O'Donnell	Trello
Cowell	Jones	Oliver	Wachob
DeMedio	Knight	Petrarca	Wargo
DeWeese	Kolter	Pievsky	White
DiCarlo	Kukovich	Pistella	Williams
Dawida	Laughlin	Pucciarelli	Wright, D. R.
Dombrowski	Letterman	Rappaport	Yahner
Duffy	Levin	Reed	Zitterman
Dumas	Livengood	Rhodes	Zwinkl
Earley	McCall	Richardson	

NAYS—102

Anderson	Foster, Jr., A.	Lynch, E. R.	Sieminski
Armstrong	Fryer	McClatchy	Sirianni
Arty	Gallen	McKelvey	Smith, E. H.
Belardi	Gannon	McVerry	Smith, L. E.
Bittle	Geesey	Mackowski	Spencer
Bowser	Geist	Manmiller	Spitz
Brandt	George, C.	Micozzie	Stairs
Brown	George, M. H.	Miller	Steighner
Burd	Gladeck	Moehlmann	Stuban
Burns	Goebel	Mowery	Swift
Caltagirone	Greenfield	Nahill	Taddonio
Cessar	Grieco	Noye	Taylor, E. Z.
Cimini	Gruppo	Perzel	Telek
Clark, M. R.	Halverson	Peterson	Thomas
Cornell	Hasay	Piccola	Vroon
Coslett	Hayes, Jr., S.	Pitts	Wass
Cunningham	Helfrick	Polite	Wenger
DeVerter	Honaman	Pott	Wilson
Davies	Johnson, E. G.	Punt	Wilt
Dietz	Kanuck	Pyles	Wright, Jr., J.
Dininni	Klingaman	Rocks	Yohn
Dorr	Kowalshyn	Ryan	Zeller
Durham	Lashinger	Salvatore	Zord
Fischer	Lehr	Scheaffer	
Fisher	Levi	Schweder	Seltzer,
Foster, W. W.	Lewis	Serafini	Speaker

NOT VOTING—11

Alden	Gray	Knepper	Pratt
Freind	Hayes, D. S.	Madigan	Weidner
Giammarco	Hutchinson, W.	Milanovich	

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

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

CONSTITUTIONAL POINT OF ORDER

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, before I speak on my amendment, the first of my amendments, I would like to do two things: I would like, first of all, to see if I can locate my glasses, and I have done that; and I would like to raise, before we entertain the amendments, I would like to raise, Mr. Speaker, a point of constitutionality with regard to the legislation.

The SPEAKER. For the information of the gentleman, Mr. Williams, the amendment he sent to the desk has not been distributed. The clerk will recall the amendments and send them back to the gentleman.

Does the gentleman have any other amendments which he has circulated on the floor of the House?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on my amendments, I do have other amendments which have been circulated, but my point, before anything on that, is, I want to raise a point of constitutionality with regard to the legislation that we are seeking to amend before we even get into the question of amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman, Mr. Williams, questioning the constitutionality of HB 2044?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. All right.

The question of constitutionality will be decided by a majority of the members of the floor. Those who believe that HB 2044 is constitutional will vote "aye"; those who believe it is not constitutional will vote "no."

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I beg your pardon.

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation, HB 2044, is unconstitutional, and it is unconstitutional in many basic respects. I believe that if we pass the bill and enact it into law, we will once again reveal ourselves as being irresponsible and expensive.

Mr. Speaker, just this very day as I was coming to the legislature, I read a public account of a bill which we passed and assumed, although we were warned, there would be some expense. We were told also there was no need. It appears from the article on the subject of geology—read today's newspaper, the Inquirer—and it indicates that there is tax money that we, in our wisdom, did not take the time to understand. Indeed, it appears that the very need that was suggested does not, in fact, exist.

So by saying that, Mr. Speaker, and on the constitutionality, I am just saying to this body that a very deliberate look into that question is required, is fundamentally necessary and is wise fiscally. Specifically, Mr. Speaker, there are

provisions in this bill which determine what can happen with regard to whether or not you can get help if you are poor, depending on your age. Mr. Speaker, that is outright discrimination of the highest order.

I am 48 now and sometimes I forget it. Sometimes I try to do the things I did when I was 21 or 19 at Penn State, because my head and my spirit are willing, but my body is not. I look back and I wonder about the things as a young man I thought I could do. I did not think I could do a heck of a lot, because I looked at the older guys, 48, and they appeared so wise. Now I am 48 and I wish I had the body of a 19-year-old with the wisdom I have achieved at 48, and I am in fact a male, and I do not want to type.

Mr. Speaker, we have learned in the last several years a very clear lesson throughout this country, and that is that women have insisted upon their equal rights. Even though they vote us into office - President, Senator, Congressman - for all those years we have discriminated against women in every facet of our lives. They are about the business of ERA and everything else, straightening that out. Indeed, this legislature did that a few years ago. We have recognized that senior citizens in this Commonwealth have spoken to the issue of age, and our Constitution and legal provisions speak to that.

In this bill, Mr. Speaker, whether you are older or younger, what fundamental difference does it make if you are poor? And I suggest to this body, because we are not talking about race and we are not talking about religion, all those things that makes things sometimes a little less clear; we are talking about economic and age discrimination. And I suggest to this body that HB 2044, if you entertain the thought of discriminating against people on the basis of age simply because they happen to be poor, it is clearly unconstitutional. If we pass this bill or amend this bill next year or the following year, who is going to stand here and be responsible for all the money you are going to waste, all the immorality we are going to expend, who is going to stand up and do that? No, not one here and not the Governor of this state, because we very conveniently forget and we move on to the next awesome issue with the same approach.

There are other provisions, Mr. Speaker, in this bill, which also speak to those discriminatory categories which I suggest are equally unconstitutional. I might add that a thorough look at this bill and the history of public assistance in and of itself would disallow in this economic period, from a constitutional standpoint, this bill. So in summing up I suggest to you, the discriminatory and unconstitutional provision based on age, is a little less clear, but I predict that later on it will be clear that there is discrimination based on other things that have economic impact on classes of people that courts look at. So as it is applied, it is also unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, I, in calling for a "no" vote on its constitutionality, suggest to the members of this body that by your vote that means that you have taken the time to look; and by your vote that means that you have gotten information;

and by your vote that means that you will not waste the taxpayers' money in the name of trying to save some; that you will not get caught next year having spent, like we did in the geology bill, millions and millions of dollars in a mechanism that is expensive and discriminatory. That when you vote on the constitutionality, at least, that if you have an informed vote and that you, each and every one of you, Republican and Democrat, women and men, young and old, will take personal responsibility of saying, I am voting knowing that I would not cost the taxpayers money and disrupt a system that is in place and do a phyrnic and empty act.

I urge a "no" vote, Mr Speaker, on the constitutionality of HB 2044 and I ask and urge anyone who has any input—and especially those who drafted this bill—on that question, that they ought to have it interchanged so we can intelligently know where we are on that fundamental question before we proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I have finished on that point, but I say to the Speaker that on the amendment question, I had had my amendments distributed some time ago, a long time ago. I do not know where they are, but I will have it redistributed if they are not.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

For the information of the gentleman, the amendment clerk in the front has no record of receiving that particular set of amendments.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Cohen, on the constitutionality.

Mr. COHEN. Article 14, Section 1 of the Constitution of the United States reads as follows: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction equal protection of the laws."

This provision has been used repeatedly by the Federal courts to mandate programs that states have never had, such as programs for the handicapped, programs for prisons, programs for the poor. Provision has been used by the courts of the United States to stop states from striking programs that have already been instituted. This bill, HB 2044, violates the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States and will so be held by any Federal court. I think we ought to save ourselves a lot of bitterness and a lot of aggravation by striking down the constitutionality of it now.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to support the motion made by my colleague, Mr. Williams, on the question of constitutionality. It seems to me that if we are to deal honestly in this House of Representatives, then in a bill such as the bill that we are facing today, it should at least

allow us the opportunity to understand what is being done. I believe very basically that we are watching a group of people who are less fortunate than us really be discriminated upon. Unless there is some attempt or some way to bring this to the forefront of the members who are sitting here, then this issue will never be raised. But you cannot talk about taking 80,000 people off the rolls of this Commonwealth and not have anything in it for substitution. It seems to me that any of the members here in this House of Representatives, if tomorrow some law was enacted that said that they would take each and everyone's paycheck away from them and they would have nothing in its place, I wonder what you would do.

It seems to me that that human element is left out each time when we deal with issues like this, and I raise that the constitutionality of that question provides that there was really no need for us to have a Constitution of the United States if in fact it can be violated right on the floor of this House without even consideration to the human beings whom we are saying that we want to affect. It always has been a process by which people have been able to go through in order to deal with that, and today we are witnessing again a type of movement that does not give that human factor any feeling, any warmth or conciliation whatsoever. I just say that maybe you need to reach inside your own heart and say, what kind of impact will that have on people who are less fortunate, who are not like myself, who are not millionaires, who are not lawyers, who do not hold other jobs, but are those individuals who may be in a particular situation who say to a number of us that we should do something about this welfare system, that perhaps there are other approaches; but because it sounds politically correct and because we are running for reelection—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman please confine his remarks to the constitutionality?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes, I will, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I would say that if we are to talk about the Constitution, then perhaps we need to reach into the constitution of our souls and recognize the fact that to displace these individuals off of the rolls, to take them off the rolls and to give them nothing in its place is unconstitutional by itself. That to me, Mr. Speaker, is the basics of our argument today, that if we are really sincere about efforts towards taking people off welfare, then let us look at all the ramifications that are involved.

As I close on this point, I say that you are doing something that is unlawful; that you are doing something that violates the law; and the constitutionality of this particular bill, because it is unconstitutional and will not stand up in court—this bill is unconstitutional—I think that if we deal with it now, perhaps there is something else that can be considered in dealing with a very complex issue. To have those persons who presently sit in welfare pitted against one another because they are in one category or another does

not eliminate the particular problem. On those bases, Mr. Speaker, I raise the constitutionality question and ask that the members vote that this bill is unconstitutional.

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

Mr. ZELLER. Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken, would you explain to us that a "yes" vote will be for the constitutionality or a "no" vote, please.

The SPEAKER. On the question of constitutionality, those who believe that HB 2044 is constitutional will vote "aye"; those who believe it to be unconstitutional will vote "nay."

The members will proceed to vote.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—131

Anderson	Foster, W. W.	McCall	Sieminski
Armstrong	Foster, Jr., A.	McClatchy	Sirianni
Arty	Fryer	McKelvey	Smith, E. H.
Austin	Gallen	McVerry	Smith, L. E.
Belardi	Gamble	Mackowski	Spencer
Bennett	Gannon	Manmiller	Spitz
Bittle	Geesey	Michlovic	Stairs
Bowser	Geist	Micozzie	Steighner
Brandt	George, C.	Miller	Stuban
Brown	George, M. H.	Moehlmann	Sweet
Burd	Gladeck	Mowery	Swift
Burns	Goebel	Murphy	Taddonio
Caltagirone	Goodman	Nahill	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Grabowski	Noye	Taylor, F.
Chess	Greenfield	O'Brien, B. F.	Telek
Cimini	Grieco	O'Brien, D. M.	Thomas
Clark, M. R.	Gruppo	O'Donnell	Vroon
Cochran	Halverson	Perzel	Wachob
Cole	Hasay	Peterson	Wass
Cornell	Hayes, Jr., S.	Piccola	Wenger
Coslett	Helfrick	Pitts	Wilson
Cowell	Honaman	Polite	Wilt
Cunningham	Johnson, E. G.	Pott	Wright, D. R.
DeMedio	Kanuck	Punt	Wright, Jr., J.
DeVerter	Klingaman	Pyles	Yahner
Davies	Kowalshyn	Reed	Yohn
Dawida	Kukovich	Ritter	Zeller
Dietz	Lashingier	Rocks	Zitterman
Dininni	Laughlin	Ryan	Zord
Dorr	Lehr	Salvatore	Zwinkl
Duffy	Levi	Scheaffer	
Durham	Lewis	Schweder	Seltzer,
Fischer	Lynch, E. R.	Serafini	Speaker
Fisher			

NAYS—47

Barber	Hoeffel	Mrkonic	Rodgers
Beloff	Hutchinson, A.	Mullen	Schmitt
Berson	Irvic	Musto	Seventy
Borski	Itkin	Novak	Shadding
Cessar	Johnson, J. J.	Oliver	Shupnik
Cohen	Knight	Pievsky	Stewart
DeWeese	Kolter	Pistella	Street
Dombrowski	Letterman	Pucciarelli	Trello
Dumas	Livengood	Rappaport	Wargo
Earley	McIntyre	Rhodes	White
Gallagher	McMonagle	Richardson	Williams
Harper	Manderino	Rieger	

NOT VOTING—18

Alden	Gatski	Jones	Milanovich
Clark, B. D.	Giammarco	Knepper	Petrarca
DiCarlo	Gray	Levin	Pratt
Fee	Hayes, D. S.	Madigan	Weidner
Freind	Hutchinson, W.		

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the constitutionality of the bill was sustained.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mrs. HARPER offered the following amendment:

Amend Sec. 1, (Sec. 432), page 3, line 3, by inserting after "offered" at wages above the standard poverty level

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Mrs. Harper.

Mrs. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, my amendment states that before a person is removed from the welfare rolls, they should be offered a job at wages above the poverty level. I know personally of over 100 men and women who are trying to find jobs. I have applications of men and women who are now on welfare and are going out daily trying to find jobs. I heard on WDAS Radio this morning a man who called in concerning a job, or someone called in and said that he was fired from his job because he did not get along with his boss, and this particular man said, "I will take any kind of abuse or do just about anything in order to get a job." So I ask you to adopt my amendment to see that people are offered a job before they are put out into the street without anything. Thank you.

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

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment as proposed by Mrs. Harper. I find that if this concept would pass, all of those persons, and particularly in rural areas throughout this Commonwealth, who may not be receiving certain wages may as well quit their jobs and go on the rolls of public assistance. There is no incentive for them to continue working.

The standard poverty level is more. An individual who would be offered jobs, perhaps, at the minimum wage of \$3.10 per hour could reject employment and continue to be subsidized by those individuals who are working. Therefore, I would ask my colleagues to join with me in opposing this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Mrs. Harper.

Mrs. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, on the stand that the poverty-level wage is only \$3,000—I do not have the exact figures on that. Just one moment please. I have the information that for a family of four the wages are \$6,000.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Mrs. HARPER. I intended to withdraw this amendment. Mr. Speaker, may I withdraw this amendment?

I have another amendment that states that people should be hired at the minimum wage instead of above the poverty level. That is the amendment I intended to offer and it is being printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the lady will withdraw her amendment to HB 2044. The Chair hears none.

Does the lady indicate that she has another set of amendments to offer at this time?

Mrs. HARPER. That is all at this time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

Does the gentleman, Mr. Barber, have a set of amendments?

Mr. BARBER. Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to offer my amendments a little later, please.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has a calendar that is marked with 15 or 18 members who have amendments. The Chair has a problem in deciding who should be recognized first to offer their amendments.

The Chair would hope that the members would be prepared to offer their amendments when the Chair calls upon them.

Will the gentleman, Mr. Barber, indicate to the Chair when later would be satisfactory to him? Would Mr. Barber indicate to the Chair when it would be a satisfactory time to be recognized for his amendments?

Mr. BARBER. I would say approximately the next hour and a half, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Is Mr. Street indicating that he is not going to offer any amendments today to this bill.

Mr. STREET. The gentleman, Mr. Street, so indicates.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. STREET offered the following amendment:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 432), page 3, by inserting between lines 9 and 10 (iv) No person shall be deemed transitionally needy unless and until each agency of State government and party contracting with any State agency, department or instrumentality of the State has set aside ten percent of its jobs at prevailing wages and working conditions for welfare recipients and has filled these positions over a two-year period with those receiving general assistance currently or those who have received such aid within one year from the effective date of this act.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, is there a fiscal note attached to this?

The SPEAKER. The Chair had anticipated that question being raised. The Chair queried the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. McClatchy, and was informed there is a fiscal note attached to this. It has been circulated to all the members.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Can we have a copy of it?

The SPEAKER. It was indicated to the Chair that the fiscal note has been distributed. If the gentleman does not have a copy, he will see that the gentleman, Mr. Richardson, receives another copy. Can Mr. McClatchy see that Mr. Richardson receives a copy of the fiscal note, please?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Can we ask how many members have received it, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman repeat his question?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Can we ask how many members have already received it?

The SPEAKER. All 203 members received their fiscal notes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not know how you can make that statement without asking.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had asked the chairman of the Appropriations Committee sometime prior to the gentleman, Mr. Richardson, asking the Chair. The Chair had been advised that the fiscal note had been circulated sometime past.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Today?

The SPEAKER. No, no, it was prior to today.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to interrogate our chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Mr. McClatchy.

Mr. McCLATCHY. Mr. Speaker, I have not been following the gentleman. Which fiscal note are you checking on?

Mr. RICHARDSON. He said they were all distributed. Which one is he talking about?

Mr. McCLATCHY. I want to know which one you are talking about.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The same one the Speaker is talking about, sir.

The SPEAKER. The same one the gentleman inquired about. The Chair is understanding that Mr. Richardson inquired whether or not HB 2044 had a fiscal note attached to it. The answer is "yes."

Mr. RICHARDSON. May I have a copy of it, please, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. McCLATCHY. We will get you a copy.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to ask our minority chairman on the Appropriations Committee some questions.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Street to explain his amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to ask Mr. Pievsky some questions.

The SPEAKER. The question before the House is the amendment offered by Mr. Street.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I raised a point of order.

The SPEAKER. When the House has disposed of this question, we will take up the next question, but the question before the House is the Street amendment.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Street to explain his amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. RICHARDSON. I raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would just like to ask some questions about the fiscal note now that I have a copy in my hand.

The SPEAKER. It is not a proper point of order to be raised at this time. The question before the House is the amendment offered by Mr. Street. When the Street amendment is disposed of, the Chair will then recognize Mr. Richardson.

Mr. STREET. Mr. Speaker, is Mr. Street in order?

The SPEAKER. As far as the Chair is concerned, the gentleman has always been in order.

Mr. STREET. May the gentleman speak?

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

Mr. STREET. Okay.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment A5322 goes to the question of jobs. What it says is that each department or each state agency should lay aside 10 percent of its work force for GA recipients. If that is done, we can take a substantial number of our general assistance recipients off welfare. Title XX now provides for the Department of Health and Welfare to employ 4 percent of their employment staff to be GA recipients, and the Department of Health and Welfare refuses to implement that. Now that should tell us all something.

I also point out that I have here in my possession, a computer printout, which I took the pains, Mr. Speaker, to get a hold of, and right now on the state level there are 600 job vacancies, on the state level right now. Anybody is free to have this information to look at it. But if you review this information and you look at it, every available job on here calls for 2 years' experience, 3 years' experience, college degrees, 15 years' experience. Why are these jobs not filled? I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, how can we have a bill that would ask to take people off general assistance and we have right now vacancies in each agency of the state that we are not putting these people in? With that, I urge the approval of this amendment. It assures jobs for people.

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

Mr. PUNT. I would oppose the amendment because it would hamper the operation of state government by giving welfare recipients priority in state hiring regardless of existing civil service and veteran preference policies previously enacted by this General Assembly. In addition the Commonwealth could be placing unenforceable burdens on the vendors. Were the amendment to, which Mr. Street is offering, be enacted into this bill, the bill itself could not be administered and therefore able-bodied welfare recipients would remain on the rolls.

Mr. STREET. Will the gentleman, Mr. Punt, stand for brief interrogation.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Punt, permit himself to be interrogated? The gentleman indicates that he will, and Mr. Street may proceed.

Mr. STREET. Mr. Speaker, do you have any information that would show that it would be too cumbersome or impossible to administrate the departments, the agencies of the state employing the unemployed?

Mr. PUNT. It simply breaches the Civil Service Act.

Mr. STREET. It what?

Mr. PUNT. It breaches the Civil Service Act, veterans' preference, and so on.

Mr. STREET. You mean to lay aside 10 percent of the jobs that would be available in the Department of Labor and Industry, would be a breach of the Civil Service Employment Act?

Mr. PUNT. Very possibly so, yes.

Mr. STREET. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate in this debate that we not deal with "very possibles"; that we not deal with figments of our imagination. We can always conjure up arguments that deal with the imagination but not facts. Now, I have taken the pains to do some research on this bill, and I have taken the pains to find out some factual information, and we do in this State of Pennsylvania have 650 vacancies of jobs right now that call for criteria beyond the GA recipients' capabilities. Now when we are talking about taking them off because there are jobs available, I can think of no better agency to use as an example that jobs are not available and where there are job vacancies than in the state. When I asked a specific question about why cannot the state agencies hire these people, I come up with the figment of one's imagination and I do not understand that.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs, Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STREET. I raised the question to the gentleman, Mr. Punt, to which I got an unsatisfactory answer; and I raised the question again, and I got no answer, and the Speaker is moving forward. I would like a definitive answer from the gentleman, if I may.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman, Mr. Punt, completed his answer?

Mr. PUNT. I thought I had completed it satisfactorily for the gentleman from Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman completed his answer?

Mr. PUNT. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates that he has completed his answer. Does the gentleman, Mr. Street, have any further questions.

Mr. STREET. I have a question of the Speaker, if it is in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will listen diligently. It is not proper for the Chair to debate with a member from the podium, but the Chair will listen to the interrogation of the gentleman and respond accordingly. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. STREET. I would like, from the majority side, to get some clarity, in view of, Mr. Speaker, this Inquirer article that alluded to the fact that the black caucus was going to be filibustering this bill. Does this mean, Mr. Speaker, that our questions of legitimacy can be given just any old kind of answer and we will be forced to move on or put in the position by the gentleman, Mr. Punt, that we are in fact trying to filibuster the bill?

The SPEAKER. If the Chair understood the question, it is the opinion of the Chair that a member is only obligated to answer a question to the best of his ability or knowledge to answer it, and within those confines, the gentleman, Mr. Punt, apparently has responded to Mr. Street's question.

The question of whether or not an answer response is satisfactory is most times strictly a question of whether or not the member who asked the question agrees with the answer he receives.

The gentleman may proceed if he has additional—

Mr. STREET. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to get into a debate with you or your Parliamentarian, but we are talking about an answer that went to a Federal Register. When I said, well, does the Federal Register forbid the state agencies, which goes right to the heart of my amendment; and I asked, did the State Register forbid the state, or would it be a violation for the different agencies to lay aside 10 percent of its jobs for the unemployed? Then the gentleman said, "I would imagine so." But he used that as an answer to urge the defeat of an amendment based on the fact that it could possibly be illegal or violate some law. Well, I want to know if it does. If it violates the Federal Register, then I will withdraw the amendment. If it does not, then I want to push forward, because I think it is a reasonable amendment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman, Mr. Punt, have any further response to the question?

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, I can only state that this does breach the State Civil Service Act in regarding veterans' preference, and so on. I do not know really what more the gentleman, Mr. Street, wants.

Mr. STREET. I have nothing further, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman, Mr. Punt, consent to a brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates that he will. The gentleman, Mr. White, may proceed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, you stated that if we were to adopt the Street amendment No. A5322, that we would be breaching the Civil Service Act as it relates to certain cate-

gories of people presently covered under that statute, is that correct?

Mr. PUNT. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not this General Assembly, Mr. Speaker, who determines the content of the Civil Service Act and who, in fact, would be subject to any special kinds of treatment such as is afforded the veterans in this Commonwealth?

Mr. PUNT. Yes, but I do not believe it is desirable.

Mr. WHITE. No; I did not ask you whether it was desirable. I asked you whether or not this General Assembly does in fact single out special categories of people to receive preferential treatment with respect to perspective employment with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania? I believe your answer is that that is correct?

Mr. PUNT. That is what I just said, yes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, what then would prohibit this General Assembly from instituting language that would require a 10-percent set-aside of jobs, available positions, within the Commonwealth for persons formerly on general assistance or categorized according to the Milton Street amendment as transitionally needy?

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, I have very strong reservations regarding the amendment itself to begin with. But, secondly, being that it does involve the State Civil Service Act, I would think, really, it would be appropriate if we voted against this amendment and instead refer this amendment as an amendment to the Civil Service Act itself; not as an amendment to the Welfare Code.

Mr. WHITE. Would you sponsor such an amendment?

Mr. PUNT. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. We believe that one, too. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments on the Street amendment if I could.

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the haste of the prime sponsor of this legislation to continue to push it through this body, he has overlooked what I believe to be the most essential question concerning the "able-bodied employable presently on the General Assistance rolls." That essential question would be the availability of jobs here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; not only as it relates to the private sector, but also as it relates to the public sector. We have taken the time to look into and to investigate some facts regarding GA recipients and their employability. What we have noted, Mr. Speaker, is that within the city of Philadelphia one such agency which deals primarily with the unemployed, the underemployed, persons who are otherwise classified as needy for falling below the poverty guidelines, people who are presently on the GA rolls that the Philadelphia Urban League reported in its quarterly report on its employment projects that more than 2,097 persons had been employed. Of that, roughly 2,100 persons, 90 percent of them, were black; 100 percent of them were at or below the official poverty line. The

program placements regarding those 2,100 individuals broke out as follows: Subsidize placement, which would be classified as placement with the assistance of Federal money through CETA - Comprehensive Employment and Training Act - and other types of job training programs accounted for 874. Unsubsidized placement accounting for private industry, accounted for 123.

Obviously from these figures compiled by the Philadelphia Urban league, what we are actually looking at is approximately 5 percent of those individuals who are at or below the poverty level, otherwise on GA. Only 5 percent of them were able to be placed in private employable situations within the city of Philadelphia.

If this General Assembly is so bent upon removing some 80,000 people from the General Assistance rolls, then such a move must be also coupled with a commitment to find employment within state agencies, within state departments, within the government of this Commonwealth so that these 80,000 people do in fact have some other alternative rather than the rolls of general assistance in this state.

HB 2044 severely neglects to answer that question. Through the passage of the Street amendment, which in my mind I have characterized as a 10-percent set-aside amendment, we at least began to address this important question of what to do with 80,000 people able to work, willing to work, wanting to work, yet unable to find a place that would allow them to work. If this General Assembly is going to be the initiator of any action which deprives people of the right to eat, the right for shelter, the right for clothing, then this General Assembly must also provide the initiative to see to it that those 80,000-plus people have the opportunity to secure employment within the government of this Commonwealth. To request or to mandate that 10 percent of all the state jobs, state agencies and state departments be earmarked for those individuals on general assistance, in no way contradicts the same attitude that this General Assembly took with respect to veterans' preference. For during the discussion of veterans' preference, it was stated over and over again that these people, as veterans returning home from war, returning home from military service, deserve preferential treatment because they too were transitionally needy. The transitionally needy is not solely limited to a member of the armed forces who has served his time. It is also meant to mean those individuals who have worked, who have maintained gainful employment, who have now been laid off, whose unemployment compensation has expired and who have no other alternative but to turn to this state, this Commonwealth, for means of assistance.

If we are serious about bringing jobs and creating jobs and setting the type of atmosphere which discourages one to use welfare or general assistance as a crutch, then we would have no alternative but to start at home, and at home begins by this General Assembly mandating that 10 percent of those jobs available in the Commonwealth through state departments, state agencies, and the various bureaus set aside that amount of positions for persons who

have been categorized "transitionally needy." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Street, for the second time.

Mr. STREET. I have one comment. We have checked with the Federal Register. It would not be a violation of any regulation if the GA recipients were required to take the Civil Service examination first, and based on whether they passed or failed the examination, they would then be placed into a slot. And all those who pass would be eligible to get put into a slot, a job, in one of those agencies without violating any of the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Johnson, wish to debate the bill?

Mr. J. J. JOHNSON. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Johnson, is in order and may proceed.

Mr. J. J. JOHNSON. When I talked to Mr. Punt about his bill about a month ago, I thought Mr. Punt was sincere in saying that he was going to try and find jobs for people. Well, when I hear him stand here before this committee today and tell us that he would not support trying to get 10 percent of the state jobs for people he is trying to find work for, I am surprised. Because, Mr. Speaker, back home in Philadelphia, the unions are saying the same thing you just said. They do not want these people to work with them at smaller wages. And you are telling us today that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has a rule that would not allow these people to work. So what is the purpose of this bill? We are saying to this Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, set 10 percent of these jobs aside, and you oppose it. We are saying to the people back in Philadelphia, put these people to work, and the unions said "no." So where are we going? This is a question that needs to be answered, Mr. Speaker, before any type of bill like this is passed.

I would support the recommittal, because there are no answers in this bill. Until you can tell me and this House how are you going to put these people to work, I do not see how we can consider this bill. You tell this House today you do not believe that you would support 10 percent of the people working in this state. Then where are they going? Can I ask you that question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask Mr. Punt a question, if he will stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Punt, stand for interrogation? The gentleman indicates that he will. Mr. Johnson may proceed.

Mr. J. J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, do you really oppose welfare recipients going to work for the state?

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, I said very clearly to you—I believe that it was Mr. Street or maybe it was Mr. White—when I was asked would I support the amendment to the State Civil Service Act, I said, yes; not to the Welfare Code.

Mr. J. J. JOHNSON. In other words, you would support putting people to work to take them off welfare? Is that what you are saying?

Mr. PUNT. If they were qualified for those various individual positions, most emphatically. But let me continue, please? You said, where are these people going to go, regarding jobs and so forth? The facts are, of the 81,000 people, 14 percent have white-collar jobs skills, 46 percent have blue-collar jobs skills, 24 percent have agriculture and farm-related service skills.

What I am saying is that I found that a lot of these people do have skills. I have a basic contention there is work available. It may not be a job that pays what that person thinks that person is worth. It may not be a job that that person may like. It may not be a job which is four blocks from their home. It may not be a job in that town, but there is work available.

Mr. J. J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, only one question I ask you: Would you support this amendment to put people to work with the state? That is all I asked you.

Mr. PUNT. I have already said twice now, yes.

Mr. J. J. JOHNSON. Oh, yes, you will. But you will support the amendment?

Mr. PUNT. Not on this bill, not on the Welfare Code. I said yes, on the Civil Service Act.

Mr. J. J. JOHNSON. You are confusing me. We are trying to pass a bill in this House—

The SPEAKER. The question before the House is the amendment.

Mr. J. J. JOHNSON. That is what I am discussing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Johnson, asked Mr. Punt whether or not he would support this amendment. The gentleman, Mr. Punt, indicated, no, that he would support another amendment. Does the gentleman have any further questions?

Mr. J. J. JOHNSON. Did you say you would support another amendment, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. PUNT. Not to the Welfare Code, I said. I said to the State Civil Service Act, perhaps.

Mr. J. J. JOHNSON. What Mr. Street's amendment says is, we will put welfare people to work with the state. Will you support that?

Mr. PUNT. Not the way that this is worded, no; Mr. Street's amendment, no.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Punt, has responded on three occasions to Mr. Johnson's questions. On all three occasions, the answer has been no.

Mr. J. J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the way I understand this amendment, it says, to set aside jobs for people that are coming off the welfare, if I am correct. That is all this amendment says. I am trying to find out if the set-aside for welfare recipients, whom we are trying to take off the welfare rolls, is appropriate or not, by Mr. Punt. That is all I ask. I did not ask for the qualification, and I did not ask for anything else. Will the state lead in trying to get people jobs that we are going to take off the welfare roll? If you are saying in this House, if the members are saying in this House that they will not support a 10-percent set-aside, then the unions are saying the same thing that Mr. Punt and the rest of the members who vote against this bill will be saying.

All I am asking you to do, Mr. Speaker and members of this House, is to let us lead the way and set aside 10 percent of these jobs for people whom we are going to take off welfare.

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Punt made a very interesting comment as he was throwing out statistics concerning the number of people, the percentages, of those who are on general assistance who have specific skills in specifically skilled categories. I would implore this House to pay strict attention to what Mr. Punt said. What he said was that these people who are on general assistance, some 16 percent, I believe you said, had white-collar skills; another 40-some odd percent had blue-collar skills. My question then becomes, you tell us where the white-collar jobs are. You tell us where the blue-collar jobs are. When this state has lost 218,000 manufacturing jobs in the last 10 years, you tell me where those blue-collar jobs are? Tell me, Mr. Speaker, what are those persons who used to work for Two Guys and E. J. Korvettes supposed to do when those stores closed? They have marketable skills. But they do not have department stores opening up in Philadelphia or in those suburban counties. You tell me what a steelworker has done after he has been employed for some 20 years in a plant in western Pennsylvania; the plant closes; there are no other steel plants in the area; he will get one check for one 30-day period in any 12 months, and you can stand there and tell this House a bunch of poppycock about jobs being available. If the jobs were available, half the people in this room would not be sitting here.

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

Mr. EARLEY. I wish to interrogate Mr. Punt, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Punt, indicates he will stand for interrogation. Mr. Earley may proceed.

Mr. EARLEY. First, Mr. Speaker, I would like you to state again your reason for opposition to the Street amendment.

Mr. PUNT. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. Would you repeat that again?

Mr. EARLEY. I would ask you to state—I am having trouble understanding it. Therefore, I would ask you to state again—your reason for opposition to the Street amendment.

Mr. PUNT. First, it is a breach of the State Civil Service Act. Secondly, I have very strong reservations that we, as an elected body, as a legislature, should establish preferential treatment for individuals who may be on the rolls of public welfare and of giving them preference over anybody else who may be eligible for those jobs. Nobody, nobody ever told me where jobs were. I always had to go look and I always had to compete against the other competition.

Mr. EARLEY. Mr. Speaker, exactly what is the purpose of HB 2044? Exactly, what is the thrust of HB 2044?

Mr. PUNT. We are restructuring general assistance in Pennsylvania that would restructure it in two categories: the chronically needy and the transitionally needy. The *chronically needy* are those individuals who are physically or mentally unable, that cannot work; individuals who may be blind or deaf or crippled and so forth. The transitionally needy category are those individuals whom we have been discussing here for the last hour or hour and a half now, the 81,000 people.

Mr. EARLEY. Is it a fact, Mr. Speaker, that in your definition of transitionally needy, there are a large number of those people who you consider employable?

Mr. PUNT. Yes.

Mr. EARLEY. And is it a fact that you just stated recently that a number of those people have white-collar skills and blue-collar skills?

Mr. PUNT. Yes.

Mr. EARLEY. Is it also a fact, Mr. Speaker, that over the past several years this Commonwealth has lost an inestimable number of jobs in industry and in white-collar levels?

Mr. PUNT. Yes.

Mr. EARLEY. Is it a fact that, with respect to veterans preferences, an attempt was made by the Federal Government and the state government to see that those people, who had served this Country and were coming back, got a special opportunity to get employment?

Mr. PUNT. Yes.

Mr. EARLEY. Now, are you saying, Mr. Speaker, that these employables who are on the welfare rolls are a drain on the treasury of this Commonwealth, and yet you are unwilling to see that they be given some kind of preference in taking them off the rolls of this Commonwealth and, therefore, not being such a drain on the treasury?

Mr. PUNT. I cannot answer adequately, Mr. Speaker, as to if they are a drain or not. The individuals who are abusing the system, that are lazy, that are cheating the system, are *draining*. There are many individuals on the rolls who are not placed within that category.

Mr. EARLEY. My question, Mr. Speaker, had to do with employables. Is it your position that most of the people whom you are classifying as transitionally needy are cheating the system, are abusing the system? Is that your position?

Mr. PUNT. No.

Mr. EARLEY. Of the approximate 85,000 people who are expected to be removed from the welfare rolls pursuant to HB 2044, how many of them approximately, in your opinion, are in fact cheaters and frauds?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield? The question before the House is the amendment offered by Mr. Street. The Chair would hope that the members of the House will confine their questions to the subject before us. The gentleman, Mr. Earley, may proceed.

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, you all put a bill on the floor, tell us that we want to debate it. The debate on this amendment deals with set-aside for jobs and then he interrogated the gentleman, and then you tell him he cannot do it.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman, Mr. Richardson, will make his point of order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I already did.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was unable to hear him.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No problem. I will repeat it.

Mr. Speaker, you bring this bill to the floor of this House; tell us that you want to debate it; there are questions on the floor dealing specifically with jobs and set-aside jobs for people in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The gentleman, Mr. Earley, is interrogating Mr. Punt on the question, and you tell him that he is out of order. I think that it is wrong, and I think, Mr. Speaker, maybe we will have an intelligent debate, maybe—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman—

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have not finished my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Richardson, will please take his seat. The gentleman was recognized for a point of order. The gentleman is not making a point of order. In the opinion of the Chair, he is making a speech. The gentleman, Mr. Earley, may proceed.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2044 CONTINUED

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have not finished my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please take his seat. Mr. Earley is recognized.

Mr. EARLEY. I would like to repeat my question, Mr. Speaker, and point out to the Chair that I believe my questioning goes right to the heart of HB 2044.

The question I believe I asked was: Of the number of people anticipated being removed from the welfare rolls, the general assistance rolls, by HB 2044, approximately what percentage of them are in fact considered by the prime sponsor to be cheats and frauds?

Mr. PUNT. None of them are cheats and frauds. I cannot document that. The ones that I can document are the ones that have been removed, through the investigative process, from the rolls.

Mr. EARLEY. Is it not a fact, Mr. Speaker, that the category "transitionally needy" addresses itself to employables primarily?

Mr. PUNT. Unemployed employables, yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. EARLEY. Unemployed employables, is that correct?

Mr. PUNT. Ablebodied, yes.

Mr. EARLEY. Now, it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that legislation affecting other agencies and other codes of this Commonwealth is fairly frequently passed in this House of Representatives?

Mr. PUNT. Would you repeat that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. EARLEY. Your objection to this amendment, among others, is that it violates the Civil Service Code. My question is, is it not a fact that legislation frequently passes this House and this body that has impact on other laws and regulations of this Commonwealth?

Mr. PUNT. Yes.

Mr. EARLEY. I have no further questions. I would like to make some remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Earley, is in order and may proceed.

Mr. EARLEY. Mr. Speaker, part of the problem that we have here is the attitudes with which this question of welfare reform is approached. We have heard for the past several months many, many, many statements by the Governor and others as an attempt to bring about welfare reform in order to make certain that the truly needy are the ones who receive the benefit of the welfare program. Therefore, it must be presumed from that language that those who are to be removed from the welfare reforms are not truly needy. Now, the heart of this bill is not whether one is categorized as transitionally needy or chronically needy. I fail to see a great deal of difference between a transitionally needy person and a chronically needy person. What I see is a complete body of needy people.

What is meant by needy? The whole philosophy of the welfare system was designed to assist the citizens of this country, and, with respect to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the citizens of this Commonwealth to maintain themselves on a bare subsistence level, addressing themselves to the problems of housing, shelter and clothing. We have a category here that is called transitionally needy, meaning that these persons are temporarily on the welfare role. There is absolutely nothing wrong with that.

The figures will show that the overwhelming majority of those people on general assistance are there for less than 2 years. The figures will show that the overwhelming majority of those people on general assistance are between the ages of 21 and 26 years of age and are from single-family households. The figures will also show that in this Commonwealth the category of persons with the highest level of unemployment are those young persons between the ages of 21 and 30 years of age. The figures will also show that there has been a corresponding increase in the rolls of general assistance with the loss of employment here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Therefore, the Street amendment is attempting to correct something that is being done here in a rather meat-axe type manner and that is placed here on us, upon the Commonwealth, and to participate in assisting those persons who are employable, who are looking for employment and who cannot find employment, get some employment that they are qualified for. Why must the recipient of general assistance, because he or she is a recipient of general assistance, be treated as a second-class citizen? You are saying to this person, you are qualified; therefore we are not going to give you any assistance. At the same time you are qualified, but we are not going to

give you any assistance in finding employment. I submit that the Street amendment is one of the most realistic approaches to this problem, and I urge this legislative body to pass it.

POINT OF ORDER

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

Mr. ZELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ZELLER. Mr. Speaker, why is it that every speaker from Messrs. Richardson, White, Earley, Johnson, Punt, everybody uses the words "these people" and "those people"? Now, as soon as Zeller uses it, I get questioned. I would just like to ask that question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not sure which of these people to recognize.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and you folks.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the analysis Mr. Punt made a few minutes ago when he suggested that there would be some inability for us to provide what Mr. Street calls for in his amendment, the 10-percent lay-aside. Mr. Punt did indicate that in the blue-collar area, I believe, there were about 40,000 or 45,000 people and that just is not so. In the new-job openings in 1980, according to this chart which is prepared from the statistics of our own Bureau of Employment Security, there are 9,500 openings for blue-collar workers. On the other hand, it is very clear from the statistics, we have unemployed 380,000 people. Of those general assistance employable, we have 86,000 people, for a total of 466,000 people. In the new-job openings for 1980, we have among the white-collar, 30,600 people. It is obvious Mr. Speaker, that with Mr. Street's amendment, we can take every one of those 30,600 white-collar people in 1980 and they will be qualified and unemployable. We can take them, and they are employable. It would only take near one-third of what we have in general assistance employable. Not only are your statistics wrong in that respect, but this chart makes it absolutely clear that Mr. Street's amendment is morally necessary, fiscally prudent, and legislatively mandated. The figures are here. White-collar, 30,000. We can absorb them in the 10-percent lay-aside and we can absorb about one-third of those already who are GA employable. In the new-job openings, the jobs are there, the people are ready, and they are qualified. It is just not so that in the blue-collar area there are some 40,000 or 45,000; there are only 9,500.

I once again would urge this body just to think a little bit in terms of what you are doing, because we are contradicting fiscal prudence, we are contradicting moral obligation, and we are playing politics on things that we should have thought of doing already before this traumatic bill came before us. I would urge that you think very closely

about Mr. Street's amendment and how directly it approaches the problem.

I thank Mr. Street for the thorough research he made on this matter and the exhibit, one that every lawyer loves to have to make their point, and to you folks, the jury, here it is in black and white.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to interrogate Mr. Punt.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, can you tell the members of this House how many employable persons you have in your district?

The SPEAKER. The question before the House is the amendment offered by Mr. Street. The interrogation should be confined to the amendment. With those restraints, the gentleman, Mr. Richardson, may proceed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not believe that the question posed pertains to the amendment offered by Mr. Street.

Mr. RICHARDSON. You do not know what I am going to say, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has already asked the question. Will the gentleman repeat his question?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes. I would like to ask Mr. Punt if he could tell us how many employable persons he has in his district?

Mr. PUNT. Employable or—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Richardson, confine his interrogation to the question before the House. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will confine his interrogation to the question before the House. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes, Mr. Speaker. Could you tell us how many employable persons you have in your district?

The SPEAKER. The question is not germane to the question before the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is germane to the point that we are talking about, jobs. I am trying to get a clear picture of the employable persons who live in this gentleman's particular district. Certainly it is germane to the fact that this job set-aside program must relate to his district in some way, and all I am trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is find that out. I do not know how I could be ruled out of order when I have not in fact asked my question and have gotten an answer to proceed onto the next point that deals with the Street amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair, the question is not germane to the question before the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, Mr. Speaker, then I would ask that perhaps we could get another kind of opinion. I would appeal that my question is germane, Mr. Speaker, to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The avenue of redress the gentleman has is to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Of the employable persons who live in your district, Mr. Speaker, could you tell us how many that is?

Mr. PUNT. I cannot give you an exact number, no. We are looking at unemployment. I could give you that idea that we, in my area of Franklin County, do presently have about a 6.2-percent unemployment figure, presently.

Mr. RICHARDSON. 6.2 percent of what? Of the total?

Mr. PUNT. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Total unemployment?

Mr. PUNT. No. That is our unemployment figure of our work force in our county.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Of your work force you only have 6.2 persons who are unemployed.

Mr. PUNT. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Okay. Out of that 6.2 who are unemployed, Mr. Speaker, in relationship to the set-aside program that Mr. Street brings in this amendment, how many of them will be eligible for employment?

Mr. PUNT. How many will be eligible for what, employment? I did not understand your last question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Of those individuals who presently are unemployed in your district, in relationship to Mr. Street's amendment, how many of those individual persons are on welfare?

Mr. PUNT. I do not know.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. PUNT. I have no idea how many of those people.

Mr. RICHARDSON. You do not know. Okay, Mr. Speaker, could you then give us a picture of what is the number of persons we are specifically talking about that are unemployed in this Commonwealth?

Mr. PUNT. If we use figures just shared by Mr. Williams, I believe he said it was 360,000 or so.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Do you believe that figure?

Mr. PUNT. Let me say I have no reason to disbelieve it at this point.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Okay. Mr. Speaker, if that is true, can you tell us then, in terms of the set-aside program that is being offered as an alternative, a viable, meaningful alternative towards what you are asking for, could you tell us, Mr. Speaker, specifically where would we get these jobs to fill in the particular problem that you are trying to resolve?

Mr. PUNT. Very easily, Mr. Speaker. Introduce legislation by creating jobs in this state, instead of continuously voting on legislation which has resulted in jobs leaving from this state.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, Mr. Speaker, then you are a contradiction to yourself in relationship to the problems that are existing when you say that we should introduce a jobs bill. We said right here that we have a program right now in this amendment. You say you are opposed to that. Then you say go get legislation to put jobs in. Which do you want, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. PUNT. We are not, I will not, support this concept in this proposal as submitted. If you want to come up with a detailed process to reach or achieve that ultimate objective, fine. Introduce it in a bill form and let it take its legislative process.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, specifically, then, Mr. Speaker, what is our attempt here today? If this set-aside program offers a viable, meaningful alternative but you do not like it, and you are saying that you are one of the chief proponents of HB 2044, which says it will take all of these people off welfare, we have an alternative measure. We are asking you if you will support that. You say "no," you will not support jobs for people who will just be displaced off welfare. Then what will you support?

Mr. PUNT. I said I would, one, not support this as an amendment to the Welfare Code; two, I said that what we should do is to go out and look at what legislation we feel necessary which is going to stimulate jobs in Pennsylvania, job growth, involving our manufacturers and employers in Pennsylvania, product diversification, plant expansion, anything which would, one, create jobs; or, two, create job stability for existing jobs.

Now, this amendment will also delay the effective date of HB 2044, which would, one, reduce the amount of dollars that we would realize in savings by HB 2044 and therefore would have a snowball effect in delaying the use of those dollars in the job training in the educational bill, which has just been announced last week and which had been introduced into this House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is true, then why will you not support a jobs bill prior to bringing up HB 2044, which would, in effect, do exactly what you are after?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has asked the gentleman to confine his interrogation to the amendment before the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. He spoke on it, Mr. Speaker. I am responding.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman have any further questions on the amendments?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No question I do.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman wish to debate the amendment?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No, I want to ask him some more questions.

The SPEAKER. Within the confines of the question before the House, which is the Street amendment, the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Of those jobs then, Mr. Speaker, specifically dealing with the Street amendment, could you tell us then if that is not a viable way to, in effect, deal with the problem of jobs in this Commonwealth, and you resort back to the fact of saying that we need a jobs bill but not amending the Welfare Code. Then my question to you is, should we not do it before this concept?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has been very patient with the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have been very patient with the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman wish to continue his interrogation of the gentleman, Mr. Punt?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will confine his questions to the amendment before the House. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Okay. Mr. Speaker, if this amendment were to pass, if we pass this amendment and we would get a viable jobs program that would deal with 10-percent set-aside, would you make a motion at that time to reconsider the vote by which that amendment passed?

The SPEAKER. That is not a proper question. The Chair has ruled that that is not a proper question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Why, Mr. Speaker? It was asked as being relevant to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not required to explain his rulings. It is the gentleman's opportunity to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Not at this point, Mr. Speaker. I will continue.

The only point that I am making, Mr. Speaker, is, that if you oppose it and for some reason it falls, then it would seem to me that the thrust of what is being tried here is not really sincerely being addressed. I have not heard the answer yet to, Mr. Speaker, on dealing with set-aside programs and of how many blue-collar jobs are there in the Commonwealth. Since you brought these figures up, how many of those blue-collar jobs are available right now for people who are employable or ablebodied persons who are on GA?

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, I did not say the classification or the breakdown of the various jobs which are available in the Commonwealth. Mr. Williams did. I said the classification or the breakdown of the ablebodied recipients, the 81,000 which HB 2044 would affect. That is the classification.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, I am asking, what are they? What are the numbers?

Mr. PUNT. Fourteen percent white-collar; 46-percent blue-collar; 24-percent agricultural or farm-related.

Mr. RICHARDSON. And they are 14 percent and 46 percent of what?

Mr. PUNT. That is the number, the percentages, of the various categories of white-collar, blue-collar, agriculture or farm-related with regard to the 81,000 general assistance ablebodied recipients which HB 2044 would affect.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That would affect those amounts. Could you give us a breakdown, Mr. Speaker, in relationship to the Street amendment, of the number of those individuals who fall in grade categories as far as education is concerned, about those individuals who would be eligible in accordance to their marks or their education of those blue-collar jobs and farm-related jobs and other jobs you just spoke about?

Mr. PUNT. No, I could not, Mr. Speaker. I do not have that kind of a breakdown.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Do you not think that is important to try to deal with the fact that this set-aside program deals specifically with taking 10 percent of all of these jobs across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in these varying departments—and you mentioned agricultural on farming, which is where agriculture is—to know specifically what the educational background of these individuals is that we are, in fact, talking about taking off?

Mr. PUNT. Yes. Would you like to share that with us? Would you share that information with the House?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No. I am saying, do you not know that? I am saying that as the prime sponsor I am just dealing with the fact that this program being set-aside, whether or not—

The SPEAKER. The question posed to the gentleman has nothing to do with the amendment before us.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes it does, Mr. Speaker. It speaks—

The SPEAKER. The Chair has said the question has nothing to do with the question before the House. If the gentleman has the information, he may, in debating the amendment, give the membership the information.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess the best way to do it then, since we are not allowed to ask questions and try to get a fair and honest debate on the subject matter dealing with a bill that is going to affect 80,000 people—

The SPEAKER. The question before the House is not the bill. The question before the House is the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. And that is what I am dealing with, a set-aside program for—

The SPEAKER. The Chair has listened very diligently to the questioning of the gentleman, Mr. Richardson, and found that he has been far afield for the last half hour. The gentleman will confine his remarks to the question before the House, which is the amendment. The gentleman may continue.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have no further questions, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman. Does the gentleman wish to debate the amendment?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to speak on the amendment.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that the attitude that is being used in relationship to this particular amendment is not conducive to any other bills that we have on the floor of this House when other debate takes place. To talk about taking 80,000 people off welfare and then to have an amendment that deals specifically with a job set-aside program, and then to be hammered down by the Speaker, seems to me does not address the problem of decorum that is supposed to be displayed in this House of Representatives. It seems that if we are to be honest and

fair about the approach and that the eyes that are watching are calculating coldness, it seems to me that it does not reach the humaneness of the individuals who are being taken off welfare. Here is an alternative dealing with some jobs for individuals as saying let us go to the various departments where there are "X" number of jobs already there available, and we are saying that we do not want to seek out or reach out to that position. That upsets me, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask that the members of this House support the Street amendment; that it deals specifically with those particular problems and that we need not bypass this.

There are very clear facts to me, that according to the unemployed employable payees that are available in this Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, by the Department of Public Welfare, the highest grade of school completed by payee under the category of "none" is 150. The percentage of that is .18 percent. The unemployable payees estimated number in relationship to that same category is 750, or 1.56 percent. Of those who have an education of eighth grade or less, we have 12,300 in this Commonwealth, which adds up to about 15.10 percent. The estimated number according to unemployable payees is 13,950, or 29.6 percent. The gentleman who speaks on the amendment, Mr. Punt, is supposed to be the one who is enforcing this bill, is shoving it down our throats, does not have that information.

We are asking legitimate questions that deal with this. A high-school dropout, those in that complement in this Commonwealth, fall under the estimated number of about 30,900. That is about 37.9 percent in terms of its percentages. The unemployable payees estimated figure under that category is 18,900, or 39.3 percent. Also, those that are high-school graduates fall in the category of 28,500 in this Commonwealth, or available, and that is about 34.9 percent. But those that are unemployable payees that fall under the same category for the estimated figure is 11,100, or 23.1 percent.

Finally in the area of college, college dropouts, 5,700, or 7 percent, or under the unemployable payees estimate 1,350, or 2.8 percent. The college graduate who graduates, 2,250, or a percentage of 2.76. Under that category, 450 are under the unemployable payees, and the percentage of that is .94. Those that are unknown fall in the category of 1,650, Mr. Speaker, or a percentage 2.3. Out of that the unemployable figure reaches somewhere around the area of 1,500, or 3.13 percent. I share with you that, Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious piece of legislation that is being considered, and if the Street amendment is not considered in a legitimate and honest way, I think that a number of the members will miss the boat, because this is it. It gives an opportunity for those who are saying that they believe that we should have jobs for these folks without laying off 80,000 people just cold and uncalculated without any feeling or concern at all. Maybe one of them might be your brother or sister or someone in your family. How would you respond to the fact that 80,000 people just blanketly being laid off does not address itself to the problem of welfare or welfare reform. I seriously ask that the members vote in favor of this amendment.

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

Mr. TRELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Street amendment for some very good reasons. My district resides in the steel valley where approximately 28,000 jobs have been eliminated in the past year and a half. To deny them assistance would deny men and women who have paid taxes, and in some cases for as many as 30 years, to support the welfare program and then deny them the benefits that they have paid in towards a welfare program.

To say that able-bodied persons in welfare are not interested in work is a fallacy. In my district I am constantly being consulted by ex-steel workers for jobs of any kind. To address this problem to other legislation, as the gentleman suggested, would be like putting the cart before the horse. I say we address the problem of jobs prior to HB 2044 and then go on with a decent welfare program.

Now anybody that is not familiar with the steel valley area, I invite you to come out there and just get some of the calls that we get about people that are out of work. Their unemployment has run out and they sincerely want to work. They want jobs; they do not want welfare. But this would deny them assistance from programs that they paid taxes to support for 30 years. If you are going to do that, then you are going to see a revolt like you never saw before. Not from welfare recipients but from honest people that want to work. You think about it and support the Street program and give them a leg up on it anyway. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—60

Austin	Goodman	McIntyre	Rhodes
Barber	Grabowski	Manderino	Richardson
Berson	Harper	Michlovic	Rieger
Cappabianca	Hutchinson, A.	Mrkonic	Ritter
Chess	Irvis	Mullen	Rodgers
Clark, B. D.	Itkin	Murphy	Schmitt
Cohen	Johnson, J. J.	Novak	Seventy
Cowell	Jones	O'Brien, B. F.	Stewart
DeWeese	Knight	Oliver	Street
Dawida	Kolter	Petrarca	Stuban
Dombrowski	Kukovich	Pievsky	Trello
Dumas	Laughlin	Pistella	White
Earley	Letterman	Pucciarelli	Williams
Gallagher	Livengood	Rappaport	Wright, D. R.
Gatski	McCall	Reed	Zwinkl

NAYS—115

Anderson	Foster, W. W.	McClatchy	Smith, E. H.
Armstrong	Foster, Jr., A.	McKelvey	Smith, L. E.
Arty	Fryer	McVerry	Spencer
Belardi	Gallen	Mackowski	Spitz
Bittle	Gamble	Manmiller	Stairs
Bowser	Gannon	Micozzie	Steighner
Brandt	Geesey	Miller	Sweet
Brown	Geist	Moehlmann	Swift
Burd	George, C.	Mowery	Taddonio
Burns	George, M. H.	Nahill	Taylor, E. Z.
Caltagirone	Gladeck	Noye	Taylor, F.
Cessar	Goebel	O'Brien, D. M.	Telek
Cimini	Greenfield	Perzel	Thomas
Clark, M. R.	Grieco	Peterson	Vroon
Cochran	Gruppo	Piccola	Wachob

Cornell	Halverson	Pitts	Wargo
Coslett	Hasay	Polite	Wass
Cunningham	Hayes, Jr., S.	Pott	Wenger
DeMedio	Helfrick	Punt	Wilson
DeVerter	Honaman	Pyles	Wilt
DiCarlo	Hutchinson, W.	Rocks	Wright, Jr., J.
Davies	Johnson, E. G.	Ryan	Yahner
Dietz	Kanuck	Salvatore	Yohn
Diminni	Klingaman	Scheaffer	Zeller
Dorr	Kowalshyn	Schweder	Zitterman
Duffy	Lashingier	Serafini	Zord
Durham	Lehr	Shupnik	
Fee	Levi	Sieminski	Seltzer,
Fischer	Lynch, E. R.	Sirianni	Speaker
Fisher			

NOT VOTING—21

Alden	Giammarco	Levin	Musto
Beloff	Gray	Lewis	O'Donnell
Bennett	Hayes, D. S.	McMonagle	Pratt
Borski	Hoefel	Madigan	Shadding
Cole	Knepper	Milanovich	Weidner
Freind			

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

WELCOME

The SPEAKER. The Chair welcomes to the balcony Jean McCluskey, Carol Piatt, and Donna Martin, all members of the legislative committee of the Pennsylvania Nurses Association, who are here today as guests of Mrs. Mary Ann Arty.

The Chair also welcomes to the balcony Mr. and Mrs. Jack Wagner and Mr. and Mrs. Henry Badzik, guests of Messrs. DeMedio and Sweet.

HOUSE SCHEDULE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, Mr. Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I would request that we recess now until 4:20. It is my intention tonight to keep the floor open, stay on HB 2044 until approximately 6:30. We will stay with 2044 for the week. I have instructed our legal counsel to take such steps as are necessary to comply with the "sunshine" provisions so that we will come in early tomorrow and Wednesday and the next legislative week and the next legislative week and the next legislative week until we complete this bill. I would expect that any of you who have plans early Tuesday or Wednesday evening should probably make such arrangements as are indicated. Other than that Mr. Speaker, I do not have anything else to add.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

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

Mr. STREET. Point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of personal privilege.

Mr. STREET. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, seriously concerned, about the remarks that just came from the

majority leader. It appears to me as though we have gotten into a personality clash over HB 2044 as a result of a newspaper article. I have put a lot of work on 2044 and I believe that I have a lot of legitimate questions, and I believe there are a lot of people on the floor of this House who have legitimate concerns about 2044.

I believe that where we are going now is an attitude that black legislators from Philadelphia, the black legislative caucus, is not going to push us around and they can filibuster as long as they want and we will come in and we will sit there and everytime they put something on the floor of the House, we will just vote it down and we will show them. Well, I tell you that I am not involved in HB 2044 because it is a black-white issue. I am involved in 2044 and I have done weeks and weeks and weeks of work on 2044 to pull out some legitimate information that I am confident, and based on the remarks that were just made, are not going to be listened to. People are going to walk around, the legislators in the corridors, and they are going to go get coffee and they are going to get crackers and everytime that somebody says vote, it is a Street amendment, it is a Richardson amendment, it is an Earley amendment, then that is the clue to just vote it down regardless of the legitimacy of the information. I do not believe that this House should be forced by a newspaper article to be put in that type of position, and I can sense here that what is going on this afternoon tends to legitimize what the Speaker, what the majority leader, has said, and I resent it because I have not, by any stretch of the imagination, come here with the purpose of filibustering a bill. I came here with the purpose of pointing out some legitimate information that the legislators can look to with some objectivity, based on its value, and I think that we have a serious problem here and I wish somehow we could address it before we leave the floor of this House.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. This House now stands in recess until 20 minutes after 4.

AFTER RECESS

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

CALENDAR**CONSIDERATION OF HB 2044 RESUMED**

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. STREET offered the following amendment:

Amend Sec. 1, (Sec. 432), page 3, line 9, by inserting after "period:" Provided, That at least fifty percent of the savings for each fiscal year from the creation of the transitionally needy category shall be used to provide public service jobs for the transitionally needy. Said jobs shall pay the same wages as paid under Title II of the Federal Comprehensive Employment Training Act.

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

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

Mr. STREET. Mr. Speaker, this is amendment A5324. I am sure, Mr. Speaker and all my colleagues on the floor of the House are going to be interested in this one—no, I am a chauvinist—because it goes to the cash. This one deals with the cash. This one states that 50 percent of the savings that come in from striking the people, the 86,000 general assistance recipients, off welfare will be put into a jobs creation program. And that is very, very important. And it also states that the said job shall pay the same wages as paid under Title XX of the Federal Comprehensive Employment Training Act.

I think that Mr. Punt could stand for a brief interrogation in reference to this, Mr. Speaker, this amendment; it would please me well.

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

Mr. STREET. Mr. Speaker, how much money do we propose to save by HB 2044 in the first year?

Mr. PUNT. In the first year, Mr. Speaker, our estimated savings is \$34 million.

Mr. STREET. \$34 million. And also that \$34 million was pointed, I believe, if we turn to page 10 and 11 in the budget brief, we will find out that the Governor, in his speech to the House, also concluded that that would be the savings, \$34 million in the first year?

Mr. PUNT. That is correct.

Mr. STREET. Now, can you tell me, Mr. Speaker, how you arrived at that \$34-million figure?

Mr. PUNT. That figure is based upon HB 2044 with the grandfather clause of 6 months on the transitionally needy category. At the end of that 6-month period, that the transitionally categorized individuals would remain on welfare. At the end of that 6-month period they would be given another check for a 30-day period. Those savings represent those number of individuals who would be taken off the general assistance rolls beginning with the 8th month.

Mr. STREET. Okay, beginning with the 8th month, at the end of the 6 months plus 1, the 7th month, we would have 5 months in which we would have the 86,000 people off the rolls. Right?

Mr. PUNT. About 80,000.

Mr. STREET. About 80,000. So a general recipient receives \$172 a month, correct?

Mr. PUNT. That is an estimate or an average.

Mr. STREET. All right, now, if you take 80,000 times 172 and multiply it by 5, do you not come up with about \$75 million rather than \$34 million?

Mr. PUNT. Some recipients are on statistically for a year, and others are not based upon that context, and that is where we come up with \$34 million.

Mr. STREET. No, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the 80,000 that you just said would be taken off in the first

transitional period of 7 months. You had just told me that 80,000 people would, in your estimate, be taken off. If you multiply that by the amount of money that those 80,000 receive every month, you get \$75 million, and I want to know what the Governor is going to do with the rest of cash. How come he is only telling us \$34 million? There is some more cash around somewhere.

Mr. PUNT. To try to clarify some of your questions, here, you are statistically incorrect. By some of the formulae evaluation which was used in determining the \$34 million, the monthly allowance we figured on would be \$164. That would be multiplied by the average of number of months saved, and that in turn would be multiplied by the number of general assistance unemployed employables.

Now this is adjusted to reflect the September 1978 GA unemployed employables of 86,150 to 81,450, or 105.77 percent, or in that fiscal year of that time period, the \$34,704,000. This excludes in that formula persons over 55 years of age, which would be 5.89 percent. Also based upon the January 1, 1980 grant increases, this would bring you to \$172 a month versus \$164. It would bring the total to \$33,563,000, or, rounded off, to a \$34 million figure.

Mr. STREET. Are you finished, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that you understand the formula that you were just dealing with. It is very simple elementary math. A recipient receives \$172 per month. The projections in all of the literature that I have read and even from Perzel's office states that 80,000 people will be taken off welfare the first year after the transitional period. Very elementary, Mr. Speaker. All you have to do is take 80,000 and multiply that by the amount of the grant, which is \$172, that \$172 times 80,000 for 5 months gives you \$75 million. Now, there is some cash missing. And what I am saying to you is that this is not welfare reform; this is a cost savings bill. And that is why I want 50 percent of this money, when we find it, to create jobs. Now, all I have to do is go right here. Here it is, the budget that the Governor stood up there and read it to us. Right down on the bottom of page 10 and 11, \$34 million.

For every figure that you read, Mr. Speaker, now I want you to come back and give me some facts. I want to know how you can take 80,000 people off welfare, that receive \$172 a month, and come up with \$34 million savings?

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, they are a different 80,000. There are variables which enter into that figure. There are some welfare recipients who are not on for an entire 12-month period, that receive 12 checks. There are some who may be on for 4 months; some who may be on for 6 months. All of this was entered into the determination formula which arrived at the \$34-million figure.

Mr. STREET. The formula that you used and the formula when I went over and sat with Mr. Pistella and talked with him is the same formula that I used to try to find the cash. All I want to know is, where is the cash? You are talking about \$34 million, and there is some cash going somewhere that I cannot find. That is why I wanted to go into this amendment, to give it to those people to create some jobs.

All right, in the second year, the budget indicates that we would have \$90 million savings. When you use the same formula, you find out that you have \$165 million savings and there is over \$75 million somewhere that is going to have to be found, and I think that everybody in here is interested in case. Everybody should be interested in where the money is going, and I think there is no better place for the money to go than into jobs for these people.

If you are saying that the formula that you used is based on people being on general assistance for a short period of time and they do not stay on for a long period of time, then I think that HB 2044 is unfounded, because what we are saying is that HB 2044, dealing with general assistance, is not dealing with lazy people; it is dealing with people who do work, and it is dealing with people who do seasonal jobs, and because they do seasonal jobs, they are only on welfare for an extended period of time when they cannot find work; for example, migrant workers. So what are we talking about here? What are we talking about? And I want you, Mr. Speaker, to tell me where the cash is?

Mr. PUNT. I can only tell you on the formula which was utilized in determining the rationale for the first fiscal year under HB 2044, and that is the formula which we did utilize.

Mr. STREET. All right, Mr. Speaker, that is all you can tell me, but there is some cash somewhere, and it is obvious that I am not going to get the answer from you.

We also state here that we are putting \$4 million, all right, out of this \$34 million into what they call a community conservation program to create jobs. Is that correct?

Mr. PUNT. That is correct.

Mr. STREET. Mr. Speaker, if we go over in the budget brief, that is what we find. But if we go over to the budget proper and look under the youth programs in this, for the budget—and I wish your assistant there would find that—and you go in there and you look at the budget for community conservation for 1980, what we find is that there is a total of \$1.46 million out of the savings that is going to go into community conservation, and we find that \$2.7 million that was put into that same program last year will be carried over, and when we add the \$2.7 million and the \$1.264 million, we come out with the \$4 million. So we are not, in fact, putting \$4 million from the savings from HB 2044. What we are really putting into the jobs conservation program, if I am correct, Mr. Speaker, I am looking at the figures - is \$1.624 million. So where is the rest of the cash going?

Mr. PUNT. I cannot go into detail about the figures which you described from a budget. However, that is part of the program which the administration has endorsed, and you will have every opportunity to vote to appropriate more dollars for the job training program once we start on the budget process.

However, under the proposed legislation, I am of the understanding, when Mr. Earley will introduce this bill, appropriations will be attached to that legislative proposal of the community conservation employment and grants

program to equal a total of \$4 million, as the Governor proposed.

Mr. STREET. Mr. Speaker, would you pick up your budget and turn to page 207, and this deals with the jobs program, and that is why I want 50 percent of this money to go into the jobs program. On that in the program cost analysis and you look at the bottom, Community Conservation for Youth; 2.736, 1979-80. I have to have the answers to this because something is wrong. All right? Then you look over to 1980-81, and if you look at 1980-81, you will see that in 1979-80 there was 2.736; in 1980 we have \$4 million allocated for the budget. Am I correct?

Mr. PUNT. That is correct.

Mr. STREET. All right.

Now if you take the 2.736 and add 1.264, you come up with that \$4 million. So the amount of money that we are putting from HB 2044 into the community conservation savings is not \$4 million, but it is only \$1.264 million. And what I want to know is where the other \$2.7 million is going. I have a thing about the cash, and I want to know where it is going, because nobody is telling us.

Mr. PUNT. I just said, Mr. Speaker, I think it is in the proposed legislation entitled, The Employment Community Conservation Grant Program, the additional amount.

The savings of HB 2044, part of those savings, are going to be utilized for a jobs training program, training people for jobs which are available. The second category is that we are going to utilize those savings to increase the cash assistance checks, as well as, the Governor stated, in our boarding homes.

Mr. STREET. Mr. Speaker, at the bottom of page 10 in the brief, the Governor says he is going to put \$27 million for family-grant increases. He said he is going to put \$3 million for boarding homes, licensing, and \$4 million into the community conservation program. Now, if you add that up, that comes up to \$34.8 million, which balances the \$34 million that the Governor states, at the top of the page, that we are going to save for HB 2044. But if you go to page 200, you go over here to page 207, on the Youth Conservation Program, you will find out that he is not putting \$4 million into conservation; he is only putting \$1.264 million. So the figures are not accurate. Something is wrong, and there is \$2.7 million of the \$34 million that somebody is doing something with that obviously they do not want us to know about, and all I am asking you is, where is the cash?

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, I think you answered your question yourself. You just pointed out where the \$4 million was. What you find is a difference between one publication and a second publication. I think those questions will be asked during the budget process. The Governor has said that it is in the proposed budget for \$4 million for this program.

Mr. STREET. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that we have raised here some questions about the cash. It is obvious that we have raised some questions about the money that we cannot get answers to here. There is some money some-

where, and, based on that, Mr. Speaker, so that I do not have to bog down this House and I do not have to continue to argue about the cash, because there is continuous contradictions from publication to publication about the cash, and I think it would irresponsible for this House to move forward based on publications that contradict themselves around the money. We are talking about taxpayers' money, and with that, Mr. Speaker, I move that we table this bill until such time that we can get the answers to at least have intelligent debate as to where the money is.

MOTION TO TABLE

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

Mr. STREET. Mr. Speaker, I move we table HB 2044 and the amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, I think probably that what we are about to do will be in violation of the rules of the House, and I notice there is a number of absentees. Would the Speaker urge the members to come to their seats? That is an important motion; they ought to be on the floor to vote "nay" or "aye." And would the Chair insist that those people in their seats be voted and no one else.

The SPEAKER. The minority leader is correct. Only those members in their seats will be recorded. This motion is not debatable.

Those in favor of laying the bill and the amendment on the table will vote "aye." Those opposed will vote "no," and only those members in their seats will be recorded.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—74

Table listing names of members who voted 'YEAS' for the motion to table. Includes names like Austin, Barber, Bennett, Berson, Brandt, Capparebianca, Chess, Clark, B. D., Cochran, Cohen, Cole, Cowell, DeMedio, DeWeese, Dawida, Dombrowski, Duffy, Earley, Fryer, Gallagher, Gamble, Gatski, Goodman, Grabowski, Harper, Hoeffel, Hutchinson, A., Irvis, Itkin, Jones, Knight, Kolter, Kukovich, Laughlin, Livengood, McCall, McMonagle, Manderino, Michlovic, Milanovich, Mrkonic, Mullen, Murphy, Novak, O'Brien, B. F., O'Donnell, Oliver, Petrarca, Pievsky, Pistella, Pucciarelli, Rappaport, Reed, Rhodes, Richardson, Rieger, Ritter, Rodgers, Schmitt, Seventy, Shupnik, Stewart, Street, Stuban, Sweet, Taylor, F., Trello, Wachob, Wargo, White, Williams, Wright, D. R., and Zwinkl.

NAYS—96

Table listing names of members who voted 'NAYS' for the motion to table. Includes names like Anderson, Arty, Belardi, Bittle, Bowser, Brown, Burd, Foster, Jr., A., Gallen, Gannon, Geesey, Geist, George, C., George, M. H., Lynch, E. R., McClatchy, McKelvey, McVerry, Mackowski, Manmiller, Micozzie, Sieminski, Sirianni, Smith, E. H., Smith, L. E., Spencer, and Stairs.

Table listing names of members who were present but did not vote. Includes names like Burns, Caltagirone, Cessar, Cimini, Clark, M. R., Cornell, Coslett, Cunningham, DeVerter, DiCarlo, Davies, Dietz, Dorr, Durham, Fee, Fischer, Fisher, Foster, W. W., Gladeck, Grieco, Gruppo, Halverson, Hasay, Hayes, Jr., S., Helfrick, Honaman, Hutchinson, W., Johnson, E. G., Kanuck, Klingaman, Kowalyszyn, Lashingier, Lehr, Letterman, Levi, Lewis, Miller, Moehlmann, Mowery, Nahill, Noye, Perzel, Peterson, Piccola, Pitts, Polite, Pott, Punt, Pyles, Ryan, Scheaffer, Schweder, Serafini, Steighner, Swift, Taddonio, Taylor, E. Z., Telek, Thomas, Vroon, Wass, Wenger, Wilt, Yohn, Zeller, Zitterman, and Zord.

NOT VOTING—26

Table listing names of members who did not vote. Includes names like Alden, Armstrong, Beloff, Borski, Dininni, Dumas, Freind, Giammarco, Goebel, Gray, Greenfield, Hayes, D. S., Johnson, J. J., Knepper, Levin, McIntyre, Madigan, Musto, O'Brien, D. M., Pratt, Rocks, Salvatore, Shadding, Weidner, Wilson, and Wright, Jr., J.

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

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—60

Table listing names of members who voted 'YEAS' for the amendment. Includes names like Austin, Barber, Beloff, Berson, Cappabianca, Chess, Clark, B. D., Cohen, Cowell, DeWeese, Dawida, Dombrowski, Dumas, Earley, Fryer, Gallagher, Gatski, Goodman, Harper, Hoeffel, Hutchinson, A., Irvis, Itkin, Jones, Knight, Kolter, Kukovich, Laughlin, Livengood, McCall, McMonagle, Manderino, Michlovic, Milanovich, Mrkonic, Mullen, Murphy, Novak, O'Brien, B. F., O'Donnell, Oliver, Petrarca, Pievsky, Pistella, Pucciarelli, Rappaport, Reed, Rhodes, Richardson, Rodgers, Seventy, Shupnik, Stewart, Street, Trello, Wargo, White, Williams, Wright, D. R., and Yahner.

NAYS—116

Table listing names of members who voted 'NAYS' for the amendment. Includes names like Anderson, Armstrong, Arty, Belardi, Bennett, Bittle, Bowser, Brandt, Brown, Burd, Burns, Caltagirone, Cessar, Cimini, Clark, M. R., Cochran, Cole, Cornell, Coslett, Cunningham, DeMedio, DeVerter, DiCarlo, Fisher, Foster, W. W., Foster, Jr., A., Gallen, Gamble, Gannon, Geesey, Geist, George, C., George, M. H., Gladeck, Grabowski, Greenfield, Grieco, Gruppo, Halverson, Hasay, Hayes, Jr., S., Helfrick, Honaman, Hutchinson, W., Johnson, E. G., Kanuck, Lynch, E. R., McClatchy, McKelvey, McVerry, Mackowski, Manmiller, Miller, Moehlmann, Mowery, Nahill, Noye, O'Brien, D. M., Perzel, Peterson, Piccola, Pitts, Polite, Pott, Punt, Pyles, Ritter, Rocks, Ryan, Smith, E. H., Smith, L. E., Spencer, Spitz, Stairs, Steighner, Stuban, Sweet, Swift, Taddonio, Taylor, E. Z., Taylor, F., Telek, Thomas, Vroon, Wachob, Wass, Wenger, Wilson, Wilt, Wright, Jr., J., Yohn, and Zeller.

Davies	Klingaman	Salvatore	Zitterman
Dietz	Kowalysbyn	Scheaffer	Zord
Dorr	Lashingier	Schweder	Zwikl
Duffy	Lehr	Serafini	
Durham	Letterman	Sieminski	Seltzer,
Fee	Levi	Sirianni	Speaker
Fischer	Lewis		

NOT VOTING—20

Alden	Goebel	Levin	Pratt
Borski	Gray	McIntyre	Rieger
Dininni	Hayes, D. S.	Madigan	Schmitt
Freind	Johnson, J. J.	Micozzie	Shadding
Giammarco	Knepper	Musto	Weidner

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

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

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

Mr. STREET. Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of questions about this, and I cannot get the answers. So I am going to have to try to get them through amendments. At this time I would like to offer these 200 amendments; take them to the table before that vote.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, before the vote is stricken from the roll, I think that you made an incorrect calling on the amount of the vote that was recorded on the board. I think you are calling them so fast, Mr. Speaker, that even all of the members are not getting a chance to record them, and as the computer is kicking it out, you read incorrectly what the exact count was.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the amendment are 60; opposed 116. Less than majority having voted in the affirmative, the amendment falls.

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

Mr. STREET. Mr. Speaker, you had asked a question if the gentleman, Mr. Street, had any more amendments to offer. The gentleman is following the process at the amendment clerk's desk there, and I would be glad to continue, if you would allow; I would be glad to come back with these amendments at anytime you see fit as we finish. There are only 200.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman had the amendments distributed to the members?

Mr. STREET. No, they have not been. I am doing that process now.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman have any amendments that have been distributed to the members?

Mr. STREET. No, I think we have debated those.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will go on to other members who distributed their amendments.

REMARKS ON VOTE

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

Mr. LETTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was voted in error on the recommittal of this bill earlier today and I would like to be noted as "no."

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2044 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Does Mrs. Harper have any amendments to offer at this time?

Mrs. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, my amendments are being distributed now.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, there are other members who have amendments, and it seems to me that there is a systematic approach being dealt here in relationship to them. I can call off the other members of this House who have amendments, but you are bypassing them in order to deal specifically with trying to deal with a certain group, and I do not like that and I would ask that those other members who have amendments be called up.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, for the convenience of the Chair, I would just like to indicate that I have one amendment and I will be willing to introduce it now, if there is a problem finding something to vote on.

The SPEAKER. Have the gentleman's amendments been circulated?

Mr. COHEN. Yes, it has, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,
Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?
Mr. COHEN offered the following amendments:

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 23 and 24 Section 3. This act shall apply only to those recipients residing in counties of the fourth class. The Department of Public Welfare shall study the effects of this program to determine whether or not it is feasible to expand the program Statewide and make its recommendations to the General Assembly within one year from the effective date.

Amend Sec. 3, page 3, line 24, by striking out "3" and inserting 4

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

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this makes HB 2044 an experimental program for fourth class counties. I think that before we begin this on a statewide basis, we ought to experiment on it and see what the effects are. I think that

an experimental program is a means that we ought to use more frequently in state government, and this will be a very good place to begin. I urge support of the amendment.

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

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is a total joke. I oppose it.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to interrogate the prime sponsor.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. I withdraw that. I will ask Mr. Punt the question. He is the most knowledgeable one.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Punt, did not offer the amendments. I do not understand.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have a question on the amendment. I want to ask Mr. Punt a question.

The SPEAKER. Within the confines of the amendment offered by Mr. Cohen, the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, in the fourth class cities in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, are you aware of the number of recipients that would include, specifically?

Mr. PUNT. No.

Mr. RICHARDSON. You do not know?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman responded "No."

Mr. RICHARDSON. I cannot hear, Mr. Speaker. You have been asked before and I think this bill is so important that perhaps maybe you should get some order in the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's response was "no."

The gentleman, Mr. Richardson, may proceed. Does the gentleman have any further questions?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes. I just wanted to know from the gentleman if he could express whether or not an experimental proposition such as has been offered here by the gentleman, Mr. Cohen, would be a realistic approach to try to resolve this particular problem, and whether or not he felt that he could be in favor of such an amendment that speaks directly to trying to use a demonstration approach to resolving this particular problem as opposed to just using a cold-blooded approach to just wiping 80,000 off?

Mr. PUNT. No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No, you cannot support that?

Mr. PUNT. No, sir.

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

I rise to support the Cohen amendment, and just as I thought, the same attitude still prevails and we cannot get a fair and equitable, honest debate on the question. Here is another approach being offered by members on this side of the aisle, and certainly we are getting all this for the record so that if there is going to be any actions taken, at least it will be on the record that the prime sponsors of this bill have no recollection at all of what the impact of this is going to have on the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The Cohen amendment speaks directly to dealing with an issue in a demonstration project that will allow individuals to say, hey, we are at least coming up with a small amount of an area that we can try it on as opposed to just wiping out a number of thousands of people without giving any consideration to them. I certainly rise to support that amendment and ask the members to do likewise.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the members of the House, the fourth class counties of Pennsylvania are Beaver, Cambria, Dauphin, Cumberland, Fayette, Lackawanna, Northampton, Schuylkill and Washington Counties. These are some of the poorest counties in the State of Pennsylvania. Fayette County, which is in this amendment, actually has the highest percentage of welfare recipients of any county in the state, including Philadelphia. Dauphin County has the city of Harrisburg, which includes, I believe, the highest percentage of black citizens of any city in the state.

I think that the fourth class counties were picked because this represents a cross section of Pennsylvania; a small cross section of Pennsylvania, but a cross section nevertheless.

If this is an effective and humane proposal that Governor Thornburgh has offered here, then we certainly should be able to see what the effect is in these nine counties. If the effect is going to be that all these people are going to get jobs and the public interest is going to be served, these nine counties, which are the fourth class counties, are a reasonable cross section of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and this will be indicated.

I personally do not think that is what is going to happen, but I certainly would think that everybody, whether you support this concept that is represented by HB 2044 or oppose it, ought to want to see a demonstration of it first, and if it proves successful, then we can expand the demonstration beyond the fourth class counties. So I, therefore, urge support of my amendment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—58

Austin	Earley	McMonagle	Rappaport
Barber	Gallagher	Manderino	Reed
Beloff	Gamble	Michlovic	Richardson
Bennett	Goodman	Milanovich	Rieger
Berson	Grabowski	Mrkonic	Rodgers
Borski	Harper	Mullen	Seventy
Cappabianca	Hoefel	Murphy	Stewart
Clark, B. D.	Hutchinson, A.	Novak	Street
Cochran	Irvis	O'Donnell	Sweet
Cohen	Itkin	Oliver	Taylor, F.
DeMedio	Johnson, J. J.	Petrarca	Trello
DeWeese	Jones	Pievsky	Wachob
Dawida	Knight	Pistella	White
Dombrowski	Kukovich	Pucciarelli	Williams
Dumas	Livengood		

NAYS—122

Anderson	Foster, Jr., A.	Lynch, E. R.	Sieminski
Armstrong	Fryer	McCall	Sirianni
Arty	Gallen	McClatchy	Smith, E. H.
Belardi	Gannon	McKelvey	Smith, L. E.
Bittle	Gatski	McVerry	Spencer
Bowser	Geesey	Mackowski	Spitz
Brandt	Geist	Manmiller	Stairs
Brown	George, C.	Micozzie	Steighner
Burd	George, M. H.	Miller	Stuban
Burns	Gladeck	Moehlmann	Swift
Caltagirone	Goebel	Mowery	Taddonio
Cessar	Greenfield	Nahill	Taylor, E. Z.
Cimini	Grieco	Noye	Telek
Clark, M. R.	Gruppo	O'Brien, B. F.	Thomas
Cole	Halverson	O'Brien, D. M.	Vroon
Cornell	Hasay	Perzel	Wargo
Coslett	Hayes, Jr., S.	Peterson	Wass
Cowell	Helfrick	Piccola	Wenger
Cunningham	Honaman	Pitts	Wilson
DeVerter	Hutchinson, W.	Polite	Wilt
DiCarlo	Johnson, E. G.	Pott	Wright, D. R.
Davies	Kanuck	Punt	Wright, Jr., J.
Dietz	Klingaman	Ritter	Yahner
Dininni	Kolter	Rocks	Yohn
Dorr	Kowalyszyn	Ryan	Zeller
Duffy	Lashingier	Salvatore	Zitterman
Durham	Laughlin	Scheaffer	Zord
Fee	Lehr	Schmitt	Zwinkl
Fischer	Letterman	Schweder	
Fisher	Levi	Serafini	Seltzer,
Foster, W. W.	Lewis	Shupnik	Speaker

NOT VOTING—16

Alden	Gray	McIntyre	Pyles
Chess	Hayes, D. S.	Madigan	Rhodes
Freind	Knepper	Musto	Shadding
Giammarco	Levin	Pratt	Weidner

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

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. LAUGHLIN offered the following amendment:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 432), page 3, line 9, by removing the period after "period" and inserting: Provided, however, That a transitionally needy person who has received unemployment compensation, pursuant to the act of December 5, 1936 (1937 2nd Sp.Sess., P. L. 2897, No. 1), shall be eligible for and shall receive assistance for a period of one hundred eighty days from the date of the last unemployment compensation payment.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Beaver, Mr. Laughlin.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I had discussed with Mr. Punt this amendment earlier today, and he said that he wanted to take a look at it. I did not know if that meant he wanted to concur in it and accept it as an agreed-to amendment or if he wanted to debate it.

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

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, I did have a chance to review it after we discussed and I would oppose the amendment as is written.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Beaver, Mr. Laughlin.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, would you please stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates that he will, and Mr. Laughlin may proceed.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, what are the provisions of the present statute under which general assistance is granted?

Mr. PUNT. Those factors are determined based upon need, as to their eligibility requirements or sources of income, their worth, property holdings, and so forth.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the assets of the individual family, what is that figure set at for a family of two?

Mr. PUNT. Offhand, we do not have that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the figure is actually \$350. Now, let us deal with the circumstance of my amendment in this fashion: First of all, you are aware, of course, that the unemployment rate in Pennsylvania is at a very high level right now. Are you not?

Mr. PUNT. Yes.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Are you aware, Mr. Speaker, that the industries in Beaver County, basic steel industries and related fields, have been hit extremely hard by unemployment? Are you aware of that?

Mr. PUNT. From what I have read in the papers, yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, are you aware that the St. Joseph Mineral Company which employed 1,200 people in Beaver County has closed down completely with the exception of a small staff that is there to handle close-out arrangements?

Mr. PUNT. I was not aware of that, Mr. Speaker, until you told me this afternoon.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, those are 1,200 jobs, those are 1,200 men and women who have been put out of work through no fault of their own. Now, many of these people have been employed for 10, 15, 20 years, and, as you know, under the general assistance clause those people are presently eligible to receive assistance after they have used up their unemployment compensation if they qualify under assets, and, if they qualify under need. Is that correct?

Mr. PUNT. That is correct.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, what do you propose in your legislation as opposed to my amendment? My amendment deals with the fact that we want to make sure that these people, after having worked all their lives and then, through no fault of their own, are unemployed, are not denied some form of assistance and that assistance is general assistance. Can you tell me what your response to that is, sir?

Mr. PUNT. We certainly do not want to deny, but if you are going to discuss 1,200 people, let us look at those 1,200 people. How many of those 1,200 people have children? How many of those 1,200 people would fall under the

Federal program? I think we need to determine that if we are going to talk about 1,200 people.

HB 2044 is directed at general assistance. How many of the 1,200 people are affected through HB 2044?

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Approximately, out of that 1,200, there are approximately 800 people in that particular area who would qualify under general assistance. That is two-thirds of the total of those who are employed there, because you see, Mr. Speaker, most of those jobs were made available during the years of 1955 to 1965. That plant has been going downhill since that time. They have been phasing out many of the older employes under retirement benefits; they are not affected by this. For many of these people, and the greater majority of them, their children are already graduated from high school and thus are not covered under your provisions of HB 2044. As you know, it covers those 16 years of age and older or those 20 years of age that are presently in college. Those people are not covered, Mr. Speaker.

What you are saying to me is that after a period of 30 weeks, these people will no longer be eligible to collect general assistance. That means that a person who has worked all of his life or her life and now has come onto hard times because of a closing, you want these people now to be denied a general assistance fund even though their home would be held as a lien for repayment of that money. Are you aware of that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. PUNT. I am aware of what you are saying, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. If you are aware of it, then how can you condone or how can you propose being against this amendment that would provide that coverage for these families?

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, I think we need to, again, in discussing the 1,200 people which you referred to, look at how many of those people are 55 years of age or older, how many of those may have developed some type of serious physical handicap which would prevent them from going into perhaps some other vocation, or would they perhaps fall into a category of a lone caretaker for a dependent, if they may be single, if they would be providing for, say, their 80-year-old mother, who would live with them in their home. All of those individuals would be placed within the chronically needy category.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the group that you suggest were covered in the 400 families that I said originally are exempt. They are not covered. They either have dependent children or they are over the age of 55, as you indicated. When you talk about a physical disability, Mr. Punt, you are not talking about an able-bodied steelworker who has been employed for 20 or 30 years or 10 years, for that matter. Do not put them in a category of being physically unable to do work, because they have been gainfully employed. As you know, workmen's compensation would have taken care of anyone that was outside of that category that had some physical infirmity. Now I do not want to place hardworking, earned income people in the category

that you are suggesting. I am trying to get home to you, Mr. Punt, the fact that we are talking about people who are not historically welfare recipients and who in fact own a home that ultimately would be used as a lean for that assistance, but you are still willing to deny them benefits. Now, I have not heard an answer from you.

Mr. PUNT. How long are these people going to be unemployed? If their UC benefits would expire, then they are going to be of that fate. If they fall into the transitionally needed category, then that will be the case. Now, they will still be eligible, if they are eligible for general assistance, and they can still receive food stamps; they can still receive fuel assistance; they can still receive a medical card; they can still receive hospitalization and medical care, et cetera. The only thing that we are talking about through 2044 are the cash assistance checks allowances. We are not depriving any of those individuals the basic necessities of life.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Punt, that is far from the truth. What you are saying in effect is that any person who has utilized the maximum benefits that they have under unemployment compensation are going to be denied general assistance. That is what we are talking about, Mr. Punt, - the fund and the grant that is available to them.

Now, Mr. Punt, you make the statement and you talk about the number of people, and I am telling you, factually, that I checked as late as today—

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman completed his interrogation?

Mr. LAUGHLIN. No, Mr. Speaker, I have not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may continue then.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. As late as today, Mr. Punt, the Department of Labor and Industry—

The SPEAKER. The Chair is concerned whether the gentleman is speaking on the amendment or interrogating Mr. Punt.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. I am interrogating Mr. Punt for the basis of the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I have not drifted from that position.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Punt, the number of people that were laid off in that particular plant that have been placed, up until right now, by the State of Pennsylvania in training programs is 50. The number of people who have been placed through the unemployment office is 12. The number of people that have been placed in jobs on their own efforts, that were hired in other plants, is 26. Mr. Punt, there are less than 100 people, or 8 1/4 percent, of the total unemployed of that plant that have been able to find jobs or are receiving training. We are talking then about 1,100 people who have already utilized 2 months of unemployment compensation, with only a few months to go. At the end of that time, these people will not only have used up unemployment compensation but will have used up a reserve of maybe 6 months of income that may have been fortunate enough to save to pay for their mortgage, to pay for their automobile, to feed their family and to send their

children to school. Now, you are taking these people that have used all of their moneys, used their assets that are available, and now you are saying they cannot receive a grant under this general assistance. Mr. Punt, that is totally irrational. There is available to these people and to the welfare department the opportunity to put a lean against their home, against their assets. How can you possibly oppose that position?

Mr. PUNT. Mr. Speaker, I think that you will find of these 1,100 people now, we do not know how many of those people may find jobs within the next several months. What we are doing is simply telling those individuals, if they would fall into the general assistance category and apply for welfare and if they would be placed in the transitionally needed category, they would receive one check and that is all. Now, that may sound hard and that may sound irrational, but the state should not be subsidizing individuals that could work. Although they may not have a job there in that specific area, they could secure employment in other areas perhaps by relocating.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if Mr. Punt is aware and I do not know if the House is aware that the area of Pittsburgh, which covers the counties of Beaver, Washington and several other counties for unemployment, last month, that is the month of January, had a figure of unemployment of 5.9 percent. Mr. Speaker, in 30 days or 29 days that February covered, that rate is now up to 6.6 percent. What we are talking about in 6.6 percent of unemployment is 75,000 unemployed people in those few counties that are represented. Mr. Speaker, there are no jobs that are available for these people right now. They have their families established; they have their homes established; they cannot just pick up and leave at your request.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the House consider this. Mr. Punt, I have no more further questions of you.

Mr. Speaker, just a brief word on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that Mr. Punt is certainly not in possession of the facts and figures dealing with unemployment of this state. He is also not very familiar with what it means to work for a living and then find yourself unemployed because of circumstances you have nothing to do with.

Mr. Speaker, it is wholly possible for this House to pass this amendment and protect the employment rights and protect the benefit rights of those people who have worked all of their lives in this state and have paid the taxes to pay the salaries of the people that are in this House, as well as paying to support their school districts and their local communities. Their homes are held liable for the benefits they would receive under general assistance. I am not asking for a give-away. I am not asking for something for free. I am asking to protect the living rights of those who have worked in this state all of their life. Those men and women who are employed in industry and utilize their maximum benefit under unemployment deserve consideration of this House. I ask the membership to vote affirmatively on the amendment. Thank you.

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

Mr. A. C. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Beaver, Mr. Laughlin, consent to interrogation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates that he will stand for interrogation.

Mr. A. C. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe you alluded to the fact that the current unemployment compensation benefits were for 30 weeks?

Mr. LAUGHLIN. The 30 weeks, sir, plus there is an extension of 13 weeks if in fact the unemployment rate exceeds the Federal guideline, and in Pennsylvania, as late as 2 weeks ago, it exceeded that guideline.

Mr. A. C. FOSTER. So in actuality the 30-week figure is no longer correct?

Mr. LAUGHLIN. No, that is not correct, sir. The 30-week figure is the unemployment rate that is received by the employes that are employed in the State of Pennsylvania from the State of Pennsylvania. At the first period of time that that rate dropped below the figure set by the Federal Government, those benefits that you speak of that are additional are curtailed and they are no longer in effect and it does not take a 6-month period, a 3-month period, or even a quarter to take care of that.

Mr. A. C. FOSTER. But at the present time, Mr. Speaker, an unemployed individual would be eligible for 39 weeks, am I not correct?

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Yes, it would be 39 weeks for those laid off as late as, I believe, 6 months back. They are still eligible.

Mr. A. C. FOSTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That concludes my interrogation and I would like to make a brief statement.

Mr. Speaker, I can sympathize with anyone who is going through the throes of unemployment. It is not a happy situation. But Pennsylvania and the Federal Government have done everything possible to meet these problems relating to this area. We have a quite liberal unemployment compensation system in the state, and finally push comes to shove, and how long can we continue to pay unemployment compensation benefits? How long beyond 39 weeks? How long does it take to find some employment? I think we have been liberal in this area, and at that point I feel we are quite justified in letting the unemployment compensation system take care of the unemployed and not further burden an already overburdened welfare system. I would urge a negative vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to this amendment just very briefly and I would like to say that some of the facts that I think are critical to our consideration of this amendment have not been discussed as thoroughly as they should. We, in my judgment, have an unemployment compensation system in this Commonwealth which encourages unemployment. It encourages unemployment because it allows people who have been laid off, who

are unemployed, to reject the availability of employment if the jobs available to them are not commensurate with the position from which they have been laid off. The problem is not the availability of jobs; the problem frequently is the willingness of those to whom these jobs are available to take those jobs.

I am reminded here just a day or so ago of the statement made, or at least alleged to have been made, as was recorded, as was published in one of the statewide newspapers, of the leader of a welfare rights organization who said that she wanted a job but she did not want a job scrubbing toilets or washing floors. That remark offended me and it offended me because I have, over the last 10 years, done this type of work very frequently, because I was unable to get a full-time job that paid as well as I would have liked it to have paid. As a consequence of that, I frequently drove long distances, commuting to get to work that was not close my home. On various occasions I strung three and four part-time jobs together to get the equivalent remuneration or compensation that would have been available to me through one full-time job rather than take welfare benefits or unemployment compensation. I do not think the central problem frequently—now not always, but frequently—is not the availability of some kind of employment. The problem is the willingness of the individuals to whom this employment is available to deign to take it.

I would urge the defeat of this amendment because I think the unemployment compensation we have in Pennsylvania is a liberal, generous one; it is a compassionate one that attempts to deal with a very serious problem. I do not attempt to stand here and minimize the plight of the unemployed; it is a very serious problem and I feel genuine empathy for people who are unemployed and I think it is important that we provide them reasonable benefits over a reasonable period of time. But I do not think cascading on top or pyramiding on top of the currently very liberal generous unemployment compensation system an additional 6 months of benefits is warranted. I think that is the very thing that provides the disincentive to employment and actually encourages unemployment and, as a consequence of that, I would urge the defeat of this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Beaver, Mr. Laughlin, for the second time.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, would Mr. Cunningham just answer a question or two, please?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Cunningham, indicates that he will stand for interrogation. On the amendment, the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly will stay on the amendment and I will respond to Mr. Cunningham's remarks also.

Mr. Speaker, you made the statement that benefits and people turning down jobs seem to somehow be entwined; that is, that a person on unemployment compensation has the right to turn down employment. Is that your statement, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. My statement is that anybody who is unemployed or is on unemployment compensation, who is offered a job that is not commensurate with the position from which he has been laid off, may reject that employment. That is my statement.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know where your unemployment office is that operates under that particular set of guidelines, but in fact—

The SPEAKER. The debate is getting far afield. The gentleman, Mr. Laughlin, may continue his interrogation on the amendment. The gentleman, Mr. Cunningham, will please respond on the amendment.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Since the amendment deals with the unemployment compensation benefits and the final payment of that benefit, Mr. Speaker, I want it to be clearly understood that I believe that Mr. Cunningham's referral to the system by which you collect unemployment compensation and the availability of positions are in no way accurate. Those positions, in fact, Mr. Speaker, require that after a period of 4 weeks—that is 4 checks; not 30 or 39, but 4 checks—you must then submit for interviews on job employment where you would be sent. There is no opportunity, as you indicate, to turn down employment that would be made available to you. That kind of a situation no longer exists. That may have been a long time ago, but now you are required, Mr. Speaker, to take any job that is within reason in that area. You do not have the opportunity to just, at your own will, select where and how you are going to work. Those are the rules and those are the guidelines of today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have no other questions of Mr. Cunningham. I would like to make my final statement.

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

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, a person's home, who is employed, is the collateral for the benefits that are received from general assistance. We are not asking for a handout to able-bodied working people. We are asking for consideration. We are not exactly coming to you and saying, we want to give you some special benefit because you are unemployed. We are not saying we want to extend unemployment compensation benefits. We are not asking for that as was indicated at some override by the gentleman with regard to extending some coverage of public assistance. That availability of public assistance and the repayment of that public assistance is mandatory under the assets level. There is no guarantee of any free lunch for those who have the assets to pay under GA. The level of \$350 is maintained. If you own property, if you own bonds, securities, you are required to cash them. If your last asset is your home, a lien is filed against it.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, we are not asking for something for those who do not want to work. We are asking for consideration of those who have exhausted unemployment benefits and still would be entitled to some coverage, which they would have to pay back ultimately with a lien filed on their property. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—81

Austin	Fee	Letterman	Richardson
Barber	Fryer	Livengood	Rieger
Beloff	Gallagher	McCall	Ritter
Bennett	Gamble	Manderino	Rodgers
Berson	Gatski	Michlovic	Schmitt
Borski	George, C.	Milanovich	Seventy
Brown	Goodman	Mrkonic	Shupnik
Caltagirone	Grabowski	Mullen	Steighner
Cappabianca	Greenfield	Murphy	Stewart
Chess	Harper	Novak	Stuban
Clark, B. D.	Hoeffel	O'Brien, B. F.	Sweet
Cochran	Hutchinson, A.	O'Donnell	Taylor, F.
Cole	Irvis	Oliver	Telek
Cowell	Itkin	Petrarca	Trello
DeMedio	Johnson, J. J.	Pievsky	Wachob
DeWeese	Jones	Pistella	Wargo
DiCarlo	Knight	Pott	White
Dawida	Kolter	Pucciarelli	Williams
Duffy	Kukovich	Reed	Yahner
Dumas	Laughlin	Rhodes	Zwinkl
Earley			

NAYS—95

Anderson	Gannon	Mackowski	Sirianni
Arty	Geesey	Manmiller	Smith, E. H.
Belardi	Geist	Micozzie	Smith, L. E.
Bittle	George, M. H.	Miller	Spencer
Bowser	Grieco	Moehlmann	Spitz
Brandt	Gruppo	Mowery	Stairs
Burd	Halverson	Nahill	Swift
Burns	Hasay	Noye	Taddonio
Cessar	Hayes, Jr., S.	O'Brien, D. M.	Taylor, E. Z.
Cimini	Helfrick	Perzel	Thomas
Clark, M. R.	Honaman	Peterson	Vroon
Cornell	Hutchinson, W.	Piccola	Wass
Coslett	Johnson, E. G.	Pitts	Wenger
Cunningham	Kanuck	Polite	Wilson
DeVerter	Klingaman	Punt	Wilt
Davies	Kowalyshyn	Pyles	Wright, D. R.
Dietz	Lashinger	Rappaport	Wright, Jr., J.
Dininni	Lehr	Rocks	Yohn
Dorr	Levi	Ryan	Zeller
Durham	Lewis	Salvatore	Zitterman
Fischer	Lynch, E. R.	Scheaffer	Zord
Fisher	McClatchy	Schweder	
Foster, W. W.	McKelvey	Serafini	Seltzer,
Foster, Jr., A.	McVerry	Sieminski	Speaker
Gallen			

NOT VOTING—20

Alden	Giammarco	Knepper	Musto
Armstrong	Gladeck	Levin	Pratt
Cohen	Goebel	McIntyre	Shadding
Dombrowski	Gray	McMonagle	Street
Freind	Hayes, D. S.	Madigan	Weidner

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

REMARKS ON VOTES

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Cohen, rise?

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, my switch was not functioning then. I would like to be recorded in the affirmative on the Laughlin amendment A4827.

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

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

Mr. RAPPAPORT. I am happy to be recorded in the affirmative on the Laughlin amendment A4827, as well.

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

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

Mr. GOEBEL. I was out of my chair when the vote was taken on the Laughlin amendment A4827. I would like to be recorded in the negative.

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2044 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman, Mr. Laughlin, have an additional set of amendments he wishes to offer?

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have another amendment that is along the same lines. Would you kindly pass over my amendment until later when I get the proper information on it?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Mr. Speaker, I am offering these two amendments on behalf of my colleague from Philadelphia, Mr. Levin.

This is amendment A4446.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. RAPPAPORT offered the following amendment:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 432), page 3, by inserting between lines 9 and 10

(iv) General Assistance will continue for every transitionally needy person between the ages of eighteen and forty-five until the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation has conducted a formal evaluation of the person's employability and if certified employable the Bureau of Employment Security has given the vocationally employable person a minimum of five referrals for appropriate employment.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of debate today about whether people on welfare could be working, should be working or would be working. My amendment speaks to that very issue. The amendment now before the House would require that before someone on general assistance is cut off from that and they are between the ages of 18 and 45, the prime earning years, that they shall be evaluated by the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation and, if they are certified employable, the Bureau of Employment Security has sent this person to five referrals for appropriate employment. After that has happened, then

the person in question would be thrown off the welfare rolls.

This attempts to speak to the problem of the person whose employment compensation has run out and through no fault of his own must continue to be dependent upon government for the livelihood of himself and his family, a person who is willing to work and is employable. The person who is a lazy bum and is saying I am not going to work, who is certified that they can work, will no longer receive welfare. I think that is proper, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for the adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. PUNT. I have a lot of respect for my colleague from Philadelphia. I believe Mr. Rappaport has many times on this floor conveyed very sincere ideas to this body. However, regarding this amendment, I must oppose it because this proposal negates the intent of HB 2044. I think it should be noted that it is not the responsibility of government to provide employment for every individual, but rather it is the responsibility of the individual to support himself.

This amendment, as I read it, would require BVR to interview and evaluate approximately 65,000 people, and would further require BES to locate approximately 325,000 jobs. It should be noted that the Commonwealth offers assistance to individuals; however, the Commonwealth is not a private employment agency and nor should it become one. Therefore, I would oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Mr. Speaker, I am really quite gratified at the statement of the gentleman from Franklin County. He has really put his finger on the philosophical distinction between this side of the aisle and that side of the aisle. Those of us on this side of the aisle, by basic philosophy, believe, along with Benjamin Franklin, that government should do things for people which they cannot presently do for themselves. I do believe that it is the responsibility of government to help people that are starving and needy. I happen to believe that it is the responsibility of anyone living in a civilized society to take that responsibility. We are taught that by our sages. The object of this amendment is to weed out those who can work and will not work. Those who can work and do not have the opportunity to gain employment, or those who cannot work for some temporary or permanent reason should not be forced to starve and watch their families starve. This amendment says if you are able-bodied and you can work and there is work available for you, you better damn well work because we are not going to support you; but if you cannot work for whatever reasons or there is no work available for you, then we are going to give you a helping hand.

That is the essence of this amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I think the gentleman from Franklin has described it very well and his description of it is accurate. That is why I am supporting the amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the question facing us on this amendment introduced by Mr. Rappaport and drafted by Mr. Levin is, what kind of outcome do we want? Do we want people to be working, or do we want people merely unemployed and not receiving any kind of funds from the government? This amendment asserts that the goal of public policy in the Commonwealth is to get people working. The purpose of this amendment is to provide jobs. The purpose of this amendment is to provide jobs through the private sector. This is clearly the best amendment that has yet been introduced. This is an amendment that will lead to people being employed and leave them working if there are any jobs available. It may be that there are no jobs available. I know as a state legislator now for about 6 years, no company has told me they have huge numbers of jobs available. We in the Philadelphia area do not get overwhelmed with companies complaining that they cannot find people who are willing to work; but the whole feeling behind this, the whole belief expressed by Governor Thornburgh, is that there are a huge number of jobs that are available and it is merely the peoples' fault and there are lazy people who are not working. Under this amendment, if it is true that there are jobs available and there are people who are not working, and if it is true that the goal is for the people working in the private sector, this is the amendment for everybody to vote for. I strongly urge support of this amendment.

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

Mr. PUNT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Regarding this amendment, I think the time has come—and Mr. Rappaport is right. There are some basic differences here in philosophical aspects. I am of the opinion that the middle-income American class of people are senior citizens that are retired and are on fixed incomes and can no longer struggle to survive and make ends meet. They are having a difficult time as it is. They are demanding a redirection of welfare in Pennsylvania. And that is my philosophical difference, that middle-income America and our senior citizens cannot go any longer. What we need to do—and we can accomplish such through HB 2044—is to take care and provide for the truly needy and not for those who should not be on general assistance. We do not need a creation or an increase in staffing of BER or BES. As I said earlier, we are not in an employment-agency business. It is the state's obligation to provide these tools to obtain an education, to obtain a job skill, but it is not the state's obligation to set those people into this school or to set those people into this job training and to set those people into this specific job. Somewhere along the way that individual is going to have to take that first step towards reaching independence rather than dependence upon government and its institutions. That is my philosophical attitude. Generations of welfare, we have seen children growing up, becoming adults, remaining on the welfare roles. We need to reactivate a work ethic, a work

environment. And it may not be a pleasant job. It may be a gas station attendant. I was laid off and I was fortunate enough to go out and find a job and pump gas. I did not care for it. It did not pay that much, but it was something. I submit to this body that there are those types of jobs and work available on at least, if nothing else, an interim basis until a better job becomes available for that individual to promote and advance themselves.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—76

Austin	Fee	Letterman	Rhodes
Barber	Fischer	Livengood	Richardson
Beloff	Gallagher	McCall	Rieger
Bennett	Gatski	Manderino	Rodgers
Berson	George, C.	Michlovic	Schmitt
Borski	Goodman	Milanovich	Seventy
Caltagirone	Grabowski	Mrkonic	Shupnik
Cappabianca	Greenfield	Mullen	Steighner
Chess	Harper	Murphy	Stewart
Clark, B. D.	Hoeffel	Novak	Street
Cole	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien, B. F.	Stuban
Cowell	Irvic	O'Donnell	Sweet
DeMedio	Itkin	Oliver	Trello
DeWeese	Johnson, J. J.	Petrarca	Wachob
Dawida	Jones	Pievsky	Wargo
Dombrowski	Knight	Pistella	White
Duffy	Kolter	Pucciarelli	Williams
Dumas	Kukovich	Rappaport	Wright, D. R.
Earley	Laughlin	Reed	Yahner

NAYS—105

Anderson	Fryer	McKelvey	Sirianni
Armstrong	Gallen	McVerry	Smith, E. H.
Arty	Gamble	Mackowski	Smith, L. E.
Belardi	Gannon	Manmiller	Spencer
Bittle	Geesey	Micozzie	Spitz
Bowser	Geist	Miller	Stairs
Brandt	George, M. H.	Moehlmann	Swift
Brown	Gladeck	Mowery	Taddonio
Burd	Goebel	Nahill	Taylor, E. Z.
Burns	Grieco	Noye	Taylor, F.
Cessar	Gruppo	O'Brien, D. M.	Telek
Cimini	Halverson	Perzel	Thomas
Clark, M. R.	Hasay	Peterson	Vroon
Cochran	Hayes, Jr., S.	Piccola	Wass
Cornell	Helfrick	Pitts	Wenger
Coslett	Honaman	Polite	Wilson
Cunningham	Hutchinson, W.	Pott	Wilt
DeVerter	Johnson, E. G.	Punt	Wright, Jr., J.
DiCarlo	Kanuck	Pyles	Yohn
Davies	Klingaman	Ritter	Zeller
Dietz	Kowalyshyn	Rocks	Zitterman
Dininni	Lashinger	Ryan	Zord
Dorr	Lehr	Salvatore	Zwinkl
Durham	Levi	Scheaffer	
Fisher	Lewis	Schweder	Seltzer,
Foster, W. W.	Lynch, E. R.	Serafini	Speaker
Foster, Jr., A.	McClatchy	Sieminski	

NOT VOTING—15

Alden	Gray	McIntyre	Pratt
Cohen	Hayes, D. S.	McMonagle	Shadding
Freind	Knepper	Madigan	Weidner
Giammarco	Levin	Musto	

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

On the question recurring,
Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?
Mr. RAPPAPORT offered the following amendment:

Amend Sec. 3, page 3, line 24, by striking out all of said line and inserting Section 3. This act shall not take effect until the State unemployment rate is less than or equal to the unemployment rate at which employment compensation benefits are automatically extended under Federal law, as determined by the Department of Labor as provided in section 401 (a), act of December 5, 1936 (2nd Sp.Sess. 1937 P. L. 2897, No. 1), known as the "Unemployment Compensation Law."

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

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

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the members of the House are familiar with the trigger provisions of the Federal law under which unemployment compensation is extended from 13 weeks to 39 weeks, et cetera. This amendment will state that this act will not take effect until the unemployment rate in Pennsylvania goes below the Federal trigger rate of unemployment. The purpose of this amendment is to state that, yes, it is well and good to tell people that you go out and get a job, but it is rather self-defeating to tell them to go out and get a job when no job is available. They had a revolution in France when the Queen said, "Let them eat cake," when they did not have bread. And perhaps we are doing the same thing.

It is rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, when we see the breakdown of the number of people on general assistance in each of the legislative districts in Philadelphia. It is alleged by many that I represent a high-income area, and, indeed, in some parts of my district the poor people live in homes that are only worth \$150,000. However, even in my district we have 4,100 people on general assistance, one of the highest rates in the city.

I would argue for this amendment, Mr. Speaker, by saying merely that when the jobs are available, then the people should go out and get them; but if the jobs are not available—and in many parts of this state they are not because of our declining manufacturing economy—then it is really self-defeating and almost foolish to tell them to go out and get the jobs that are not there. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. PUNT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amendment, as I read it, is little more than an attempt to stifle welfare reform. The goal of this bill is to increase aid to the truly needy and curb assistance to the able-bodied. Again, finding a job for the individual is not the responsibility of government, although we will be attempting to increase Pennsylvania's economic climate through PIDA, the Minority Business Development Authority and the proposed community conservation and employment opportunities incentive grant program. We are addressing these needs. These

people will still be eligible for food stamps, for medical assistance, for the basic necessities. What we are doing is redirecting so that these people, these citizens, that have been on the rolls will find independence from government and its institutions rather than dependence upon those institutions. I, therefore, would oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Mr. Speaker, I am really at quite a loss to determine the philosophical background of the administration in offering this concept and opposing an amendment such as I have offered today.

I remember during the campaign when Dick Thornburgh was running for Governor, and he was campaigning through the public housing projects in Philadelphia, saying that he was going to increase welfare and he was going to cut out the fraud. Probably the two major areas where this could be done would be in stepping up the drive against fathers who have abandoned their families and thus relegate them to the Aid to Dependent Children program. The other one is Medicaid fraud.

Instead of really wading in and doing what has to be done in those two areas, we see the administration going after this area. Well, I understand why he is doing it; general assistance is all state dollars. The other two programs have Federal dollars involved. But, I would suggest, as a moral proposition, if we are to become very moralistic about this and self-righteous, that those are the areas where we should be interested, because those are the people who are avoiding the responsibilities, the fathers who abandon their families and have jobs and just disappear. We probably could make up a lot of money with an effective program. We have yet to see such an effective program go in. In fact, it is as bad as it ever was.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat my arguments. To send people out to get jobs when there are no jobs and then disclaim responsibility for their inability to get a job is not what this country is all about. Let us make the able-bodied work, and how. And those who are loafers and will not work, throw them off the welfare roll; but where there is no work for them, then we are not particularly living in a moral society by saying go out and get work. That is what Herbert Hoover said in 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932, and perhaps that is why Herbert Hoover was not reelected in 1932, because people realized that you cannot send people out to get jobs when there are no jobs. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clarion, Mr. Wright.

Mr. D. R. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that anybody else shares my confusion, but frankly I am confused. I hear these protestations that government should stay out of our lives, that government does not have any business trying to help people to get jobs. I hear that from a person who just a few months ago was touting the Workfare bill, saying that this Commonwealth should be providing jobs for those who cannot work. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think he was right the first time. It distresses me,

it concerns me that we are in the process of developing a piece of legislation that makes no provision for those who are genuinely unemployed. I think it is a mistake on our part to reject some of these amendments, at least, that will do something that we ought to do for people who want to work but cannot find it. If there are so many jobs, I wish you would send some of those to Clarion County because I have some people who want them.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—79

Austin	Fee	McKelvey	Rocks
Barber	Gallagher	Manderino	Rodgers
Beloff	Gamble	Michlovic	Schmitt
Bennett	George, C.	Milanovich	Seventy
Berson	Goodman	Mrkonic	Shupnik
Borski	Grabowski	Mullen	Steighner
Caltagirone	Greenfield	Murphy	Stewart
Cappabianca	Hoeffel	Novak	Street
Chess	Hutchinson, A.	O'Brien, B. F.	Stuban
Clark, B. D.	Irvis	O'Donnell	Sweet
Cochran	Itkin	Oliver	Taylor, F.
Cole	Johnson, J. J.	Petrarca	Telek
Cowell	Jones	Pievsky	Trello
DeMedio	Knight	Pistella	Wachob
DeWeese	Kolter	Pucciarelli	Wargo
Dawida	Kukovich	Rappaport	White
Dombrowski	Laughlin	Reed	Williams
Duffy	Letterman	Rhodes	Wright, D. R.
Dumas	Livengood	Richardson	Yahner
Earley	McCall	Ritter	

NAYS—99

Anderson	Fryer	Lynch, E. R.	Sieminski
Armstrong	Gallen	McClatchy	Sirianni
Arty	Gannon	McVerry	Smith, E. H.
Belardi	Gatski	Mackowski	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Geesey	Manmiller	Spencer
Brandt	Geist	Micozzie	Spitz
Brown	George, M. H.	Miller	Stairs
Burd	Gladeck	Moehlmann	Swift
Burns	Goebel	Mowery	Taddonio
Cessar	Grieco	Nahill	Taylor, E. Z.
Cimini	Gruppo	Noye	Thomas
Clark, M. R.	Halverson	O'Brien, D. M.	Vroon
Cornell	Hasay	Perzel	Wass
Coslett	Hayes, Jr., S.	Peterson	Wenger
Cunningham	Helfrick	Piccola	Wilson
DeVerter	Honaman	Pitts	Wilt
DiCarlo	Hutchinson, W.	Polite	Wright, Jr., J.
Davies	Johnson, E. G.	Pott	Yohn
Dietz	Kanuck	Punt	Zeller
Dininni	Klingaman	Pyles	Zitterman
Dorr	Kowalshyn	Ryan	Zord
Durham	Lashingier	Salvatore	Zwinkl
Fischer	Lehr	Scheaffer	
Fisher	Levi	Schweder	Seltzer,
Foster, W. W.	Lewis	Serafini	Speaker
Foster, Jr., A.			

NOT VOTING—18

Alden	Gray	McIntyre	Pratt
Bittle	Harper	McMonagle	Rieger
Cohen	Hayes, D. S.	Madigan	Shadding
Freind	Knepper	Musto	Weidner
Giammarco	Levin		

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

REMARKS ON VOTES

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

Mr. COHEN. My switch still is not working, and I would like to be recorded in the affirmative.

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

With the gentleman, Mr. Cohen, indicate on future votes before the Chair closes the vote, whether or not his switch is recording because the Chair does not want him to miss his roll call?

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2044 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. KUKOVICH offered the following amendments:

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 23 and 24 Section 3. No person shall be employed or enrolled for training under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) by any CETA prime sponsor until all transitionally needy persons in the geographic area of the CETA prime sponsors have been employed or enrolled in a training program.

Amend Sec. 3, page 3, line 24, by striking out "3." and inserting 4.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. KUKOVICH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The amendment itself is rather simple. What it says is that those individuals who would be placed in the transitionally needy category under HB 2044 would be the first ones eligible for CETA - Comprehensive Employment and Training Act - employment. Now my purpose for this amendment is two-fold. First, and it was articulated quite well by the few previous speakers, that where there are those who are employable and jobs are not available that we do have a moral obligation to provide them with jobs. The CETA program will do that.

Secondly, I have statistics here that show that the state has given back millions of dollars in CETA funds which we could use to employ the people who would come under transitionally needy. There are about six different categories or six titles under the CETA Act. According to just three of these titles which I have been able to garner some information about, under Title II of the act, in 1979, Fayette County gave back \$235,000; Montgomery County, \$1,800,000; the city of Pittsburgh, \$147,000; Washington County, \$271,000; Westmoreland County, \$203,000.

Under Title III, Allegheny County gave back \$161,000; Berks County, \$10,000; Bucks County, \$101,000; Centre County, \$15,000; the city of Pittsburgh, \$333,000; the Tri-County area, \$60,000; and Washington County, \$80,000.

Under Title VI, Berks County gave back \$364,000; the city of Pittsburgh, \$479,000; and Washington County, \$245,000. Now in just the fiscal year 1979, in only half of

the programs under CETA, this state gave back over \$4.5 million. Now, I am suggesting to you that that money could be put to good use. If this bill does pass, I would suggest that the CETA money should first go to employing these people. If you are truly concerned about being fair, then I do not see how you can possibly vote against this amendment and I would ask for your support.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Punt.

Mr. PUNT. I must feel, to a large extent, some of the comments that the gentleman just said are possibly so. I think we can all agree that many abuses were found through the CETA programs. Nevertheless, there are individual respected areas where CETA has been working. I think this amendment has such strong ramifications, though the intent is good, I truly believe that this type of amendment should be handled as a separate piece of legislation that should be studied in very explicit detail as HB 2044 is unquestionably being at this time. I would oppose this amendment under those grounds.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Kukovich.

Mr. KUKOVICH. I think Mr. Punt just made a valid argument for committal. I think if we are talking about throwing people off welfare—and he admits that this would be a viable means of getting these people to work and he does go on to say that it should be studied—well, I think once again we have that moral obligation not to take such a drastic step unless alternatives are studied. If these people are able-bodied and they are employable, why are so many, 105 to 115, people voting not to give them employment?

Mr. Speaker, I just read an article recently by Michael McMannus, who writes frequently about the economic problems indigenous to the northeast. He stated in an article recently that one of the reasons why the Sunbelt has a surplus of \$23 billion and the northeast is losing billions of dollars in tax revenues is because of the way we mishandle or do not appropriately use funds like CETA. We are not doing a good job of using that money and implementing it in such a way to match those industrial training jobs with actual jobs when the money runs out. Now, this is the chance to do that. This is the chance to use that money totally without sending back millions more which will leave this state and go back to the Sunbelt. For that reason also, I would ask your support of this amendment. I think it is a reasonable one and I think it deserves passage. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. YOHN. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman, Mr. Kukovich, consent to interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Would the gentleman, Mr. Kukovich, stand for interrogation?

The gentleman indicates that he will. Mr. Yohn may proceed.

Mr. YOHN. Mr. Kukovich, am I correct that CETA is a Federal program.

Mr. KUKOVICH. That is correct.

Mr. YOHN. And am I also correct that in connection with that Federal program, the Federal Government sets the guidelines by which the prime sponsors do the hiring? Is that correct?

Mr. KUKOVICH. That is true.

Mr. YOHN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I would therefore oppose the amendment. I think that what the amendment does is attempt to take the Federal guidelines for CETA hiring programs and make them state guidelines by imposing this restriction on the prime sponsors. I do not think we can do that. The Federal guidelines are the ones that control and therefore I think that this amendment would not prevail even if it were enacted into law as opposed to the Federal statutes and would suggest we defeat the amendment. Thank you.

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

Mr. STREET. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Kukovich amendment because something very interesting is happening here. If we read the Federal guidelines on the CETA program and if in fact the state was really concerned about hiring or providing employment for the unemployed, they would understand that when you turn back money, that has a tremendous impact on the amount of money you receive in the next year. So the turning back of \$4.5 million means that the grant coming up for 1978 is not going to be as great as the grant that we received in 1979 because we did not demonstrate, as the State of Pennsylvania, a need for the amount of money that we received in 1979.

My point is that if we are going to receive CETA moneys and continue to turn it back, and by the same token, say that we want jobs, why not make sure, one, that the CETA money is used to provide jobs for people? How can we come up with 2044 talking about people who do not want to work when we could have used the \$4.5 million that we turned back to demonstrate at least that people did not want to work? We should at least be in the position to say, we have \$4.5 million where we could have provided jobs. We put jobs up that would have consumed this money. The people on general assistance came in and they said, we do not want that job, so as a result the jobs that we had the people would not take so we had to send the money back. But, we did not do that, we never did provide the jobs. All we did was send back \$4.5 million, and I think we need to look at that, because what that means is that we will not receive as much money in 1980 as we received in 1979. If it keeps going back, pretty soon the State of Pennsylvania will qualify for very few dollars under the CETA self-help work program.

With that, I urge, I urge the support of the Kukovich amendment, because we can see by doing that that the State of Pennsylvania never again turns back \$4.5 million to the Federal Government, that was sent up here to us from Washington. Thank you.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman, Mr. Kukovich, stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Kukovich, indicates that he will.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not clear on the point that was raised over there seeming to suggest that we could not provide in this amendment some effort or guidelines that would be legal that would in fact hook up the Federal moneys we are turning back with the jobs that are needed now. Could you respond and suggest that we could or could not legally do what you propose?

Mr. KUKOVICH. Yes, Mr. Speaker. There would be absolutely no problem. We would not even need any new guidelines in the state. We would simply follow the Federal guidelines the way we do now when we have jobs available. The only thing that the Federal Government says is that an individual must be unemployed for 30 days before they would receive CETA employment. All we would have to do is that our own Bureau of Employment Security and everybody else who provide jobs would simply follow it the same way. There would be no overlap. There would be no problem, and we could do it in a very simple straightforward manner. So that the argument on the legality really is of no moment and is a device to avoid the issue. I think that there was very little validity to that argument, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would the gentleman, Mr. Punt, consent to interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Punt, indicates that he will. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, did I hear you say there were ramifications of this amendment that should be studied? I thought I heard you say that. Is that what you said?

Mr. PUNT. I said this should be handled as a separate piece of legislation rather than an amendment in the Welfare Code.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I heard you say that. I am asking you in truth did I also hear you say that there were ramifications to this amendment that needed to be studied?

Mr. PUNT. Certainly something of this impact should be studied, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the impact or what are the ramifications that you speak of?

Mr. PUNT. I look at, for an example, a loan from Philadelphia, I believe we saw that Philadelphia returned to the Federal Government \$12 million or \$11 million from Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, and it is a federally funded program with state matching funds in local government, and I do not think something like this should be handled in an amendment process. That is what I meant by that statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand what you just said. Are you suggesting that one of the ramifications is that cities and counties have been turning back money? What, in

terms of ramification, do you mean, because Mr. Kukovich did say that the main thing was that Pennsylvania was turning back money, and you repeated that as a ramification. What I am trying to ask you is, what is the ramification of trying to hook up that money that we are turning back with the jobs that he is suggesting in the amendment? What ramifications do you see that need to be studied before you would consider it being part of this legislation in HB 2044?

Mr. PUNT. The ramification, Mr. Speaker, as I said just a minute ago, is that the municipality determines the destiny for those moneys. The state does not determine it. And I feel that this idea or this concept should be handled as a total separate entity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, would your opinion change if the state said, okay, we put these people off welfare, but they have a priority of some kind in their respective counties to hire those people, the same way you are doing now, but these people have a priority on money that they are all turning back. Would that satisfy that particular ramification?

Mr. PUNT. Would you repeat your question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. WILLIAMS. You have suggested as one of the ramifications that county to county turn back their own particular segment of money. I have suggested, would you feel more comfortable if the people in the categories suggested by Mr. Kukovich were from county to county? In other words, if the people who are first put into that money that we are losing were in this general assistance category we are cutting off, and make it county to county? Would that satisfy that particular objection?

Mr. PUNT. These grants are done by units, and I am certainly not an authority on CETA itself. As I say, in view of the many different areas that this is involved with and concerned with, I do not think that this idea should be handled through an amendment process to the Welfare Code.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask you this question: HB 2044 is an amendment to a code. Is that not a fact?

Mr. PUNT. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So, there, would you agree, would be nothing so magic as far as substance is concerned about the amendment in that the proposed legislation that we are seeking to amend is in and of itself also an amendment? Am I correct?

Mr. PUNT. I am sorry, would you repeat that, please?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was suggesting to the speaker that the reply that what we are talking about here is an amendment to the Welfare Code would be no different from the main bill because it also is an amendment.

Mr. PUNT. This bill is an amendment to the Welfare Code. Is that what you are saying?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In reply to your query or comment, I was suggesting that it was a difference you were suggesting without a distinction, in talking about an amendment because this is an amendment and so is the main bill.

Mr. Speaker, one final inquiry: Was there a study of the ramifications of HB 2044 as it exists now?

Mr. PUNT. Do you mean was there a study of what HB 2044 would do, the results?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, of the many ramifications of economic impact, the crime impact, the cost impact on municipalities because of the dislodgment of people who could not find jobs? Was there such a study made?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

The Chair asks that the gentleman, Mr. Williams, please confine his interrogation to the amendment before us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I was attempting to do that because the response raised by Mr. Punt to the amendment spoke on the heavy question of ramifications. I, therefore, assumed that that was a concern throughout this legislation. However, I will withdraw that inquiry.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your responses and the right to comment briefly on the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. DiCARLO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Williams has not finished.

The SPEAKER. The Chair apologizes to you, Mr. Williams. I thought the gentleman had completed.

If the gentleman wishes to debate the amendment, he is in order and may proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, just very briefly, Mr. Kukovich's amendment, once again, is a very intelligent effort just to try to do something very commonsense and moral. He has said, look, we are already throwing away money. He has said that the Sunbelt bill is sexy because that is smart. He has said, let us scratch our heads, we protectors of the taxpayers' money, and hook up some available money, that we have been dumb about in the past, with the fact that we are ripping off some people who cannot find jobs in our own state. It is very simple, very intelligent, and very smart.

One of the comments raised was ramifications. And Mr. Kukovich is right; we know that none of us has studied the awesome ramifications of HB 2044. Indeed, very simply, one thing that we can do is to adjust this small segment of this small amount of money that is coming from the Federal Government anyway. I would support the amendment, Mr. Speaker, as at least one simple step of rationality to a bill that just does not make sense.

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

Mr. DiCARLO. Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the maker of the amendment, Mr. Kukovich, submit to a brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Kukovich, stand for interrogation? The gentleman indicates that he will. Mr. DiCarlo may proceed.

Mr. DiCARLO. Mr. Speaker, is there anything in the language that you submitted before the House that mandates that local communities have to spend or appropriate funds to the maximum dollars permitted by the Federal Government?

Mr. KUKOVICH. No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DiCARLO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Kukovich amendment, and for two specific reasons. One is, Mr. Kukovich indicated that it still gives local communities, those taxing bodies, the right, the opportunity, the obligation, to make a decision based on their own revenues as to whether they should have a Comprehensive Employment and Training Act program; how large that CETA program should be, and what length and what duration that program should be. But, more importantly, what he is doing is saying that those people who indeed need the employment are going to have the first opportunity to fill those CETA jobs.

Any of you who are active politically back in your own districts know, and you know for a fact, and anybody who has worked for local officials knows that CETA programs by and far have not been utilized and have not been providing services for those people who really need jobs. We have seen local officials, we have seen county officials, and we have seen even state government use CETA for purposes of political patronage. We have seen people being screened and put into CETA positions simply because of their party or simply because they got involved in past campaigns. We have seen county executives, as demonstrated in Erie County, we saw the House of Representatives last term, pass a resolution bipartisanly, almost unanimously, investigating the operations of CETA in this Commonwealth because of the uses by local officials.

Mr. Speaker, I think, for the first time, the Kukovich amendment is a reasonable response; it is going to provide some opportunities for those people who could not get jobs otherwise to have the opportunity to have a job; to have the opportunity to go to work. It, secondly, is going to hold accountable those people who are taking hundreds of millions of Federal dollars to make sure that that program is being used for the purpose that it was set up for. Mr. Speaker, it is a good amendment; it maintains local control and local flexibility, and I urge the House to support the Kukovich amendment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—94

Austin	Fee	McIntyre	Rodgers
Barber	Fryer	McKelvey	Schmitt
Beloff	Gallagher	Manderino	Schweder
Bennett	Gamble	Michlovic	Seventy
Berson	Gatski	Milanovich	Shupnik
Brown	George, C.	Mrkonic	Steighner
Caltagirone	Goebel	Murphy	Stewart
Cappabianca	Goodman	Novak	Street
Chess	Grabowski	O'Brien, B. F.	Stuban
Clark, B. D.	Greenfield	O'Donnell	Sweet
Clark, M. R.	Harper	Oliver	Taylor, F.
Cochran	Hoeffel	Petrarca	Telek
Cohen	Hutchinson, A.	Pievsky	Trello
Cole	Irvin	Pistella	Wachob
Cowell	Itkin	Pott	Wargo
Cunningham	Johnson, J. J.	Pucciarelli	Wass
DeMedio	Knight	Rappaport	White
DeWeese	Kolter	Reed	Williams
DiCarlo	Kowalshyn	Rhodes	Wright, D. R.

Dawida	Kukovich	Richardson	Yahner
Dombrowski	Laughlin	Rieger	Zitterman
Duffy	Letterman	Ritter	Zord
Dumas	Livengood	Rocks	Zwikl
Earley	McCall		

NAYS—84

Anderson	Gannon	McVerry	Sieminski
Armstrong	Geesey	Mackowski	Sirianni
Arty	Geist	Manmiller	Smith, E. H.
Belardi	George, M. H.	Micozzie	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Gladeck	Miller	Spencer
Brandt	Grieco	Moehlmann	Spitz
Burd	Gruppo	Mowery	Stairs
Burns	Halverson	Nahill	Swift
Cessar	Hasay	Noye	Taddonio
Cimini	Hayes, Jr., S.	O'Brien, D. M.	Taylor, E. Z.
Cornell	Helfrick	Perzel	Thomas
Coslett	Honaman	Peterson	Vroon
DeVerter	Hutchinson, W.	Piccola	Wenger
Davies	Johnson, E. G.	Pitts	Wilson
Dietz	Kanuck	Polite	Wilt
Dorr	Klingaman	Punt	Wright, Jr., J.
Durham	Lashingner	Pyles	Yohn
Fischer	Lehr	Ryan	Zeller
Fisher	Levi	Salvatore	
Foster, W. W.	Lewis	Scheaffer	Seltzer,
Foster, Jr., A.	Lynch, E. R.	Serafini	Speaker
Gallen	McClatchy		

NOT VOTING—18

Alden	Giammarco	Levin	Musto
Bittle	Gray	McMonagle	Pratt
Borski	Hayes, D. S.	Madigan	Shadding
Dininni	Jones	Mullen	Weidner
Freind	Knepper		

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

HB 2044 PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. SPEAKER, I have no further business and I would yield to the minority leader in the event he has further business. Otherwise I will move to adjourn at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest that the gentleman first move to pass over HB 2044 for the day.

Mr. RYAN. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

I would move at this time that HB 2044, with amendments, be held over until tomorrow.

The Speaker. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, all remaining bills and resolutions on today's calendar will be passed over.

The Chair hears no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, March 4, 1980, at 9:30 a.m., e.s.t.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and at 6:34 p.m., e.s.t., the House adjourned.