

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Legislative Journal

TUESDAY, MARCH 31, 1981

SESSION OF 1981

165TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 20

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 11 a.m., e.s.t.

THE SPEAKER (MATTHEW J. RYAN) IN THE CHAIR

PRAYER

REV. DARWYN J. NACE, chaplain of the House of Representatives and pastor of Felton Bethany United Methodist Church, Felton, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Almighty God, our Father, we come to You with open minds and a sincere heart. With so much frustration and hostility around us, we seek Your guidance. We trust in Your supreme power and ask Your daily blessing.

As we go about our tasks as people of God, we pray that we might always sense Your awareness and seek Your presence. Give us courage and insight into this another day filled with responsibilities. We acknowledge our need of You, for we come praying in the Master's name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(The Pledge of Allegiance was enunciated by members.)

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, approval of the Journal of Monday, March 30, 1981, will be postponed until printed. The Chair hears none.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 1051 By Representatives NOYE, COCHRAN, PETRARCA, KLINGAMAN, CALTAGIRONE, MRKONIC, TELEK, JOHNSON and McINTYRE

An Act amending the "Tax Reform Code of 1971," approved March 4, 1971 (P. L. 6, No. 2), excluding from the tax for education the sale or use of synthetic furs.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, March 30, 1981.

No. 1052 By Representatives NOYE, WACHOB, CALTAGIRONE, COCHRAN, TELEK, JOHNSON and McINTYRE

An Act amending "The County Code," approved August 9, 1955 (P. L. 323, No. 130), increasing the payment for attending certain meetings.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, March 30, 1981.

No. 1053 By Representatives NOYE, McINTYRE, CALTAGIRONE, COCHRAN, TELEK, WACHOB and JOHNSON

An Act amending the act of May 19, 1923 (P. L. 267, No. 170), entitled "An act authorizing probation officers of the various counties to attend the annual State Association on Conference of Probation and Parole, and providing for the payment of their expenses and membership dues by counties," further providing for expenses.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, March 30, 1981.

No. 1054 By Representatives NOYE, TELEK, CALTAGIRONE, POTT, COCHRAN, WACHOB, JOHNSON and McINTYRE

An Act amending the act of July 28, 1953 (P. L. 723, No. 230), increasing the payment for attending certain meetings.

Referred to Committee on URBAN AFFAIRS, March 30, 1981.

No. 1055 By Representatives NOYE, PETRARCA, KLINGAMAN, CALTAGIRONE, POTT, COCHRAN, B. SMITH, PRATT, BOWSER, MRKONIC, CIMINI, CIVERA, COSLETT, TELEK, ZWIKL, STAIRS, JOHNSON, GEIST, McINTYRE, PENDLETON and MERRY

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

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, March 30, 1981.

No. 1056 By Representatives COSLETT, LEHR, HASAY, SHUPNIK, MACKOWSKI, E. H. SMITH, DeMEDIO, BELARDI, SERAFINI, WASS, OLASZ, TELEK, CAWLEY, MRKONIC, HORGOS, WARGO, SEVENTY, PETRONE, STUBAN, COCHRAN, STEVENS, FRYER, BELFANTI, NAHILL, CORNELL, TRELLO, GEIST, TIGUE, BLAUM,

GREENWOOD, CLYMER, PHILLIPS, FEE, McCALL, BRANDT, WENGER, J. D. WILLIAMS, MORRIS, COWELL, PISTELLA, MADIGAN, VROON, W. W. FOSTER, CIMINI, FLECK, BOWSER, CALTAGIRONE, GEORGE, SIEMINSKI, GRUPPO, HAGARTY, GRIECO, BOYES, McINTYRE, DONATUCCI, WIGGINS, BURD, POTT, PENDLETON, RIEGER, HONAMAN, LUCYK, DAWIDA, DUFFY, ITKIN, SNYDER, SAURMAN, DAIKELER, RASCO, MICOZZIE, E. Z. TAYLOR and SIRIANNI

An Act amending the "Public Welfare Code," approved June 13, 1967 (P. L. 31, No. 21), further providing for eligibility for and the amount of State blind pensions.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH AND WELFARE, March 30, 1981.

**No. 1057** By Representatives MISCEVICH and MANDERINO

An Act authorizing the Township of Sewickley, Westmoreland County to convey a portion of Project 70 land located in the Village of Rillton for a private roadway.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, March 30, 1981.

**No. 1058** By Representative W. W. FOSTER

An Act amending the act of October 10, 1980 (No. 162), entitled "An act amending the act of May 31, 1911 (P. L. 468, No. 193), entitled 'An act providing for the establishment of a State Highway Department, \*\*\*; and providing that existing contracts are not affected by provisions of this act,' deleting a portion of Route 167 in Pike County and conveying and ceding jurisdiction to such route to the United States Government," directing the conveyance of the deleted portion of State Route 167 (U. S. Route 209) and making related editorial changes.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, March 30, 1981.

**No. 1059** By Representatives CORDISCO, J. L. WRIGHT, CLYMER, GREENWOOD and BURNS

An Act amending the "County Pension Law," approved August 31, 1971 (P. L. 398, No. 96), providing for the use of members' contributions to the fund as collateral for certain loans from a credit union.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, March 30, 1981.

**No. 1060** By Representatives KUKOVICH, SEVENTY, IRVIS, PISTELLA, DeWEESE, COHEN, WACHOB and PETRARCA

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses), of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for offenses relating to sterilization abuse.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, March 30, 1981.

## HOUSE RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

**No. 42** By Representatives DeVERTER and RYAN

House request Governor proclaim June 7 to June 13, 1981, "Pennsylvania Safe Boating Week".

Referred to Committee on RULES, March 30, 1981.

**No. 43**

(Concurrent) By Representatives HASAY, PETRARCA, COCHRAN, BELARDI, KUKOVICH, CLARK, OLASZ, CALTAGIRONE, CUNNINGHAM, STEVENS, COSLETT, CAWLEY, BLAUM, VAN HORNE, STEIGHNER, D. R. WRIGHT, F. E. TAYLOR, LUCYK and SHOWERS

General Assembly memorializes Congress and Veterans Administration coordinate activities with veterans assistance centers for veterans suffering effects of Agent Orange.

Referred to Committee on FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS, March 30, 1981.

## SENATE BILL FOR CONCURRENCE

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

**SB 269, PN 270**

Referred to Committee on Education, March 31, 1981

## LEAVES OF ABSENCE GRANTED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority whip.

Mr. CESSAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask for leaves of absence for Representatives SPITZ, FREIND, and SALVATORE for today's session.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a leave of absence for Representative TIGUE for today's session and tomorrow's session. He still remains on military leave. We also ask for leaves of absence for Representatives MORRIS and COHEN for today's session.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, all leaves will be granted. The Chair hears none.

## BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

**HB 10, PN 10**

By Rep. SPENCER

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the immunity of victims of rape and voluntary deviate sexual intercourse, and for the payment of certain expenses by the Commonwealth.

JUDICIARY.

**HB 671, PN 706**

By Rep. SPENCER

An Act providing for the protection of library, museum and archival material, defining the crime of library theft, providing

for the detention of suspects, exempting libraries and their employees from civil and criminal liability and providing penalties.

JUDICIARY.

**HB 696, PN 731** By Rep. SPENCER

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for summary criminal contempt proceedings for persons who willfully fail to comply with lawful support orders.

JUDICIARY.

**MASTER ROLL CALL RECORDED**

The SPEAKER. The Chair is about to take the master roll call. Only those members in their seats are permitted to vote.

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—190

Alden	Evans	Levin	Ritter
Anderson	Fee	Lewis	Rocks
Arty	Fischer	Livengood	Rybak
Barber	Fleck	Lloyd	Saurman
Belardi	Foster, W. W.	Lucyk	Serafini
Belfanti	Foster, Jr., A.	McCall	Seventy
Beloff	Frazier	McClatchy	Showers
Berson	Fryer	McIntyre	Shupnik
Bittle	Gallagher	McMonagle	Sieminski
Blaum	Gallen	McVerry	Sirianni
Borski	Gamble	Mackowski	Smith, B.
Bowser	Gannon	Madigan	Smith, E. H.
Boyes	Geist	Maiale	Smith, L. E.
Brandt	George	Manderino	Snyder
Brown	Grabowski	Manmiller	Spencer
Burd	Gray	Marmion	Stairs
Burns	Greenfield	Merry	Steighner
Caltagirone	Greenwood	Michlovic	Stevens
Cappabianca	Grieco	Micozzie	Stewart
Cawley	Gruitza	Miller	Stuban
Cessar	Gruppo	Miscevich	Swaim
Cimini	Hagarty	Moehlmann	Sweet
Civera	Haluska	Mowery	Swift
Clark	Harper	Mrkonic	Taddonio
Clymer	Hasay	Mullen	Taylor, E. Z.
Cochran	Hayes	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Colafella	Heiser	Nahill	Trello
Cole	Hoeffel	Noye	Van Horne
Cordisco	Honaman	O'Donnell	Vroon
Cornell	Horgos	Olasz	Wachob
Coslett	Hutchinson, A.	Oliver	Wambach
Cowell	Hutchinson, W.	Pendleton	Wargo
Cunningham	Irvis	Perzel	Wass
DeMedio	Itkin	Peterson	Wenger
DeVerter	Jackson	Petrarca	Weston
DeWeese	Johnson	Petrone	White
Daikeler	Kanuck	Phillips	Wiggins
Davies	Kennedy	Piccola	Williams, H.
Dawida	Klingaman	Pievsky	Williams, J. D.
Dietz	Kolter	Pistella	Wilson
Dininni	Kowalshyn	Pitts	Wogan
Dombrowski	Kukovich	Pott	Wozniak
Donatucci	Lashinger	Pratt	Wright, D. R.
Dorr	Laughlin	Pucciarelli	Wright, J. L.
Duffy	Lehr	Punt	Zwinkl
Durham	Lescovitz	Rasco	
Earley	Letterman	Reber	Ryan,
Emerson	Levi	Rieger	Speaker

ADDITIONS—6

Armstrong	Gladeck	Richardson	Telek
Deal	Rappaport		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

**MEMBER'S PRESENCE RECORDED**

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

Mr. DEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my name be added to the master roll call.

**RULES SUSPENDED**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader. Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the rules be suspended to permit the immediate consideration of a resolution.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—183

Alden	Emerson	Levin	Ritter
Anderson	Evans	Lewis	Rocks
Arty	Fee	Livengood	Rybak
Barber	Fleck	Lloyd	Serafini
Belardi	Foster, W. W.	Lucyk	Seventy
Belfanti	Foster, Jr., A.	McCall	Showers
Beloff	Frazier	McClatchy	Shupnik
Berson	Fryer	McIntyre	Sieminski
Bittle	Gallen	McMonagle	Sirianni
Blaum	Gamble	McVerry	Smith, B.
Borski	Gannon	Mackowski	Smith, E. H.
Bowser	Geist	Madigan	Smith, L. E.
Boyes	George	Maiale	Snyder
Brandt	Grabowski	Manderino	Spencer
Brown	Gray	Manmiller	Steighner
Burd	Greenfield	Marmion	Stevens
Burns	Greenwood	Merry	Stewart
Caltagirone	Grieco	Michlovic	Stuban
Cappabianca	Gruitza	Micozzie	Swaim
Cawley	Gruppo	Miscevich	Sweet
Cessar	Hagarty	Moehlmann	Swift
Cimini	Haluska	Mowery	Taddonio
Civera	Harper	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Clark	Hasay	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Clymer	Hayes	Nahill	Trello
Colafella	Heiser	Noye	Van Horne
Cole	Hoeffel	O'Donnell	Vroon
Cordisco	Honaman	Olasz	Wachob
Cornell	Horgos	Oliver	Wambach
Coslett	Hutchinson, A.	Pendleton	Wargo
Cowell	Hutchinson, W.	Perzel	Wass
Cunningham	Irvis	Peterson	Wenger
DeMedio	Itkin	Petrarca	Weston
DeVerter	Jackson	Petrone	White
DeWeese	Johnson	Phillips	Wiggins
Daikeler	Kanuck	Piccola	Williams, H.
Davies	Kennedy	Pievsky	Williams, J. D.
Dawida	Klingaman	Pistella	Wilson
Deal	Kolter	Pitts	Wogan
Dietz	Kowalshyn	Pott	Wozniak
Dininni	Kukovich	Pratt	Wright, D. R.
Dombrowski	Lashinger	Pucciarelli	Wright, J. L.

Donatucci	Lehr	Punt	Zwilk
Dorr	Lescovitz	Rasco	
Duffy	Letterman	Reber	Ryan,
Durham	Levi	Rieger	Speaker
Earley			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—13

Armstrong	Gladeck	Mullen	Saurman
Cochran	Laughlin	Rappaport	Stairs
Fischer	Miller	Richardson	Telek
Gallagher			

EXCUSED—7

Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair is about to take up a resolution dealing with the sad events of yesterday. I would ask the House and its members to be in complete order.

**MEMBERS' PRESENCE RECORDED**

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

Mr. TELEK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my name be added to the master roll call.

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

Mr. RAPPAPORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my name be added to the master roll call.

**RESOLUTION ADOPTED**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader. Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution. The following resolution was read:

In the House of Representatives, March 31, 1981  
 WHEREAS, On Monday, March 30, 1981, President Ronald Reagan was wounded by an assassin's bullet in Washington, D.C.; and

WHEREAS, After emergency surgery the President is beginning his recovery; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania expresses its outrage that such a heinous action once again scars the peaceful pursuit of this great Nation's purpose; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the members of the House of Representatives extend to the President and his family their heart-felt wishes and prayers for a quick and complete recovery and an early return to the leadership of our Nation; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this Resolution be delivered to President Ronald Reagan.

Samuel E. Hayes, Jr.  
 Matthew J. Ryan  
 K. Leroy Irvis  
 Richard J. Cessar  
 James J. Manderino  
 Fred C. Noye  
 John Hope Anderson  
 Frank A. Salvatore  
 Richard A. McClatchy, Jr.  
 Marvin E. Miller, Jr.

On the question,  
 Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the unanimous adoption of the resolution read by the clerk. I rise as an American outraged that a President of the United States would not be able to walk the streets of the United States in safety.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we addressed ourselves in this country to the question of whether we really mean to have a peaceful and nonviolent society or whether we intend to continue to put at risk the lives, not just of the President of the United States, not just of the Secret Service man who lies desperately wounded, not just of a press secretary and a D.C. uniformed policeman, but the lives of each and every American being threatened daily in our homes, on our streets, and in our businesses by those people who have too free an access to the guns which destroy nothing except human life and human hopes.

Mr. Speaker, the heartbeat of this Nation hesitated yesterday at approximately 2:30 in the afternoon. At that point in time there were no Democrats; there were no Republicans; there were only Americans praying for the safety of our President, a brave and a good man and one who I pray personally will be returned speedily to good health. But once he has returned to that health, I think, Mr. Speaker, we need to address ourselves to what placed him in jeopardy. I think this society has to finally deal with the problem it has neglected ever since the death of Abraham Lincoln, ever since the death of McKinley, ever since the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, ever since the attacks on President Ford. I think we must finally address ourselves to the question of whether or not we so value the right to bear arms that we will give it to those maniacs, those madmen, those terrorists, those burglars, those robbers, those thieves who victimize not only the President of the United States, who symbolizes all of us, but every single one of us who wish to live in peace with his and her neighbors.

I call for the adoption of the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. HAYES. We on previous days already this session have called our own attention and that of all Pennsylvanians to the fact that in this year, 1981, it will be 300 years Pennsylvania has been a colony and a Commonwealth. William Penn brought to this land of ours a group known as Quakers. Quakers, as a group, were known for their peacefulness and their disdain for violence.

I hold here in my hand a book printed many, many years ago by Quakers. My words in support of this resolution will be a Quaker prayer offered many years ago by our forefathers. (Reading:)

Father! to thee I breathe my prayer!  
 Father! on thee I cast my care.  
 Strength of the weak! where, but to thee,  
 Frail, tempted, trembling, can I flee?  
 O save thy child! the trying hour  
 Draws near in all its fearful power;  
 Snares all around me, clouds above,  
 Save, or I perish, God of love!  
 Yes, thou wilt save! on thee alone

I lean—thine arm is round me thrown  
 A gleam of Heaven's own blessed light  
 Is dawning on my spirit's night!  
 I cannot doubt, I cannot fear,  
 For, O my Father! thou art near;  
 Confidingly I look to thee,  
 Thou, thou, wilt give the victory!

This prayer is for our President and our Nation. I urge adoption of the resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. H. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I too rise to support the resolution. I do not intend to be long, and I do not intend to be anywhere near as eloquent as the majority leader and the minority leader.

I would like, however, to take the opportunity to suggest that the events of yesterday indicate in very clear terms that probably our biggest task in this country, in our cities, is the question of violent crime. Violent crime cuts across the fabric of everything we do. At any time the President of our country cannot walk city streets without fear of violent attack, something is deeply wrong, and it is a task, in my judgment, for us in every local government and higher government to take on and to do. I say that only because I remember all the deaths in between, the shocking deaths. All of us, of course, know the violence that takes place every day in neighborhoods to citizens and how suffocating it is.

It is just my observation that we have not been efficient as public officials, not just this legislative body but anywhere. We have not been as creative as we must need be, and we can. I say that, Mr. Speaker, in the sense that crime, violent crime, has become the consensus in this country. We need to be about the business of creating the anticrime consensus through creative steps and work and not just from normal observations we always get.

I make a plea for that at this particular time, and my observations are sincere and serious. I do hope, as I promised earlier, to offer something that I think may be effective in taking advantage of other resources we have. I just wanted to take this sad moment to say that hopefully we can come out of it in a direction and committed to beating back these malicious forces, these violent forces. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,  
 Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the resolution will rise and remain standing as a mark of respect for the occasion. (Members stood.)

The SPEAKER. The resolution is unanimously adopted.

#### STATEMENT BY MR. WHITE

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a few remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed. The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHITE. I waited until after the adoption of the resolution because I knew that the majority leader and the minority leader and various members of the House wished to speak directly to the contents of that resolution and to the events of yesterday.

It has been alluded to by the Democratic leader, Mr. Irvis, and also by my colleague on the Democratic side of the aisle, Mr. Williams, that it is time for this House to significantly move to address the whole issue of violent crime and the issue of crime committed with the use of handguns here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The events of yesterday were tragic, and tragic indeed, but that tragedy is also exemplified in the examples that Representative Williams gave with respect to the real fear that permeates not only our cities but our suburban communities in this Commonwealth as well.

For the benefit of the House members present and those who may be in the various offices, I want to take the opportunity to inform you that I have instructed the Legislative Reference Bureau to draft substantive legislation addressing the whole issue of gun control and will be soliciting bipartisan support in an effort to move this General Assembly to take a very close look and to take definitive action with respect to violent crimes and particularly those crimes that are committed with the usage of a deadly weapon.

I thank the Speaker for the opportunity to speak to you regarding this issue, and again, a memo will be circulated to the various House members suggesting and asking for bipartisan support on this vital piece of legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

#### STATEMENT BY MR. A. K. HUTCHINSON

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

Mr. A. K. HUTCHINSON. I request unanimous consent to make a statement.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed. The Chair hears none.

Mr. A. K. HUTCHINSON. This is nonpartisan. A couple of weeks ago I put in a resolution to urge the Governor to put the electric chair back in the prisons. Governor Shafer took it out through Fred Speaker; Shapp said he would never burn anybody; the Governor said he believed in it. I think we ought to put the electric chair back in so the people who have a gun will think three times before they use it.

Anybody who wants to get on my resolution can get on it. It is HR 31, PN 1017. Thank you very much.

#### BITUMINOUS COAL QUEEN PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. The Chair at this time calls to the rostrum and recognizes the gentleman from Washington, Mr. Sweet, who has a more pleasant task than the one we have just now been addressing.

Mr. SWEET. It is a quite enviable task I have this morning, and that is to bring to you a young lady of incomparable beauty, of inestimable charm, a lady I had dinner with last

night—properly chaperoned, I might add; Bill DeWeese was there.

The young lady I bring today is from my district in Washington County. She is from Fredericktown, Pennsylvania, and is a senior at Bethlehem Center High School. I bring to you the 1980 Bituminous Coal Queen, Lisa Gavlik.

Miss GAVLIK. Thank you, Mr. Sweet.

Mr. Speaker, members of the House of Representatives, before I was chosen as the Pennsylvania State Bituminous Coal Queen, I was asked what it would mean to me to be the Coal Queen and how it would change my life. I do not remember now what profound answer I must have given, but I do know that I could have not imagined what thrilling experiences I would encounter. Today, of course, is a perfect example of the thrill and honor that has come to me during my reign as Bituminous Coal Queen.

Being Coal Queen is positive and rewarding, but it is also a great responsibility. As you all well know, being a representative of a segment of the population means that you lose a portion of your identity as you work to serve that segment. As Coal Queen, I realize that each time I am in the public eye, I am a representative of the youth of the coal community and industry.

The youth of the coal community, much the same as all the youth of today, has a job to do. That job is to prepare ourselves as future leaders, workers, and builders of our state and our country. Those of us from the coal community of southwestern Pennsylvania are unique in that we come from an area full of ethnic tradition. Most of us want to preserve this tradition and to be able to build our lives around our community, to be a part of our community in which we were born and raised. This is not always possible. Just a few short years ago the youth of the community found it necessary to leave to find employment. Today, however, with the increased demand for coal as a fuel, we have increased employment and many of my classmates, male and female, will enter the mine as workers, or others will choose to further their education and become mining engineers or other professions ultimately supported by a healthy coal industry.

These are trying times in the coal community as miners and management seek to find an agreement beneficial to all. I suppose one could become alarmed over the unrest, but we must find consolation in the fact that we are free to negotiate and that both sides are ever mindful of the needs of our great Commonwealth and of our country. We all must know that our state, our country, and indeed our world is a small place. We cannot afford as a free people to be unmindful of the actions of any group, no matter how large or small.

As we, the youth, prepare ourselves for the future, studying, taking part in school activities, as we learn to compete in sports and academics, we are also watching you, our elders. We look to our parents, our community leaders, and the leaders of government, for you teach us how to face our problems of today. We will benefit from your wisdom and learn from your mistakes, and hopefully we will prepare ourselves well enough to follow in your footsteps. Thank you.

Mr. SWEET. I would also like to introduce Lisa's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Gavlik, and also, on my far left, Connie Morris from Marianna, Pennsylvania, who is the driving force behind the Coal Queen pageant.

Lisa, on behalf of the entire membership of the Pennsylvania General Assembly, I would like to present you with this citation to commend you for your fine activities as the Pennsylvania Coal Queen.

The SPEAKER. The House will be temporarily at ease while I have my picture taken with this beautiful young girl.

### FILMING PERMISSION GRANTED

The SPEAKER. The Chair advises the members at this time that permission has been granted to Calkins Group to have a photographer on the floor of the House for a period of 10 minutes.

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

Mr. LETTERMAN. I ask unanimous consent to make a statement.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield? The Chair had promised Representative Itkin that he would be recognized.

### STATEMENT BY MR. ITKIN

The SPEAKER. The Chair at this time recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Itkin, for a brief statement.

Mr. ITKIN. It is interesting to observe that the Governor is out of Harrisburg today visiting the folks in Centralia where we have the underground mine fire raging, and we certainly appreciate the Governor's attention to this issue at this time, even though it is belated as such, and, in fact, this House sent its entire Mines and Energy Management Committee several weeks ago to witness the incident and to lend support.

I am told that the Governor is there today in a very philanthropic mood. Apparently the Department of Interior has finally agreed to purchase 26 homes of those affected by the mine fire in which noxious fumes have entered those dwellings, and the Governor is going to provide the persons in that community with perhaps the check. He may even suggest that he is developing a new Governor's home purchase assistance program which is federally funded.

The reason why I bring some levity to this particular issue is because last week on the floor of the House I took exception to some stuffers that appeared in utility bills which claim that the energy assistance program funded by the Federal Government was in fact the Governor's energy assistance program, and nowhere in the insert did it ever mention the fact that the program was provided 100 percent by Federal funds, and very prominently mentioned was the Governor of Pennsylvania's name on the insert.

Well, I did receive a reply which I would like to share with the House today. The reply comes from Mr. Wiggins, who serves as the press secretary to the Secretary of Public Welfare, Helen O'Bannon. It is very brief, and I would like to read it in toto:

Dear Mr. Itkin:

Secretary O'Bannon has asked me to respond to your March 19 letter concerning bill stuffers for the energy assistance program.

In every news release we have sent out concerning this program, we have stated that the program is fully federally funded. (Copies attached.) This fact has not been overlooked in the news coverage of the program.

The bill stuffers are written according to the constraints of advertising copy style, the essence of which is to include only that information absolutely necessary to inform potential recipients about the benefits that are available. We operated under the theory that families who may need energy assistance are much more concerned about how to qualify for the program than they are about the source of funds. In other publicity, as I have stated, we made it clear this is a federally funded program.

The bill stuffers were not an effort to "serve the ambition" of anyone; they were an effort to widely disseminate clear, readable [sic] information to persons who may be eligible for this important program.

Now, it seems to me that the adjective "Federal" is far shorter than the adjective "Governor's," and therefore, it would take far less space to put "Federal energy assistance program" than "Governor's energy assistance program." So the problems of constraint notwithstanding, there seems to be a misrepresentation.

Finally, there was an opportunity to provide at the bottom of the stuffer, understanding that people really are only concerned about how to qualify for this program, in red type—the information was in black, but this line was in red type—stating a one-liner separate from the rest, "Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Dick Thornburgh, Governor."

The reason why I am making an issue out of this—and normally I would let it go—is because I am appalled that the Department of Welfare would send me, a conscientious legislator, a reply like this. I think it is an affront to me, and I think it is an affront to any legislator who would send to the department a statement of fact and ask for a response. I feel that not only has my own integrity been dealt a blow here, but I think it has also been the entire House of Representatives that has been dealt a blow.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to share these salient facts with my colleagues.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

## CALENDAR

### BILLS AGREED TO ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The following bills, having been called up, were considered for the second time and agreed to, and ordered transcribed for third consideration:

**HB 127, PN 128; HB 137, PN 138; HB 395, PN 818; HB 720, PN 1019; HB 534, PN 1020; HB 644, PN 679; HB 645, PN 680; HB 702, PN 1021; HB 706, PN 1022; and HB 757, PN 806.**

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 815, PN 1077**, entitled:

An Act amending the "Hearing Aid Sales Registration Law," approved November 24, 1976 (P. L. 1182, No. 262), adding a definition of dealer-fitter; further defining "business of selling hearing aids," "advertise" and "fitting"; further providing for persons excluded from registration; further providing for applications for examination, temporary certificates and reciprocal registration; and prohibiting the sale of dispensing of hearing aids by certain persons.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

### BILL RECOMMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.  
Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I move that HB 815, PN 1077, be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations for a fiscal note.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

### BILLS AGREED TO ON SECOND CONSIDERATION CONTINUED

**HB 1043, PN 1159; SB 405, PN 411; and HB 799, PN 857.**

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 800, PN 1147**, entitled:

An Act amending the "Soil Conservation Law," approved May 15, 1945 (P. L. 547, No. 217), further providing for county boards, providing for nomination of district directors; providing additional duties for the Department of Environmental Resources, the State Conservation Commission and district boards.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

### BILL RECOMMENDED

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

Mr. BITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that HB 800, PN 1147, be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations for a fiscal note.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

### MEMBER'S PRESENCE RECORDED

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask that my name be placed on the master roll call.

### BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 303, PN 309**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for certain remedies against individuals violating provisions relating to electronic surveillance and for certain defenses.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. DeWEESE offered the following amendments No. A666:

Amend Sec. 2 (Sec. 5726), page 2, line 9, by striking out the bracket before "and"

Amend Sec. 2 (Sec. 5726), page 2, line 11, by striking out the bracket after "any"

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Greene, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing this amendment in order to eliminate the provision regarding pensions. As the measure would stand if adopted, people who are illicitly engaged in wiretapping would not be disallowed from collecting their pensions. I feel so fervently that wiretapping in general, and specifically the insidious wiretapping that might go on in an illegal fashion, is wrong, that I want to put some safeguards into this legislative proposal so that anyone inclined to do something illegal regarding wiretapping will be further disinclined by this kind of language.

This is the reason I am introducing this measure, and I would hope that it would be supported. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tioga, Mr. Spencer.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. Speaker, this is the first that I had knowledge of this amendment, but I would request that the members vote against this amendment for the following reasons: Number one, the wiretapping statute has been on the books several years but in effect has never been used by our district attorneys because of the constraints placed in the act, one of which is the taking away of a pension of a person who is acting in good faith on a court order. None of the employes would participate in a wiretap with that threat over their heads.

Under the present act there are sufficient safeguards before a court order can be issued to wiretap. The court order has to emanate from a judge of the Superior Court. At that hearing the judge must be told the reasons why a court order is requested, and under this bill—my bill, not the Dewese amendment—if an employe, in good-faith reliance on the court order, participates in a wiretap and for some reason it might be found technically incorrect at some point, he could not then be subject to the civil and criminal actions, and to

reinstate this back in the bill, in my opinion, would put the bill back where it was in the first place and render it a nullity. If we are going to fight organized crime, which is basically what this bill is geared to, then we have got to give the same powers to the police and district attorneys' offices as the members of the organized crime have without any statute. I would request a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the DeWeese amendment.

The DeWeese amendment speaks to one who intentionally or willfully—The words in the present statute are "...willfully violated the provisions of this chapter," and we are not talking about someone who does it negligently, someone who is not sure what the law is, someone who makes a mistake. We are talking about someone who thoughtfully, willfully, or intentionally violates someone's privacy by wiretapping that they know is illegal. That is what we are talking about, and we are simply saying that those people who do that are not entitled to the break that this legislation gives them. Present law is that they can lose their pension that they may have built. That is what present law is; it says that. This law, this particular act, seeks to change that, seeks to remove the penalty of loss of pension, and I do not think we ought to remove that penalty. I think the right of privacy is so important, is so sacred, is protected by the Pennsylvania and the U.S. Constitution, and when someone, with thought, intentionally breaks that privacy, violates your privacy, violates the statute of the Commonwealth intentionally, we ought not relieve them from the penalty in present law. We ought to pass the amendment to remove from this piece of legislation the brackets that take out that part of present law that allows a forfeiture of pension.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Alden, on the question of the DeWeese amendments.

Mr. ALDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the maker of the amendment stand for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he will. The gentleman, Mr. Alden, may proceed.

Mr. ALDEN. Mr. Speaker, does your amendment go to a pension that would be vested at the time of this illegal wiretapping?

Mr. DeWEESE. Yes. Counsel advises me that the answer that is correct is in the affirmative.

Mr. ALDEN. How would that square with the recent Supreme Court decision in the Fineman case? Would they be incongruous?

Mr. DeWEESE. I am not familiar with the specific case you are referring to. We would have to chat, and I would have to answer that later.

Mr. ALDEN. I believe that case indicated that part of that pension was vested at the time, that the legislature could not take that away.

Mr. DeWEESE. I think it would be more appropriate if you would interrogate the gentleman from Westmoreland, Mr. Manderino. He has an awareness that supersedes my own relative to this issue.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. DeWeese, yields to the minority whip, Mr. Manderino.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the case to which the gentleman refers spoke to a pension that had been claimed and vested and a law which was passed thereafter.

Now, we can very well be speaking prospectively in this particular statute, especially since we are not moving to change anything with the DeWeese amendment. That is something that is already on the books; it is already there. It is already the law of this Commonwealth that one can lose a pension if they wiretap intentionally against the statute.

Mr. ALDEN. Even at the time the pension is in fact vested?

Mr. MANDERINO. At the present time the law of this Commonwealth is that one can lose a pension if in fact they intentionally violate the provisions of the wiretap law. That is present law.

Mr. ALDEN. And that includes if that person has contributed that money into that pension himself?

Mr. MANDERINO. I think that the gentleman is aware of the answer to his own question. If he wants to make a speech about it, he ought to do that.

Mr. ALDEN. I am asking Mr. Manderino for the answer to that one.

Mr. MANDERINO. I think you know the answer to that. I think whether or not the matter is vested is a matter of different law than the one before us. The law before us is one that presently takes away one's pension if the wiretap statutes are violated intentionally, and what is sought to be done by HB 303 is to remove that penalty from one who would intentionally violate the law, and I am simply saying that we ought not to remove that penalty. Whether or not there is a similarity between the provision that exists in present law here and the provision in the pension law as it affects members of this House or the Senate is a question for a court to decide.

### CONSTITUTIONAL POINT OF ORDER

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

Mr. ALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I think that Mr. DeWeese's amendment is unconstitutional, and I would like to test the constitutionality of it before this House. What motion would I have to make?

Mr. DeWEESE. We are amending to keep present law.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

Is the gentleman raising the question of the constitutionality of the DeWeese amendment?

Mr. ALDEN. Yes, I am.

The SPEAKER. On the question of constitutionality, this is a decision to be made by the House.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. DeWeese, on that question.

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker, I am under the very firm impression that what we are trying to do today is maintain the statute as it is, so if the gentleman is anxious about the constitutionality involved, I do not know why he did not bring this

up yesterday or the day before or the week before or the month before, because it has been a part of the code for quite some time. Why he would bring it up now is inconceivable to me. We are trying to maintain the statute as it is. We want to do everything possible to impede and add further disincentives to people who would wiretap, and to say that my measure is unconstitutional is to say that the law that has been on the books for a couple of years is unconstitutional. His remarks are, to me, nonsensical.

Mr. ALDEN. That, of course, is the speaker's opinion. I still am of the opinion that this amendment is unconstitutional. It was taken out of the law and you are attempting to put it back in.

Mr. DeWEESE. It is in the law today, sir, is it not? Mr. Speaker, is it not in the law today?

Mr. ALDEN. I believe it was taken out originally.

Mr. DeWEESE. That is an incorrect assertion on your part, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would caution the two gentlemen to await recognition so that the reporters are able to print accurately who is making the remarks.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Sir, repetition is the first law of learning, and I would like to repeat that what we are trying to do is maintain the statute as it is to further discourage people in the law enforcement community from being overzealous in the area of wiretapping. That is what the law says today; we want to maintain it that way.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. DeWEESE. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would remind the gentleman that the question before the House is one of constitutionality. Does the gentleman have further remarks on that question of constitutionality?

Mr. DeWEESE. Constitutionality regarding this amendment, to me, is constitutionality regarding the law as it stands. I do not understand how this gentleman can raise constitutionality, and I would like for the Speaker of the House to inform me, to enlighten me, as to how he can raise constitutionality on a matter that is already in the code.

The SPEAKER. Because the gentleman raised the question.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Alden, on the question of constitutionality.

Mr. ALDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my reading of Mr. DeWeese's amendment that he is trying to put back into the law the pension provision, the removal of pension. That is my understanding of your amendment, unless I am incorrect in the reading of it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would request that the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Alden, and the minority whip come to the rostrum.

The Chair is pleased to advise the House that the question of constitutionality has been resolved, and the question is no longer before the House.

**CONSTITUTIONAL POINT OF ORDER  
WITHDRAWN**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Alden. It is my understanding, Mr. Alden, that you are withdrawing the question of constitutionality?

Mr. ALDEN. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs, will the House agree to the DeWeese amendments?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Alden.

Mr. ALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose Mr. DeWeese's amendment for various reasons. I think to put that in there would be a chilling effect for the effective enforcement by law enforcement officers. They are not going to be willing, I think, to wiretap in these legal situations when this is what they possibly face. So I think that this amendment is bad and I think we have organized crime in Pennsylvania that must be dealt with, and I think wiretapping has taught us that this is a very effective tool against organized crime, and I think that we need it. I do not think we need anything to make the police unwilling to legally wiretap.

**FILMING PERMISSION GRANTED**

The SPEAKER. I would ask the members to pay strict attention to this announcement. The Chair has granted permission to Channel WHTM covering some 27 counties of this state to silent-film for a period of 10 minutes. I have asked the operator who was going to use lights to use them at a minimum. If we find after this experiment that the use of lights is distracting to the members, permission will not be granted hereafter for that purpose. The gentleman may proceed.

**CONSIDERATION OF HB 303 CONTINUED**

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

Mr. PICCOLA. I would like to speak in opposition to this amendment and give you what I perceive as the real reasons why the brackets were inserted in the bill.

In 1978 we passed the Public Employee Pension Forfeiture Act in response to public officials being convicted of crimes and still being able to collect pensions, and that law is on the books, and part of that statute is a listing of the various kinds of crimes that could be committed by public officials in this state for which they would forfeit their pensions if they were convicted. One of those in that list is referred to as section 5301 of the Crimes Code, which is official oppression. Official oppression is defined as a person acting or purporting to act in an official capacity or taking advantage of such actual or purported capacity and committing a misdemeanor of the second degree if, knowing that his conduct is illegal, he subjects another to arrest, detention, search, seizure, mistreatment, et cetera, and infringes on the personal property or rights of that individual.

Now, right at this current time if anybody violates the wiretap law, presumably they will have committed the crime of official oppression, and they will be subject to forfeiture of their pension. That is the reason the brackets were inserted in this bill, and that is the reason that even if this bill passes as it currently exists, and if the DeWeese amendment is defeated, which I hope that it will be, a person convicted of violating the wiretap statute will still be subject to losing his pension. This should not be in the wiretap statute, because we are adding an additional chilling factor to the use of that statute. Now, if you believe that we should be using the wiretap statute in this state to fight crime - organized crime, what have you - then vote against the DeWeese amendment, but if you wanted a chilling factor on the use of that statute so that the district attorneys and the investigators and the courts will not use that statute, then I suggest we vote for the DeWeese amendment. So I would urge, from my point of view, that we vote against the DeWeese amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Mr. Cowell, on the question of the DeWeese amendments.

Mr. COWELL. Mr. Speaker, would Mr. Piccola submit to interrogation, please?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he will. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. COWELL. Mr. Speaker, in the remarks that you just completed, you gave what I thought were two reasons for favoring this legislation in its current form and opposing the DeWeese amendment. On the one hand you seemed to say that this pension language, if allowed to continue in this law, has a chilling effect on DA's or on other law enforcement officials who might use the wiretapping provisions. On the other hand you seemed to say that this language was not necessary, because the Pension Forfeiture Act which this legislature passed a couple of years ago already took care of this kind of problem, if a law enforcement official violated the wiretap provisions. Which is it?

Mr. PICCOLA. We should have one statute referring to forfeiture of pensions, and we have that statute right now, and if we have two statutes, or if every crime that we create in this Commonwealth has a forfeiture provision of pension, then the courts will interpret each statute individually on a case-by-case basis, and my fear is that the courts will use the fact that we have placed that language in two separate statutes, interpret that language differently, apply it differently, and the fear that I have is that they will apply a higher standard to district attorneys who want to use the wiretap statute and the effect will be that they will not use it.

Mr. COWELL. Is the pension forfeiture language in the current law that is amended by HB 303 substantially different from the pension forfeiture language that is in the pension forfeiture law?

Mr. PICCOLA. In answer to that, let me just refer you to section 5301 of the Crimes Code, which defines official oppression, and then you can make that judgment for yourself.

Mr. COWELL. Excuse me

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Cowell, yield? Await recognition, Mr. Cowell.

Mr. COWELL. Mr. Speaker, may I be recognized?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Piccola has a right to answer the question.

Mr. PICCOLA. I believe your question was whether the language in HB 303 is similar or the same

Mr. COWELL. Is the pension forfeiture language

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman, Mr. Cowell, please address his questions to the Chair and await recognition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Cowell.

Mr. COWELL. In response to your request for clarification, my question was, is there a substantial difference in the pension forfeiture language that appears in the current law that we seek to amend by HB 303 relative to the pension forfeiture language in the pension forfeiture law, the act to which you referred earlier?

Mr. PICCOLA. Yes; the language is different because it approaches the subject from two different perspectives. The Pension Forfeiture Act approaches it from a broader perspective in that anyone who commits the crime of official oppression, which in my view would include the violation of the wiretap statute, forfeits their pension. It also includes other crimes; official oppression includes other crimes totally unrelated to wiretap.

Mr. COWELL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recognized.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Cowell.

Mr. COWELL. Mr. Speaker, I would urge that we adopt the DeWeese amendment. I would emphasize, as he has and Mr. Manderino has, that all we are trying to do is to maintain current law. This is not an attempt to add a new ingredient, a new element, new language, to current law. It is an attempt to stick with what we have and what this legislature decided to adopt some time ago.

We have heard two reasons—and I would suggest that to some extent they are contradictory reasons—to oppose the continuation of this pension forfeiture language. On the one hand we have heard that we really do not need it because this issue is already taken care of in the Pension Forfeiture Act. Mr. Piccola just responded that he believes that the language in the Pension Forfeiture Act in fact is broader and would include violations of the wiretapping act. So there seems to be no particular problem or no particular new or extra burden that is added by the language that Mr. DeWeese seeks to keep in this particular law.

On the other hand even Mr. Piccola and Mr. Spencer have suggested that the continuation of this pension forfeiture provision will have a chilling effect on law enforcement officers. I do not think so. I think that, first of all, that suggestion is contradicted by the argument that this issue is already addressed in the pension forfeiture law in a broader sense and perhaps even a stricter sense, and so we are not really adding a new element or a new chilling effect. If the chilling effect is there, it is going to continue to be there because of the provi-

sions of the broader Pension Forfeiture Act. And secondly, I think if we go back to the language that Mr. Spencer used, he cited the instance of a law enforcement officer who acts in good faith, who follows the normal procedures to get a wiretap order as they are outlined in this current law, and he suggests that maybe there is some technical problem with the court order, and later on then that law enforcement officer is going to lose his pension because of a technical violation. I do not think that would be the case at all. I think this legislation, this current law, clearly says that it would have to be an intentional violation of the law, an intentional violation of the provisions of the law, an intentional effort to circumvent the law, the wiretap procedures. It would have to be intentional for that law enforcement officer to be subject to the forfeiture of his or her pension, and that is not going to be the case if somebody acts in good faith, if somebody tries in good faith to use the procedures that are available.

But I think the two arguments that have been made are not valid. I think that this is good language. I think it has been demonstrated that public officials do in fact think twice and maybe a third and a fourth time about their actions and the impact that their actions might have with respect to that pension forfeiture provision. Whether it is a legislator or a DA or somebody else, no matter whom we are speaking about, it is a good concept and we ought to keep it in this particular law. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. W. D. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the DeWeese amendment. The gentleman from Dauphin, Mr. Piccola, has put his finger precisely on the reasoning why this particular language was removed. This subject was the matter of great discussion in committee, and the conclusion of the committee, after reviewing the entire matter, was that the comprehensive issue of when pension should be forfeited was handled by another statute. It was thought that the law with respect to the forfeiture of pensions should be the same in all cases, and therefore, we deleted this.

Now, there is another reason for opposing this amendment as well. The gentlemen supporting this amendment have argued that this is simply current law and therefore should be left in. The whole purpose of this bill is to change current law. The reason why the bill is before you is because the wiretapping statute that was passed as part of the anticrime package in 1978 has not been used, and it has not been used because the district attorneys, the police and others throughout the state, because of this provision on forfeiture, have been reluctant to use it, because in this highly technical area they have had to be concerned that the reprisal visited upon them, loss of their job and loss of their pension, is such that the risk is too much to take.

There is another third reason. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that is needed in this area if the wiretapping law is to be utilized—and I think that the history of this Commonwealth in the last 8 years or so, 10 years or perhaps longer, shows that we do need some kind of a wiretapping statute—if it is to be used, the key and the most important thing is that there be

certainty. Now, I have read the language of subsection (a) of section 5726 under this bill, which talks about intentionally violating the statute. Then I have read subsection (b) which talks about a defense, and it is a defense to the action if someone acts in good-faith reliance on a court order or the provisions of this chapter, this chapter concerning wire-tapping.

Mr. Speaker, as an attorney, if we leave in the pension situation, I just simply do not know how to reconcile those two provisions. In the one case you are saying that if a person intentionally violates the statute, he can lose his pension and lose his job, and then down below you are saying if he acted in good faith, it is a defense. Now, I think there will be great trouble in that connection and you will lose the certainty that is necessary in this field. If a person violates this statute, he would be removed from his job, and if you put the DeWeese amendment in, if it is concluded that he intentionally violated the statute—and for him to lose his job, it has to be concluded that he would intentionally violate the statute—then he would automatically also lose his pension. It would just happen automatically.

There is another statute that should be addressed on the question of pension loss, and that is the statute that this legislature passed in an effort to comprehensively regulate that matter. To put the language that Mr. DeWeese suggests back in is contrary to what the committee thought—and I think with bipartisan support—after considering the issue very carefully. It is contrary to an understanding, I think, by all of the affected groups. It continues a law which has a chilling effect, a very serious chilling effect, and makes the wiretapping statute largely unusable.

Finally, it is mischievous because it has two sections in the law that I have great difficulty in interpreting and coming out with an answer that reconciles both of them. We need certainty. The DeWeese amendment to a great extent would remove that certainty, and for those reasons I oppose the amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. OLASZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the DeWeese amendment. To give one thought to this body before they vote, one careful thought: Who protects us from the protector? Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Mr. Ritter. Does the gentleman care to be recognized on the question of the amendment?

Mr. RITTER. Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would the gentleman, Mr. Hutchinson, consent to brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he does so consent. The gentleman, Mr. Ritter, may proceed.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, you talked about certainty, and I submit to you that you talked about certainty in the area of intentionally violating the law, that the police officer or whoever would lose his job, and then you talked about subsection (b), which says that there is a defense. Now, where is the certainty involved in that instance?

Mr. W. D. HUTCHINSON. You are asking, what does the section (b) on defense mean in the light of the intentional violation? Is that your question?

Mr. RITTER. Well, no, Mr. Speaker. You said that the DeWeese amendment would remove the certainty that is there in the bill presently as it relates to the fact that there would be an automatic forfeiture of pension.

Mr. W. D. HUTCHINSON. That is right.

Mr. RITTER. But the same provisions apply for an automatic dismissal from one's job and yet you can raise the defense that you acted in good-faith reliance. I am saying to you, where is the degree of certainty in terms of losing one's job contrasted to losing one's pension?

Mr. W. D. HUTCHINSON. As I was trying to say, I agree with the gentleman that the same uncertainty exists with respect to the loss of use of the job. I personally would have preferred to see different language in this statute, but in the committee process this is the language that came out. What I was trying to say is that the DeWeese amendment magnifies the problem by adding the uncertainty element, not just to the forfeiture but also to the penalty. It makes the problem much worse.

Now, I am supporting the bill in its current form because it was the product of a compromise situation in the committee. I am not completely happy with the language. The DeWeese amendment makes it worse and adds the element of uncertainty in another area and in effect makes the reprisal all the more severe. Hence, I oppose the amendment. I have difficulty with that language; I agree.

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Ritter, and would remind all of the participants that the question is the DeWeese amendment.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, on the amendment, it seems to me that we are talking about someone who intentionally violates the law. Now, I do not believe anyone in this chamber considers a police officer or a district attorney or an employe of the district attorney's office to be above the law. I think that is certainly the way I feel. I think that the protection in there for the law enforcement officer, for the district attorney, for an employe of the district attorney's office is the fact that if you intentionally, if you deliberately go out and wiretap knowing that it is illegal, it seems to me that if this bill would say that you would lose your job, all Mr. DeWeese expects to do is to restore the provision to the law which says in addition to losing your job, you are going to forfeit your pension. Now, I do not know how we can distinguish on one hand and say it is okay; if you intentionally violate the law, we will take your job away, but somehow it is so terrible to take away that person's pension.

Now, I resent, frankly, the inferences that if you vote for the DeWeese amendment, you are for organized crime. That is basically what I have heard—not from Mr. Hutchinson but from Mr. Piccola—and I resent that. I am talking about a lawbreaker. I do not care whether he is a police officer or a district attorney or an employe. If he breaks the law, he ought to be treated that way. If you can say on one hand if you do

that and intentionally do that, you are going to lose your job, all Mr. DeWeese wants to do is to say in addition to that, you are going to forfeit your pension. I do not see what is so terrible about that. I ask for support for the DeWeese amendment.

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

Mr. H. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reluctantly I oppose Mr. DeWeese's amendment. The one part that has not been discussed I would like to talk about.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, what Mr. DeWeese seeks to put back in the law never should have been there in the first place. If a schoolteacher molests a child, he may get fired; he does not lose a pension. If someone kills someone by gun and is convicted, he does not lose a pension. If someone discriminates against a woman or a pattern of women or a minority, they do not lose their pension, and a thousand other examples. So if someone intentionally violates this provision, that is bad. They lose their job and they get some other kind of criminal reproach. Whoever said that it is proper to take away what someone worked for all his life? It may be his first or second time; I do not know. It is unimportant. Whoever judged that it is necessary and important and not overreaching to single out one situation to take away someone's pension? It may be proper to take away pensions, but we ought to determine a policy in the law uniformly where that should happen. Should it be a teacher who molests a child; should it be somebody who shoots down an old lady; should it be people who discriminate every day in their official capacities and cause people not to get employment?

Mr. Speaker, I am just raising the whole question separate and apart from all the other technical interpretations. I think the amendment seeks to put something back that was wrong and not thought out in the first place. I do not think there is any compelling reason that has been offered by the offerer for us to place it back in there, unless Mr. DeWeese is going to talk about some policy that agrees with what we do with other areas, some policy that makes the mechanism of privacy—and I strongly agree with that and am the first to fight for a law that does not allow people to invade your privacy unless under very special circumstances.

I think it is also overreaching to say, ipso facto, someone loses a pension in this instance. It is unsupported by common sense; it is unsupported by experience; it is unsupported by any philosophy or policy in our present law that seeks to punish everybody equally for doing something awesome. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dauphin, Mr. Piccola, for the second time on the question of the DeWeese amendments.

Mr. PICCOLA. I would like to respond briefly to some of the remarks that have been made in support of this amendment.

Look carefully at the legislation and see what it would take for a district attorney or an individual who is operating under the provisions of this wiretap statute to lose his pension. It does not require that he be convicted in criminal court of

violating the law. All it requires is an action in Commonwealth Court, which is essentially a civil action, and a finding by that court of intentional violation of the statute. That would carry with it no criminal sanctions, but it would carry with it the forfeiture of his pension. Under the official oppression section of the Crimes Code and under the Pension Forfeiture Act, he would have to be convicted of a crime, the crime of official oppression.

I think—and I very seriously believe this—that if we pass the DeWeese amendment, the DA's in this state are going to say, no, we are not going to use this statute; we are risking too much; we are asking our employes to risk too much, and we are not going to do it.

I strongly urge that if you are interested in fighting organized crime and official corruption, you defeat the DeWeese amendment.

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

Mr. W. D. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of use of the word "intentionally" here, and I dislike being technical but I think that we have to take a look at what that word means as it is used here and as it would be used in the more comprehensive statute that Mr. Piccola refers to. Let me give you an example.

Under the language here, intentionally in a civil action, a district attorney tells a police officer to install a wiretap. He furthermore represents to the police officer that there is a court order in effect when there is in fact no court order in effect or there is a problem with that court order. The police officer, taking the district attorney at his word, installs the wiretap with no intent of harassing the person but just following the order. Under the law as it exists in a civil case, that could be an intentional violation of the statute. There is in fact no court order and there is no reason to rely on the provisions of this statute. I do not think a person who does that should lose his pension. Now, perhaps the district attorney should lose his job and his pension, because he should know the law and he made the misrepresentation.

However, let us take the other case under the comprehensive statute which uses "willfully," "knowingly," and so on. In that situation the burden of proof, as Mr. Piccola has said, is that it must be shown that the police officer acted intentionally beyond a reasonable doubt. But in addition, it must be shown that the police officer in that case did it, not just made the wiretap without the court order but did it intentionally in the sense that he wanted to harass the person; he knew that he was harassing him; and he knew that he could not rely on the order in the statute. They are two entirely different things, and that is a distinction that runs throughout the law. Words like "intent," "purpose," "motive," "willful," and so on are very, very slippery words in the law, and that is the difference.

The question here is: Do you think that police officer who relies on the word of the district attorney or his superior should lose his pension, or do you think that the Commonwealth, in order to take it away from him, should have to prove that he did it with a bad mind, knowing that he was

wrong and knowing that he intended to do so? That is the distinction and that is why you should vote against the DeWeese amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. MICHLOVIC. Mr. Speaker, will the maker of the amendment stand for brief interrogation?

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

Mr. MICHLOVIC. Mr. Speaker, do the provisions of your amendment apply to a widow of someone who willfully violates the provisions of the law, and would that widow be subject to being deprived of a pension?

Mr. DeWEESE. Counsel indicates that the answer should be no.

Mr. MICHLOVIC. Could you explain why?

Mr. DeWEESE. As I read the amendment, it only involves the person doing the wiretapping.

Mr. MICHLOVIC. Okay.

Mr. Speaker, do you think it is fair then that for one mistake that a person makes—and I understand that that mistake may be very seriously affecting another person's life, but it still may be one mistake—that they ought to have a lifetime of their benefits removed from them?

Mr. DeWEESE. In this case, yes.

Mr. MICHLOVIC. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, may I make a comment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Michlovic, who is in order to discuss the amendment.

Mr. MICHLOVIC. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with Mr. DeWeese on the second part of that. I understand the seriousness of this whole issue and its effect that it can have on the life of any one of us, but I do think that there is a potential for really taking away the pension and the life's benefits that somebody has worked for all their life as a result of one mistake, and I am not sure that the widow of that person would be entirely free from the provisions of this act. I am very seriously concerned about that, and for that reason I will oppose the DeWeese amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tioga, Mr. Spencer.

Mr. SPENCER. I would just like to enlarge a little bit upon what has been said.

This is not a new bill. We had public hearings last year, and we had both the ACLU - American Civil Liberties Union - and the enforcement officers, and they surprisingly agreed to the bill. Now, why this amendment will not work is this: The testimony of all the law enforcement officers was to this effect: How am I, the district attorney, going to order an 18-year veteran, making \$18,000 a year, to go tap somebody's wire on my say-so that I have got a valid court order? They just will not do it. Therefore, if this amendment is reinserted in the bill, you are again registering the whole thing a nullity and we will have to start all over again. I urge again a negative vote on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the minority whip.

Mr. MANDERINO. Will the gentleman, Mr. Spencer, yield to interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates that he will consent to interrogation. The gentleman, Mr. Manderino, may proceed.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, when the civil liberties union and all those groups agreed to the bill, were the brackets that we are trying to remove in the bill or were they put in later?

Mr. SPENCER. They were removed.

Mr. MANDERINO. Mr. Speaker, am I not correct in my thinking that what Mr. DeWeese is trying to change is an amendment that was put in just before the bill was released from committee and was not part of the bill when those groups that you talked about approved of the bill?

Mr. SPENCER. No. The groups approved of the bill as the bill is now written. They did so last year. This year the bill was moved out of committee as it was approved last year.

Mr. MANDERINO. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Greene, Mr. DeWeese, for the second time on the question.

Mr. DeWEESE. Very briefly. A long time ago a Frenchman wrote a book called "Candide." Voltaire tried to talk about a world that was absolutely blissful and idealistic. We do not live in that kind of world. In fact, we live in a world that is better described by John Toland in the life of Adolf Hitler. We live in a world where mass communications is something that we are not going to escape. We live in a world that was described a little bit in "Spandau Diary," because we are being inundated with computers and telecommunications, and there are all kinds of problems on the horizon. What we are trying to do today is very simple. Cutting through all of the fog and the pea soup, we are either for stringent penalties for illegal wiretappers or we are not.

Sam Dash of Senate Watergate fame wrote a book not too long ago and he talked about wiretapping and he favored wiretapping, and DeWeese and many of my colleagues voted for a wiretapping measure in 1978. But in Dash's book he talked about the Attorney General of California and how he was wiretapped, the Attorney General of Pennsylvania and how he was wiretapped. He gave examples of priests and lawyers—yes, lawyers—in privileged communications with their clients, who were wiretapped, husbands and wives, and even though some of us might not be affected by that, some of us have girl friends and we do not want those conversations tapped.

I do not think there is any confusion here today. This amendment, if supported, will discourage law enforcement people from doing things that are illegal in the area of wiretapping.

In the 1930's as the German Wermacht stormed out of Germany into Europe, there was no doubt that the next unit that would be there would be the SS. And what did they do? They wiretapped. They wiretapped.

Hardy Williams is wrong. Hardy Williams is wrong. There is a difference between

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt the gentleman's oration, but we are talking about the amendment and not the bill.

The SPEAKER. By popular demand, the gentleman, Mr. DeWeese, is recognized.

Mr. DeWEESE. When the government has control of all the apparatus that this government has control of, it is a mass situation, a mass problem, not an individual problem. We cannot look at somebody who has a job here or there teaching school or working in an office or working in a factory and say, if they do something wrong and they lose their pension, that is one thing, but what we are talking about is something else. We are talking about the government. We are talking about a very central problem, and I feel that the way to address that problem is to throw every single impediment possible in the way of illegal wiretappers. I call for the adoption of this proposal. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—83

Barber	Fee	McMonagle	Rybak
Belfanti	Gamble	Manderino	Seventy
Beloff	George	Miscevich	Showers
Blaum	Grabowski	Mrkonic	Shupnik
Borski	Haluska	Mullen	Steighner
Boyes	Harper	Murphy	Stewart
Brown	Horgos	O'Donnell	Stuban
Caltagirone	Hutchinson, A.	Olasz	Swaim
Cappabianca	Irvis	Oliver	Taddonio
Cawley	Itkin	Pendleton	Taylor, F. E.
Clark	Kanuck	Petrarca	Telek
Cochran	Kolter	Petrone	Trello
Cole	Kowalyszyn	Pievsky	Van Horne
Cordisco	Kukovich	Pistella	Wargo
Cowell	Laughlin	Pott	White
DeWeese	Levin	Pratt	Wiggins
Dombrowski	Livengood	Pucciarelli	Williams, J. D.
Donatucci	Lloyd	Rappaport	Wozniak
Duffy	Lucyk	Richardson	Wright, D. R.
Emerson	McCall	Rieger	Zwinkl
Evans	McIntyre	Ritter	

NAYS—105

Alden	Earley	Lescovitz	Serafini
Anderson	Fischer	Levi	Sieminski
Arty	Fleck	McClatchy	Sirianni
Belardi	Foster, W. W.	McVerry	Smith, B.
Berson	Foster, Jr., A.	Mackowski	Smith, E. H.
Bittle	Frazier	Madigan	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Fryer	Maiale	Snyder
Brandt	Gallagher	Manmiller	Spencer
Burd	Gallen	Marmion	Stairs
Burns	Gannon	Merry	Stevens
Cessar	Geist	Michlovic	Sweet
Cimini	Gray	Micozzie	Swift
Civera	Greenwood	Miller	Taylor, E. Z.
Clymer	Grieco	Moehlmann	Vroon
Colafella	Gruppo	Mowery	Wachob
Cornell	Hagarty	Nahill	Wambach
Coslett	Hasay	Noye	Wass
Cunningham	Hayes	Perzel	Wenger
DeMedio	Heiser	Peterson	Weston
DeVerter	Hoeffel	Phillips	Williams, H.
Daikeler	Honaman	Piccola	Wilson
Davies	Hutchinson, W.	Pitts	Wogan
Dawida	Jackson	Punt	Wright, J. L.
Dietz	Johnson	Rasco	
Dininni	Kennedy	Reber	Ryan.

Dorr	Klingaman	Rocks	Speaker
Durham	Lashinger	Saurman	

NOT VOTING—8

Armstrong	Gladeck	Gruitza	Letterman
Deal	Greenfield	Lehr	Lewis

EXCUSED—7

Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

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

REQUEST FOR RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. HAYES. I suggest that we stop the debate on this legislation at this time and take lunch. We will begin at 2 o'clock with the O'Donnell amendment; at 2 o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perry, Mr. Noye, for an announcement.

Mr. NOYE. There will be a Republican caucus at 20 minutes until 2 in the Republican caucus room. I ask that all members be present for a discussion of the sentencing guidelines.

The SPEAKER. The Republican caucus chairman has requested the Republican members to report to the caucus room at 20 minutes of 2 to discuss the resolution dealing with the sentencing guidelines.

Is there any further business?

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, this House stands in recess until 2 p.m. The Chair hears none.

AFTER RECESS

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 303 RESUMED

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. O'DONNELL offered the following amendments No. AS33:

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 5725), page 1, lines 14 and 15, by striking out "in good faith reliance on a court order or the provisions of this chapter." and inserting with the reasonable belief that the conduct was authorized by a valid court order.

Amend Sec. 1 (Sec. 5725), page 2, lines 13 and 14, by striking out "in good faith reliance on a" and inserting with the reasonable belief that the conduct was authorized by a valid

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

**MEMBER'S PRESENCE RECORDED**

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

Mr. GLADECK. I ask that my name be placed on the master roll call.

**CONSIDERATION OF HB 303 CONTINUED**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. O'Donnell, on the question of the amendments.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Mr. Speaker, this amendment has a fairly narrow scope. Under the current version of the law, everybody who performs an illegal wiretap would have a defense. It would be the defense that would be usually available to them in legal process.

The bill, HB 303, provides an additional defense, really two additional defenses, that would be available to any kind of violation of the wiretap act. That additional defense is good-faith reliance on either a court order or on the provisions of this chapter.

There are three possible penalties that are under discussion here. One is the loss of your pension, the other is the loss of your public employment, and the third is the penalty that would accrue via a civil suit.

My amendment does not in any way address the pension issue. It does not in any way address the loss of public employment. The effect of my amendment is to limit the defense available to violators of this act. It limits their defense to a reasonable belief that their conduct was authorized by a valid court order. It only addresses the narrow issue of what kind of additional defense should be available to a violator in the case of a civil suit. It does not in any way address the other penalties that might be imposed. If my amendment passes, there would still be the defense of good-faith reliance for those other penalties.

This kind of a discussion tends to become a debate between lawyers. One of the reasons for that is because the terms of art that are being used here frequently escape laymen. I have to admit that the words of the present bill escaped me—and, I suspect, even the other lawyers in the House—for the reason that in the Criminal Code there is no definition of good-faith reliance. Unless my amendment is adopted, we are on the verge of adopting a bill which would introduce a new defense into the criminal law for which there is no meaning under the Criminal Code. This is an extremely dangerous procedure, and what it would force a court to do in construing that section of the law would be to look outside the Criminal Code to find some meaning for good-faith reliance. The meaning that they would come across is honesty in fact. No matter how dumb, no matter how poorly founded, no matter what the absence of evidence was, you could still get away with violating the act as long as it was in good-faith reliance. I think that is inappropriate. For that reason what I am trying to substitute is reasonable belief that the conduct was authorized by a valid court order. Reasonable belief is defined in the Criminal Code; it is a concept that finds meaning within

the code; it is something the court can look at without a great deal of uncertainty.

The one final point I want to make is that the debate so far on this bill has focused on law enforcement as if law enforcement were the only people who could conceivably violate this act. In my opinion, that may be the most dangerous kind of concept that we have to deal with but probably will be the least probable occurrence. You have to bear in mind that this act forbids the interception, the recording, and the disclosure illegally. There are all kinds of people in Pennsylvania who would be very interested in intercepting conversations. Those people will have a good-faith-reliance defense unless you adopt the amendment. There are all kinds of people who, even if they do not intercept by one means or another, would be very anxious to have their hands on that information and would be very anxious to disclose it. That is why we passed the law and we made it a criminal penalty, and that is why we have imposed these other sanctions. Those people, those violators, would be able to avail themselves of this good-faith reliance, whatever that means, as a defense unless we adopt this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tioga, Mr. Spencer.

Mr. SPENCER. I urge a negative vote on the O'Donnell amendment for the following reasons: Number one, these words, "in good faith reliance on a court order," were words that were put in by the Judiciary Committee at the recommendation of the law enforcement officers and the American Civil Liberties Union, because there is only one body of law on wiretapping and that is the Federal law which uses these same words. And so with the Federal law having "in good faith reliance," with decisions under that law, we know exactly what we are talking about because it only has to do with wiretapping cases. The reasonable-belief concept expressed by Mr. O'Donnell does not have, to my knowledge at least, any court decisions relative to wiretapping. So we have a known feature, good-faith reliance. It is in the Federal law. There are Federal cases on it, and I would request that we retain that wording as was put in by the Judiciary Committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. O'Donnell.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to summarize what I think is the heart of the issue here.

You have two phrases that are available to you as you create the law - reasonable belief and good-faith reliance. The difference between those two phrases is critical. Good-faith reliance has to do with what in the law is known as a subjective test. It has to do with what is going on in the mind of the violator. The reasonable-belief test is what is known as an objective test. It has to do with regarding that conduct as it would be regarded by an objective observer. The minds that we are dealing with are the minds of wiretappers. That is not the appropriate forum to judge whether or not the law of Pennsylvania has been violated. Thank you.

**MEMBER'S PRESENCE RECORDED**

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my name be added to the master roll.

**CONSIDERATION OF HB 303 CONTINUED**

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

The following roll call was recorded:

**YEAS—88**

Barber	Evans	Lucyk	Richardson
Belfanti	Fee	McCall	Rieger
Beloff	Gallagher	McIntyre	Ritter
Blaum	Gamble	McMonagle	Rybak
Borski	George	Maiale	Seventy
Brown	Grabowski	Manderino	Shupnik
Caltagirone	Greenfield	Michlovic	Steighner
Cappabianca	Haluska	Miscevich	Stewart
Cawley	Harper	Mrkonic	Suban
Clark	Hoeffel	Mullen	Swaim
Cochran	Horgos	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Colafella	Hutchinson, A.	O'Donnell	Trello
Cole	Irvic	Olasz	Van Horne
Cordisco	Itkin	Oliver	Wachob
Cowell	Kolter	Pendleton	Wargo
DeWeese	Kowalyshyn	Petrarca	White
Dawida	Kukovich	Petrone	Wiggins
Deal	Laughlin	Pievsky	Williams, H.
Dombrowski	Lescovitz	Pistella	Williams, J. D.
Donatucci	Letterman	Pratt	Wozniak
Duffy	Livengood	Pucciarelli	Wright, D. R.
Emerson	Lloyd	Rappaport	Zwikl

**NAYS—104**

Alden	Fischer	Lewis	Showers
Anderson	Fleck	McClatchy	Sieminski
Armstrong	Foster, W. W.	McVerry	Sirianni
Arty	Frazier	Mackowski	Smith, B.
Belardi	Fryer	Madigan	Smith, E. H.
Berson	Gallen	Manmiller	Smith, L. E.
Bittle	Geist	Marmion	Snyder
Bowser	Gladeck	Merry	Spencer
Boyes	Gray	Micozzie	Stairs
Brandt	Greenwood	Miller	Stevens
Burd	Grieco	Moehlmann	Sweet
Burns	Gruppo	Mowery	Swift
Cessar	Hagarty	Nahill	Taddonio
Cimini	Hasay	Noye	Taylor, E. Z.
Civera	Hayes	Perzel	Telek
Clymer	Heiser	Peterson	Vroon
Cornell	Honaman	Phillips	Wambach
Coslett	Hutchinson, W.	Piccola	Wass
Cunningham	Jackson	Pitts	Wenger
DeMedio	Johnson	Pott	Weston
DeVerter	Kanuck	Punt	Wilson
Daikeler	Kennedy	Rasco	Wogan
Davies	Klingaman	Reber	Wright, J. L.
Dietz	Lashinger	Rocks	
Dininni	Lehr	Saurman	Ryan,
Dorr	Levi	Serafini	Speaker
Durham	Levin		

**NOT VOTING—4**

Earley	Foster, Jr., A.	Gannon	Gruitza
--------	-----------------	--------	---------

**EXCUSED—7**

Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

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

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

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

**YEAS—181**

Alden	Fischer	Lucyk	Rocks
Anderson	Fleck	McCall	Rybak
Armstrong	Foster, W. W.	McClatchy	Saurman
Arty	Foster, Jr., A.	McIntyre	Serafini
Barber	Frazier	McMonagle	Seventy
Belardi	Fryer	McVerry	Showers
Belfanti	Gallagher	Mackowski	Shupnik
Beioff	Gallen	Madigan	Sieminski
Berson	Gamble	Maiale	Sirianni
Blaum	Gannon	Manderino	Smith, B.
Borski	Geist	Manmiller	Smith, E. H.
Bowser	George	Marmion	Smith, L. E.
Boyes	Gladeck	Merry	Snyder
Brandt	Gray	Michlovic	Spencer
Brown	Greenfield	Micozzie	Stairs
Burd	Greenwood	Miller	Steighner
Burns	Grieco	Miscevich	Stevens
Caltagirone	Gruitza	Moehlmann	Suban
Cappabianca	Gruppo	Mowery	Swaim
Cawley	Hagarty	Mrkonic	Sweet
Cessar	Haluska	Mullen	Swift
Cimini	Harper	Murphy	Taddonio
Civera	Hasay	Nahill	Taylor, E. Z.
Clark	Hayes	Noye	Taylor, F. E.
Clymer	Heiser	Olasz	Telek
Cochran	Hoeffel	Oliver	Van Horne
Colafella	Honaman	Pendleton	Vroon
Cole	Horgos	Perzel	Wachob
Cornell	Hutchinson, W.	Peterson	Wambach
Coslett	Irvic	Petrarca	Wargo
Cunningham	Itkin	Petrone	Wass
DeMedio	Jackson	Phillips	Wenger
DeVerter	Johnson	Piccola	Weston
Daikeler	Kennedy	Pievsky	White
Davies	Klingaman	Pistella	Wiggins
Dawida	Kolter	Pitts	Williams, H.
Dietz	Kowalyshyn	Pott	Wilson
Dininni	Lashinger	Pratt	Wogan
Dombrowski	Laughlin	Pucciarelli	Wozniak
Donatucci	Lehr	Punt	Wright, D. R.
Dorr	Lescovitz	Rappaport	Wright, J. L.
Duffy	Levi	Rasco	Zwikl
Durham	Levin	Reber	
Earley	Lewis	Richardson	Ryan,
Emerson	Livengood	Rieger	Speaker
Fee	Lloyd	Ritter	

**NAYS—14**

Cordisco	Evans	Kukovich	Stewart
Cowell	Grabowski	Letterman	Trello
DeWeese	Hutchinson, A.	O'Donnell	Williams, J. D.
Deal	Kanuck		

NOT VOTING—1

Bittle

EXCUSED—7

Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

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

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

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 570, PN 598**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of October 6, 1980 (No. 145), referred to as the Capital Budget Act of 1980-1981 Fiscal Year, increasing the bond authorization for transportation assistance projects.

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

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

YEAS—195

Alden	Evans	Lewis	Ritter
Anderson	Fee	Livengood	Rocks
Armstrong	Fischer	Lloyd	Rybak
Arty	Fleck	Lucy	Saurman
Barber	Foster, W. W.	McCall	Serafini
Belardi	Foster, Jr., A.	McClatchy	Seventy
Belfanti	Frazier	McIntyre	Showers
Beloff	Fryer	McMonagle	Shupnik
Berson	Gallagher	McVerry	Sieminski
Bittle	Gallen	Mackowski	Sirianni
Blaum	Gamble	Madigan	Smith, B.
Borski	Gannon	Maiale	Smith, E. H.
Bowser	Geist	Manderino	Smith, L. E.
Boyes	George	Manmiller	Snyder
Brandt	Gladeck	Marmion	Spencer
Brown	Grabowski	Merry	Stairs
Burd	Gray	Michlovic	Steighner
Burns	Greenfield	Micozzie	Stevens
Caltagirone	Greenwood	Miller	Stewart
Cappabianca	Grieco	Miscevich	Stuban
Cawley	Gruitza	Moehlmann	Swaim
Cessar	Gruppo	Mowery	Sweet
Cimini	Hagarty	Mrkoncic	Swift
Civera	Haluska	Mullen	Taddonio
Clark	Harper	Murphy	Taylor, E. Z.
Clymer	Hasay	Nahill	Taylor, F. E.
Cochran	Hayes	Noye	Telek
Colafella	Heiser	O'Donnell	Trello
Cole	Hoeffel	Olasz	Van Horne
Cordisco	Honaman	Oliver	Vroon
Cornell	Horgos	Pendleton	Wachob
Coslett	Hutchinson, A.	Perzel	Wambach
Cowell	Hutchinson, W.	Peterson	Wargo
Cunningham	Irviss	Petrarca	Wass
DeMedio	Itkin	Petrone	Wenger
DeVerter	Jackson	Phillips	Weston
DeWeese	Johnson	Piccola	White
Daikeler	Kennedy	Pievsky	Wiggins
Davies	Klingaman	Pistella	Williams, H.

Dawida	Kolter	Pitts	Williams, J. D.
Deal	Kowalshyn	Pott	Wilson
Dietz	Kukovich	Pratt	Wogan
Dininni	Lashinger	Pucciarelli	Wozniak
Dombrowski	Laughlin	Punt	Wright, D. R.
Donatucci	Lehr	Rappaport	Wright, J. L.
Dorr	Lescovitz	Rasco	Zwikel
Duffy	Letterman	Reber	
Durham	Levi	Richardson	Ryan,
Earley	Levin	Rieger	Speaker
Emerson			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—1

Kanuck

EXCUSED—7

Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

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

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

CITATION PRESENTED

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Schuylkill, Mr. Hutchinson. Will the gentleman, Mr. Hutchinson, come to the rostrum?

The Chair at this time requests Mr. Hutchinson to read a citation about to be considered by this House. The Chair would request that the members of the House pay attention to the citation.

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

Mr. W. D. HUTCHINSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is with a great deal of personal pleasure that I offer this citation for the consideration of the House. The lady named in this citation has been a friend of mine since I began to practice law in 1957 and has been the Official Reporter of this House from June 1957 through today. (Reading:)

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

CITATION BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WHEREAS, Agnes O'Neill Furey has contributed many hours of dedicated service to this Commonwealth as secretary to the Secretary of the Senate, G. Harold Watkins, 1956; as the Official Reporter of the House from June 1957 to March 1981; and as the Official Reporter for the 1968 Constitutional Convention; and

WHEREAS, Educated at Immaculate Heart Academy, Immaculata College and the University of Pennsylvania, she holds a Bachelor's degree in Commercial Education and Accounting; a Master's degree in Economics and a Master's in Education and served as a public school teacher from 1938 until 1943; and

WHEREAS, Agnes O'Neill Furey's service during these years to the House from 1957 to the present, encompassed a period of great change and transition through all of which her efforts, perseverance, and good sense were of inestimable value to this House and the people of this Commonwealth; and

WHEREAS, Her service as Official Reporter through seven changes in political party leadership in the House attests to her competency and professionalism.

Now therefore, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pays tribute to Agnes O'Neill Furey for her outstanding contributions and sincere dedication as Official Reporter of the House. She has served with dignity and is respected and admired by all those who have come to know her; and wishes her the best in future endeavors; and further directs that a copy of this citation be delivered to Agnes O'Neill Furey, 412 Broad Street, Fountain Springs, Ashland, Pennsylvania.

Submitted by:  
William D. Hutchinson,  
Sponsor  
Samuel E. Hayes, Jr.,  
Sponsor  
K. Leroy Irvis,  
Sponsor  
Matthew J. Ryan,  
Speaker  
ATTEST:  
John J. Zubeck,  
Chief Clerk

March 31, 1981

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I deliver this citation to one of my constituents and my dear friend, Agnes O'Neill Furey.

Mrs. FUREY. Thank you very much.

I really do not want to do this, because as a reporter, you know, I am known as the silent man, but those who really know me know I am not.

I was just reading an article in the Inquirer about how to say goodbye, and Dr. Fink, the psychiatrist who conducted the seminar concerning the subject matter, said it is better if you share it with others. So I lay it on you and I share it with you and I hope that you will be very happy, and I say, God bless you all.

The SPEAKER. The Chair at this time recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. IRVIS. Mr. Speaker, Agnes Furey symbolizes much more than a single individual about to change careers. Agnes symbolizes what you and I have been striving for for years to achieve in this House, and that is the truly dedicated nonpartisan professional. She symbolizes the professionals who staff our committees, who staff the House, those people of whom we have every right to be singularly proud because of the high quality of work which they do. None has performed his or her task any better than Agnes. None deserves our loyalty and our thanks more, and I want her to know that when she changes careers, those of us who are still left behind, although there may not be many of us who remember those years, thank her for her guidance, for her sincerity, for her competence, and for her understanding, and we shall miss you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. HAYES. Agnes, one of the measures of a good public servant is how much better the institution is today than when you first came. I believe every member of this House of Representatives, as they reflect back upon their years of

service here, can say, without qualification, that the House of Representatives today is a little bit better because of what you have done through the years. We all thank you, Agnes, and wish the very best for you in your retirement.

### BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION CONTINUED

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 261, PN 817**, entitled:

An Act relating to the lawful conduct of bingo, prescribing penalties and making a repeal.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Mr. LETTERMAN offered the following amendments No. A429:

Amend Sec. 3, page 2, line 12, by inserting after "association", Pennsylvania private enterprise campground operators association

Amend Sec. 5, page 3, line 14, by inserting after "county." The license fee to be charged any Pennsylvania private enterprise campground operators association shall be \$100 per annum.

Amend Sec. 5, page 3, line 14, by inserting after "each" other

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. LETTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my amendment is very simple. It just includes the Pennsylvania private enterprise campground operators association. Thank you.

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

Mr. DORR. Mr. Speaker, the list of associations in the bill which are authorized to play bingo is rather comprehensive and broad based purposely. If in fact the campground operators association qualifies as a charitable organization or a civic organization, then they can play bingo. If they do not, in my judgment, they should not be playing bingo, and so they should qualify, if at all, under the provisions that are already in the bill, and I would recommend a negative vote.

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

Mr. LETTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would think they would come under "civic." When I drafted the amendment, they told me that it was all right that way, that the rest of the bill was drawn and this was satisfactory to it.

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman that if they do come under the "civic," they will have no trouble getting a license. If they do not come under, then they will not get the license. There is no need to put them in, so I would oppose the amendment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—33

Berson	Hutchinson, A.	O'Donnell	Seventy
Blaum	Klingaman	Oliver	Shupnik
Cawley	Kowalshyn	Petrone	Stewart
DeWeese	Kukovich	Pievsky	Sweet
Dawida	Letterman	Pistella	Wachob
Duffy	McIntyre	Richardson	Wargo
Gamble	Maiale	Rieger	White
Grabowski	Miscevich	Ritter	Wright, D. R.
Horgos			

NAYS—161

Alden	Earley	Levi	Rocks
Anderson	Emerson	Levin	Rybak
Armstrong	Evans	Lewis	Saurman
Arty	Fee	Livengood	Serafini
Barber	Fischer	Lloyd	Showers
Belardi	Fleck	Lucyk	Sieminski
Belfanti	Foster, W. W.	McCall	Sirianni
Beloff	Foster, Jr., A.	McClatchy	Smith, B.
Bittle	Frazier	McMonagle	Smith, E. H.
Borski	Fryer	McVerry	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Gallagher	Mackowski	Snyder
Boyes	Gallen	Madigan	Spencer
Brandt	Gannon	Manderino	Stairs
Brown	Geist	Manmiller	Steighner
Burd	George	Marmion	Stevens
Burns	Gladeck	Merry	Stuban
Caltagirone	Gray	Michlovic	Swaim
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Micozzie	Swift
Cessar	Grieco	Miller	Taddonio
Cimini	Gruitza	Moehlmann	Taylor, E. Z.
Civera	Gruppo	Mowery	Taylor, F. E.
Clark	Hagarty	Mrkonic	Telek
Clymer	Haluska	Mullen	Trello
Cochran	Harper	Murphy	Van Horne
Colafella	Hasay	Nahill	Vroon
Cordisco	Hayes	Noye	Wambach
Cornell	Heiser	Olasz	Wass
Coslett	Hoeffel	Pendleton	Wenger
Cowell	Honaman	Perzel	Weston
Cunningham	Hutchinson, W.	Peterson	Wiggins
DeMedio	Irvic	Petrarca	Williams, H.
DeVertter	Itkin	Phillips	Williams, J. D.
Daikeler	Jackson	Piccola	Wilson
Davies	Johnson	Pitts	Wogan
Deal	Kanuck	Pott	Wozniak
Dietz	Kennedy	Pratt	Wright, J. L.
Dininni	Kolter	Pucciarelli	Zwikl
Dombrowski	Lashingier	Punt	
Donatucci	Laughlin	Rappaport	Ryan,
Dorr	Lehr	Rasco	Speaker
Durham	Lescovitz	Reber	

NOT VOTING—2

Cole	Greenfield
------	------------

EXCUSED—7

Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

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. GALLAGHER offered the following amendment No. A624:

Amend Sec. 3, page 2, line 29, by striking out “, and any” and inserting . Where numbered balls are used, such balls shall be of different colors with each color designating one of the vertical rows of numbers. Any

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

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment deals with the mechanical part of bingo. The amendment says that “Where numbered balls are used, such balls shall be of different colors with each color designating one of the vertical rows of numbers.” That means that in some instances they use a white ball and you cannot tell which row the ball is called from. My information is that there is some kind of hanky-panky that goes on, that if they have a shill in the audience, they could pick out the number for the person to win the big prize. This is from the professional groups who run bingo. They just want a clean bingo so that nobody can play hanky-panky, similar to what happened to our lottery. We do not want that to happen with bingo.

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

Mr. DORR. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of things that we could put into this bill that designate various ways to play bingo. It is my judgment that we should not do that. We should define the game of bingo broadly as we have done in the bill and not get into the esoterics of how it is played at particular places. I suspect that the professional bingo operators will have a number of amendments that they would like to see in this bill because they do not like the bill. They do not want the bill because they will not be allowed to operate the game of bingo, and so anything they can do to squash this legislation, they will do. I suggest to the gentleman that if people perceive a problem with the playing of bingo, whether it is the color of the ping-pong balls or whatever it may be, they are not going to play bingo at that place anymore. If they feel like they are getting cheated, they are not going to play bingo there anymore. So I would recommend that we leave the bill the way it is as far as the definition of bingo is concerned and vote “no” on the amendment.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—30

Barber	Gray	Manderino	Pievsky
Berson	Horgos	Mrkonic	Seventy
Blaum	Hutchinson, A.	Mullen	Shupnik
Caltagirone	Irvic	O'Donnell	Swaim
Cawley	Lewis	Oliver	Wargo
DeWeese	Lloyd	Pendleton	White
Gallagher	Lucyk	Petrone	Wright, J. L.
Grabowski	Maiale		

NAYS—163

Alden	Earley	Lehr	Ritter
Anderson	Emerson	Lescovitz	Rocks
Armstrong	Evans	Levi	Rybak
Arty	Fee	Levin	Serafini
Belardi	Fischer	Livengood	Showers
Belfanti	Fleck	McCall	Sieminski
Beloff	Foster, W. W.	McClatchy	Sirianni
Bittle	Foster, Jr., A.	McIntyre	Smith, B.
Borski	Frazier	McMonagle	Smith, E. H.
Bowser	Fryer	McVerry	Smith, L. E.
Boyes	Gallen	Mackowski	Snyder

Brandt	Gamble	Madigan	Spencer
Brown	Gannon	Manmiller	Stairs
Burd	Geist	Marmion	Steighner
Burns	George	Merry	Stevens
Cappabianca	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stewart
Cessar	Greenfield	Micozzie	Stuban
Cimini	Greenwood	Miller	Sweet
Civera	Grieco	Miscevich	Swift
Clark	Gruitza	Moehlmann	Taddonio
Clymer	Gruppo	Mowery	Taylor, E. Z.
Cochran	Hagarty	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Colafella	Haluska	Nahill	Telek
Cole	Harper	Noye	Trello
Cordisco	Hasay	Olasz	Van Horne
Cornell	Hayes	Perzel	Vroon
Coslett	Heiser	Peterson	Wachob
Cowell	Hoeffel	Petrarca	Wambach
Cunningham	Honaman	Phillips	Wass
DeMedio	Hutchinson, W.	Piccola	Wenger
DeVertter	Itkin	Pistella	Weston
Daikeler	Jackson	Pitts	Wiggins
Davies	Johnson	Pott	Williams, H.
Dawida	Kanuck	Pratt	Williams, J. D.
Deal	Kennedy	Pucciarelli	Wogan
Dietz	Klingaman	Punt	Wozniak
Dininni	Kolter	Rappaport	Wright, D. R.
Dombrowski	Kowalshyn	Rasco	Zwikt
Donatucci	Kukovich	Reber	
Dorr	Lashinger	Richardson	Ryan,
Duffy	Laughlin	Rieger	Speaker
Durham			

NOT VOTING—3

Letterman	Saurman	Wilson	
EXCUSED—7			
Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

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. GALLAGHER offered the following amendments No. A625:

Amend Sec. 3, page 2, lines 29 and 30; page 3, lines 1 through 3, by striking out all of said lines on said pages and inserting of bingo. Any person conducting the game may award to any player or players first completing any combination constituting bingo a prize so long as such prize award shall not exceed a value of \$500 for any one such game of bingo except for jackpot games which shall not exceed \$3,000 for one such game of bingo.

Amend Sec. 5, page 4, line 24, by striking out "\$4,000" and inserting \$6,000

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment increases the amount of the single prize from \$250 to \$500, and the jackpot game shall not exceed \$3,000, in one such game of bingo. There is a total for the whole evening of \$6,000. That is all the amendment does.

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, the amounts arrived at in this bill are exactly the same amounts as were in the bill that we

passed last session. They are a result of long, hard negotiations with the veterans groups, the fire companies, the Catholic Conference, and all of those charitable and county fair associations that we have dealt with in trying to get a bill that would get by this General Assembly. So I would oppose any change in those numbers. They are the same as we passed last year. Everybody seemed satisfied with them, and I would suggest to you that they are probably pretty good figures. They do not satisfy everybody, but something that does not satisfy everybody is probably a good compromise. I would ask you to vote against the amendment.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, just briefly, Mr. Burns is correct that it was passed last year. Inflation has gone up. The prices are higher. The costs are higher. And, Mr. Speaker, these amendments came from St. Michael the Archangel Church in Bucks County.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—32

Barber	Cole	Hutchinson, A.	Pievsky
Berson	Cordisco	Irvis	Richardson
Blaum	DeWeese	Lashinger	Shupnik
Brown	Dawida	Lescovitz	Stevens
Caltagirone	Deal	McCall	Van Horne
Cappabianca	Dombrowski	Mullen	Wargo
Cawley	Gallagher	Oliver	White
Colafella	Grabowski	Pendleton	Wright, J. L.

NAYS—164

Alden	Frazier	McClatchy	Rybak
Anderson	Fryer	McIntyre	Saurman
Armstrong	Gallen	McMonagle	Serafini
Arty	Gamble	McVerry	Seventy
Belardi	Gannon	Mackowski	Showers
Belfanti	Geist	Madigan	Sieminski
Beloff	George	Maiiale	Sirianni
Bittle	Gladeck	Manderino	Smith, B.
Borski	Gray	Manmiller	Smith, E. H.
Bowser	Greenfield	Marmion	Smith, L. E.
Boyes	Greenwood	Merry	Snyder
Brandt	Grieco	Michlovic	Spencer
Burd	Gruitza	Micozzie	Stairs
Burns	Gruppo	Miller	Steighner
Cessar	Hagarty	Miscevich	Stewart
Cimini	Haluska	Moehlmann	Stuban
Civera	Harper	Mowery	Swaim
Clark	Hasay	Mrkonic	Sweet
Clymer	Hayes	Murphy	Swift
Cochran	Heiser	Nahill	Taddonio
Cornell	Hoeffel	Noye	Taylor, E. Z.
Coslett	Honaman	O'Donnell	Taylor, F. E.
Cowell	Horgos	Olasz	Telek
Cunningham	Hutchinson, W.	Perzel	Trello
DeMedio	Itkin	Peterson	Vroon
DeVertter	Jackson	Petrarca	Wachob
Daikeler	Johnson	Petrone	Wambach
Davies	Kanuck	Phillips	Wass
Dietz	Kennedy	Piccola	Wenger
Dininni	Klingaman	Pistella	Weston
Donatucci	Kolter	Pitts	Wiggins
Dorr	Kowalshyn	Pott	Williams, H.
Duffy	Kukovich	Pratt	Williams, J. D.
Durham	Laughlin	Pucciarelli	Wilson
Earley	Lehr	Punt	Wogan
Emerson	Letterman	Rappaport	Wozniak

Evans	Levi	Rasco	Wright, D. R.
Fee	Levin	Reber	Zwinkl
Fischer	Lewis	Rieger	
Fleck	Livengood	Ritter	Ryan,
Foster, W. W.	Lloyd	Rocks	Speaker
Foster, Jr., A.	Lucyk		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

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. CORDISCO offered the following amendments No. A667:

Amend Sec. 3, page 2, line 30, page 3, line 1, by striking out "so" in line 30, page 2, and "long as such prize awarded shall not exceed a value of \$250" in line 1, page 3, and inserting of such value as is determined by the association

Amend Sec. 3, page 3, line 2, by striking out "for" and inserting in the case of

Amend Sec. 3, page 3, line 2, by striking out "which" and inserting where the prize awarded

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. CORDISCO. Mr. Speaker, this amendment basically removes the restrictions that were placed upon the bingo game itself in describing a lap game and also the amount that could be played, which stipulated \$250.

I can agree with Mr. Burns as far as the bill is concerned to benefit the nonprofit and charitable organizations in legalizing this bill in Pennsylvania.

The provisions of \$250 per game would do nothing more than to restrict competition of various games and various communities. I believe that these restrictions that were placed into this bill are there to favor a particular organization or association against another. Our objective here today is to legalize the game of bingo for charitable and nonprofit associations, not to instruct these people on how the game of bingo shall be played. These figures are arbitrary, in fact, but do nothing more than hinder the free enterprise of the bingo game itself.

Taking Mr. Dorr's own statements when the prior amendments were placed on the floor, he said that these figures that were placed in the bill itself were to be broad. I agree with him, and I want to take it a step further with my amendment and leave it up to that association to determine how their particular bingo game is to be played. If we are going to place a \$4,000 restriction on these associations and organizations, then we should let them determine how to use that money. What might benefit one game in Bucks County might not benefit another in Butler. I think Mr. Burns' intentions are good, and the Assembly's here, in legalizing bingo for the benefit of those associations, but for the sake of free enter-

prise, please, Mr. Speaker, let them run their own game the best way they know how. Thank you.

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, as eloquent as the argument sounds about free enterprise, the fact is that free enterprise would drive a great many smaller charitable organizations out of business, simply because one group would run a big game while a second group in the same community would run a smaller game, and of course, the big game is going to drive off the customers from the smaller game.

We have worked with just about every organization, charitable and so forth, that has come forward on this bill. We have, after long and hard negotiations, come up with some figures. We think they are fair figures. They are figures that most organizations have agreed to live with, and I would, on that basis, reject the Cordisco amendment.

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

Mr. CORDISCO. Mr. Speaker, in reference to Mr. Burns' remarks on restrictions on the big game, you have already done that in a provision of the bill which stipulates a \$4,000 maximum per day. So I think that says in itself that it would restrict a big game.

I think that anyone who knows anything about bingo knows that they play more than one game and maybe play up to 15 to 20 games per evening. Break that down under a \$4,000 ceiling and it is quite obvious that that in itself restricts the big game.

Contrary to opinion, I also have met with organizations prior to coming before this House today. I have met with the Catholic churches, the volunteer fire companies, and the VFW's of Bucks County. There must be a lack of communication between those bodies and the bodies who were represented in discussing this bill because it was unanimously decided upon by all the groups present that if there was a ceiling to be placed, to let the association decide on how they are going to utilize those funds.

Mr. Speaker, I think this assembly has told various bodies on various occasions what they should do and what they should not do, and I think the game of bingo should not fall into that realm. I think if we are doing it to benefit those organizations, let us do one thing: Let us be fair to all parties concerned. If one organization is equipped to handle that \$4,000 ceiling and gain a great deal more than another organization, then it is the problem of that organization to review its games to benefit that type of game or that group of people, and I think it should be left up to those people to make that decision. Let us not jeopardize one group or another because they happen to run a game of bingo very efficiently. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—37

Berson	Duffy	McMonagle	Shupnik
Brown	Gallagher	Manderino	Stewart
Caltagirone	Gallen	Mrkonic	Trelo
Cappabianca	Grabowski	Oliver	Van Horne
Clark	Horgos	Pendleton	Wargo
Cole	Hutchinson, A.	Petrarca	White
Cordisco	Irvis	Petrone	Wilson
Cowell	Kolter	Pievsky	Wozniak
DeWeese	Lucyk	Seventy	Wright, J. L.
Dombrowski			

NAYS—155

Alden	Fee	Levi	Ritter
Anderson	Fischer	Levin	Rocks
Armstrong	Fleck	Lewis	Rybak
Arty	Foster, W. W.	Livengood	Saurman
Barber	Foster, Jr., A.	Lloyd	Serafini
Belardi	Frazier	McCall	Showers
Belfanti	Fryer	McClatchy	Sieminski
Beloff	Gannon	McVerry	Sirianni
Bittle	Geist	Mackowski	Smith, B.
Blaum	George	Madigan	Smith, E. H.
Borski	Gladeck	Maiale	Smith, L. E.
Bowser	Gray	Manmiller	Snyder
Boyes	Greenfield	Marmion	Spencer
Brandt	Greenwood	Merry	Stairs
Burd	Grieco	Michlovic	Steighner
Burns	Gruitza	Micozzie	Stevens
Cawley	Gruppo	Miller	Suban
Cessar	Hagarty	Miscevich	Swaim
Cimini	Haluska	Moehlmann	Sweet
Civera	Harper	Mowery	Swift
Clymer	Hasay	Murphy	Taddonio
Cochran	Hayes	Nahill	Taylor, E. Z.
Colafella	Heiser	Noye	Taylor, F. E.
Cornell	Hoeffel	O'Donnell	Telek
Coslett	Honaman	Olasz	Vroon
Cunningham	Hutchinson, W.	Perzel	Wachob
DeMedio	Itkin	Peterson	Wambach
DeVerter	Jackson	Phillips	Wass
Daikeler	Johnson	Piccola	Wenger
Davies	Kanuck	Pitts	Weston
Dawida	Kennedy	Pott	Wiggins
Deal	Klingaman	Pratt	Williams, H.
Dietz	Kowalyszyn	Pucciarelli	Williams, J. D.
Dininni	Kukovich	Punt	Wogan
Donatucci	Lashinger	Rappaport	Wright, D. R.
Dorr	Laughlin	Rasco	Zwikl
Durham	Lehr	Reber	
Earley	Lescovitz	Richardson	Ryan,
Emerson	Letterman	Rieger	Speaker
Evans			

NOT VOTING—4

Gamble	McIntyre	Mullen	Pistella
--------	----------	--------	----------

EXCUSED—7

Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

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. PETERSON offered the following amendments No. A665:

Amend Sec. 3, page 3, line 1, by striking out "\$250" and inserting \$150

Amend Sec. 3, page 3, line 3, by striking out "\$2,000" and inserting \$1,500

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Venango, Mr. Peterson.

Mr. PETERSON. It is my opinion that the higher the limits, the more people we are going to attract to play bingo and the more organizations will be interested in running bingo games. My amendment reduces those limits slightly.

I think many people in the General Assembly, especially from rural areas like my own, have concern for the fire departments that have depended on bingo for years for a major source of income. I believe that the limits in this bill are not necessary for the majority of organizations now playing bingo in Pennsylvania and specifically for the fire halls which most of us are more concerned about. My amendment will limit those and I think will discourage many organizations that would become competition to our fire halls, and I guess I would second the comments that Eddie Burns made a few moments ago that the large games will siphon off the dollars that our local fire halls have learned to depend on because the competition will be there. I think there is a great difference between bingo and legalized gambling. The large games that I hear mentioned here today, in my opinion, are a form of legalized gambling and do not really compare with the bingo that rural Pennsylvania has been accustomed to, and I ask for your support.

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

Mr. BURNS. Again, Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this amendment. I do so because it is the reverse of what the amendments that we just defeated would do. The amendments we just defeated would raise it. This would lower it. I would just remind everybody that these figures did not come out of the air. They are a result of long, hard negotiations with members from not only the veterans' associations but the Catholic Conference and the fire companies throughout the state, and they have all agreed that these are good numbers, and I would urge you to keep the present numbers and reject the amendment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—47

Armstrong	Fryer	McClatchy	Sirianni
Blaum	Gallagher	McVerry	Snyder
Bowser	Geist	Madigan	Spencer
Clymer	Gladeck	Manmiller	Stairs
Cochran	Grabowski	Miller	Stewart
Coslett	Hayes	Mowery	Swift
Cunningham	Hutchinson, A.	O'Donnell	Taylor, E. Z.
Dietz	Johnson	Peterson	Wass
Dininni	Klingaman	Phillips	Wenger
Fischer	Lashinger	Piccola	Wogan
Foster, W. W.	Levi	Pitts	Wright, D. R.
Frazier	Lloyd	Rasco	

NAYS—148

Alden	Durham	Levin	Rocks
Anderson	Earley	Lewis	Rybak
Arty	Emerson	Livengood	Saurman
Barber	Evans	Lucyk	Serafini

Belardi	Fee	McCall	Seventy
Belfanti	Fleck	McIntyre	Showers
Beloff	Foster, Jr., A.	McMonagle	Shupnik
Berson	Gallen	Mackowski	Sieminski
Bittle	Gamble	Maiale	Smith, B.
Borski	Gannon	Manderino	Smith, E. H.
Boyes	George	Marmion	Smith, L. E.
Brandt	Gray	Merry	Steighner
Brown	Greenfield	Michlovic	Stevens
Burd	Greenwood	Micozzie	Stuban
Burns	Grieco	Miscevich	Swaim
Caltagirone	Gruitza	Moehlmann	Sweet
Cappabianca	Gruppo	Mrkonic	Taddonio
Cawley	Hagarty	Mullen	Taylor, F. E.
Cessar	Haluska	Murphy	Telek
Cimini	Harper	Nahill	Trello
Civera	Hasay	Noye	Van Horne
Clark	Heiser	Olasz	Vroon
Colafrella	Hoeffel	Oliver	Wachob
Cole	Honaman	Pendleton	Wambach
Cordisco	Horgos	Perzel	Wargo
Cornell	Hutchinson, W.	Petrarca	Weston
Cowell	Irviss	Petrone	White
DeMedio	Itkin	Pievsky	Wiggins
DeVerter	Jackson	Pistella	Williams, H.
DeWeese	Kanuck	Pratt	Williams, J. D.
Daikeler	Kennedy	Pucciarelli	Wilson
Davies	Kolter	Punt	Wozniak
Dawida	Kowalshyn	Rappaport	Wright, J. L.
Deal	Kukovich	Reber	Zwilk
Dombrowski	Laughlin	Richardson	
Donatucci	Lehr	Rieger	Ryan,
Dorr	Lescovitz	Ritter	Speaker
Duffy	Letterman		

NOT VOTING—1

Pott

EXCUSED—7

Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

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. STUBAN offered the following amendments No. A619:

Amend Sec. 5, page 3, line 11, by inserting after "county," the sheriff and district attorney, on application, shall investigate the applicant. If on such investigation, they find the applicant a proper person to be licensed, they shall submit a report to that effect to the court of common pleas which shall then approve the license or renewal application, whereupon

Amend Sec. 5, page 3, line 12, by striking out "license, upon the application," and inserting issue a license to

Amend Sec. 6, page 4, line 30, by striking out "county treasurer" and inserting court of common pleas

Amend Sec. 6, page 5, line 1, by striking out "he finds" and inserting the investigative report of the sheriff and district attorney show

Amend Sec. 6, page 5, line 28, by striking out "county treasurer" and inserting sheriff and district attorney

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendments?

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

Mr. STUBAN. Mr. Speaker, this is not a controversial amendment. I think it is just a simple amendment. It seems that the sponsors of the bill want to keep the professionals out of the business. They want to keep the elements of organized crime out of business, and I would like to read a letter to you that I got from my county treasurer. It says:

As a County Treasurer, I do not object to selling a License to a Bingo Operator, however, I do not feel that it should be the responsibility of the County Treasurer to determine the eligibility of the applicant or to examine his or her records. After all, we are not officers of the Law. I truly do not believe that it should be the responsibility of the County Treasurer to decide if a License should be issued, revoked, or renewed.

And then he goes on to say that he believes the bill should be rewritten and some research done on the licensing process.

I think that maybe we ought to legalize bingo in the State of Pennsylvania, but if we want to keep it down to charities and we want to keep the elements of organized crime out of there, I do not see anything wrong with the district attorney and his sheriff making an investigation, bringing it to the court, and the court giving the approval. These people sure ought to know whether these people have good records or not, and it should not be any problem for these people to know whether this is a charitable organization in its county or not, so I ask for adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. DORR. Mr. Speaker, I have some sympathy for the county treasurers across this state who, if this bill passes, will have some additional responsibilities placed upon their shoulders, and the problem is that if we are going to pass the bill, then somebody is going to have to take some additional responsibilities. Again, after some soul-searching among the committee, especially last year, it was determined that because of present facilities in most county treasurers' offices for the licensing of various activities in this Commonwealth, this was the place where the responsibility should be put. If a county treasurer has any indication that there is any problem with any proposed licensee, he has the capability of going to the district attorney and asking for help. We specifically included a section in the bill which relates to the possibilities of investigation by the district attorney for that reason.

In most cases, Mr. Speaker, the county treasurers in our counties—and I would say this must be particularly true of counties like Columbia County which are small in nature—those county treasurers know the people out there who are running bingo. Our intent in this bill is to keep the people running bingo across this state, specifically the volunteer fire companies, the churches, those small hometown organizations which have been in this business, keep them in the business because we feel that in itself is the best deterrent to involvement by unsavory elements, and therefore, we wanted to keep the bill as simple as possible so that they did not have to be faced with a lot of red tape in the process of licensing.

Also, we do not think it is going to be necessary for the county treasurer to conduct a lengthy investigation of every

applicant who comes in because he is going to know them, so we recommend, Mr. Speaker, that the bill remain the way it is and ask for a negative vote on Mr. Stuban's amendment.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—64

Armstrong	Emerson	Levi	Saurman
Belfanti	Fryer	Lloyd	Showers
Berson	Gallen	Lucyk	Shupnik
Blaum	Grabowski	McCall	Smith, B.
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Michlovic	Stewart
Cochran	Haluska	Noye	Stuban
Cole	Hasay	O'Donnell	Taylor, F. E.
Cordisco	Hayes	Oliver	Van Horne
Coslett	Hutchinson, A.	Peterson	Wambach
Cowell	Hutchinson, W.	Phillips	Wargo
Cunningham	Irvis	Pievsy	Wass
DeVertter	Itkin	Pitts	White
DeWeese	Kennedy	Rappaport	Williams, H.
Deal	Klingaman	Rasco	Wozniak
Dietz	Kolter	Richardson	Wright, D. R.
Dombrowski	Kukovich	Ritter	Zwinkl

NAYS—126

Alden	Earley	Levin	Pucciarelli
Anderson	Evans	Lewis	Punt
Arty	Fee	Livengood	Reber
Barber	Fischer	McClatchy	Rieger
Belardi	Fleck	McIntyre	Rocks
Beloff	Foster, W. W.	McMonagle	Rybak
Bittle	Foster, Jr., A.	McVerry	Serafini
Borski	Frazier	Mackowski	Seventy
Bowser	Gallagher	Madigan	Sieminski
Boyes	Gannon	Maiale	Sirianni
Brandt	Geist	Manderino	Smith, E. H.
Brown	George	Manmiller	Smith, L. E.
Burd	Gladeck	Marmion	Snyder
Burns	Gray	Merry	Stairs
Caltagirone	Greenfield	Micozzie	Steighner
Cawley	Grieco	Miller	Stevens
Cessar	Gruitza	Miscevich	Swaim
Cimini	Gruppo	Moehlmann	Sweet
Civera	Hagarty	Mowery	Swift
Clark	Harper	Mrkonic	Taddonio
Clymer	Heiser	Mullen	Taylor, E. Z.
Colafella	Hoeffel	Murphy	Telek
Cornell	Honaman	Nahill	Trello
DeMedio	Horgos	Olasz	Vroon
Daikeler	Jackson	Pendleton	Wachob
Davies	Johnson	Perzel	Wenger
Dawida	Kanuck	Petrarca	Weston
Dininni	Kowalshyn	Petrone	Wiggins
Donatucci	Lashinger	Piccola	Williams, J. D.
Dorr	Lehr	Pott	Wilson
Duffy	Lescovitz	Pratt	Wogan
Durham	Letterman		

NOT VOTING—6

Gamble	Pistella	Wright, J. L.
Laughlin	Spencer	
		Ryan, Speaker

EXCUSED—7

Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

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. CAWLEY offered the following amendment No. A660:

Amend Sec. 5, page 3, line 18, by inserting after "treasurer" as follows: (1) Seventy-five percent of each fee shall be paid to the public library fund within the county. (2) Twenty-five percent of each fee shall be paid

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lackawanna, Mr. Cawley.

Mr. CAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, after the wine and cheese party last night, I felt that this is one way that we can help the libraries without putting any extra funds on the state. The money presently is scheduled to go to the county, and the county can spend the money any way that it wants to. I believe that \$25 of the \$100 license fee is plenty for the county. The county treasurer already has licenses made up that are blank. All they do is fill in the name of the people applying for the license, and I think \$75 of that \$100 should go to the libraries. I feel that the libraries throughout the state are in need of moneys, and this is one way that we can definitely help them right now—and I would say conservatively—in the neighborhood of \$500,000 statewide by doing this, which is a little bit from each county but it adds up to half a million dollars which I think they need. I ask everyone to please consider this and vote for it.

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

Mr. DORR. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman; he learns quickly. Yesterday his amendment was to give it back to the municipalities, and since the library people were here yesterday, he now wants to give it to the libraries. There is nothing wrong with that except that this is not designed and I would not like us to get it into the system where it is a revenue-raising measure.

There are all kinds of arguments that can be made about the \$100 fee. Maybe it is too much; maybe it is too little. I do not think we will know that until we have some experience, and at that point we can adjust it. It is designed as an administrative fee. Obviously the libraries have no role in the administration of this law, and I would therefore recommend that we stay with placing the fee with those who are designed to administer it, and that is the county government. I reluctantly recommend a negative vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. WASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment. If the county commissioners of any county so desire to have these funds donated or given to a library, they can do so. I would suggest that the bill is right to have it going to the General Fund.

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

Mr. CAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, the total amount will be maybe in the neighborhood of \$7,000 to \$10,000 a county.

Once the money gets to the county, if past history stays the same, which I think it will, we do not know anywhere where that money is going to go. We have no idea. At least we know where \$75 of that \$100 is going to go. The libraries throughout the state are screaming for help. This costs us nothing except a "yes" vote to give them 75 percent of that fee, and again I think that everyone throughout the state, all the Representatives, will be appreciated by a "yes" vote. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—93

Barber	Emerson	Levin	Serafini
Belardi	Evans	Lloyd	Seventy
Belfanti	Gallagher	Lucyk	Showers
Beloff	Gallen	McCall	Shupnik
Berson	Gamble	McIntyre	Steighner
Blaum	George	Manderino	Stevens
Brown	Grabowski	Manmiller	Stewart
Caltagirone	Gray	Miscevich	Stuban
Cappabianca	Greenfield	Mullen	Swaim
Cawley	Gruitza	O'Donnell	Sweet
Clark	Haluska	Olasz	Taylor, F. E.
Cochran	Harper	Oliver	Trello
Colafella	Hasay	Pendleton	Van Horne
Cole	Hoeffel	Petrarca	Wachob
Cordisco	Horgos	Petrone	Wambach
Coslett	Hutchinson, A.	Phillips	Wargo
Cowell	Iris	Pjevsky	White
DeMedio	Kolter	Pistella	Wiggins
DeWeese	Kowalshyn	Rappaport	Williams, H.
Dawida	Kukovich	Richardson	Williams, J. D.
Deal	Laughlin	Rieger	Wozniak
Dombrowski	Lescovitz	Ritter	Wright, D. R.
Donatucci	Letterman	Rybak	Zwikl
Duffy			

NAYS—103

Alden	Fleck	Livengood	Rasco
Anderson	Foster, W. W.	McClatchy	Reber
Armstrong	Foster, Jr., A.	McMonagle	Rocks
Arty	Frazier	McVerry	Saurman
Bittle	Fryer	Mackowski	Sieminski
Borski	Gannon	Madigan	Sirianni
Bowser	Geist	Maiale	Smith, B.
Boyes	Gladeck	Marmion	Smith, E. H.
Brandt	Greenwood	Merry	Smith, L. E.
Burd	Grieco	Michlovic	Snyder
Burns	Gruppo	Micozzie	Spencer
Cessar	Hagarty	Miller	Stairs
Cimini	Hayes	Moehlmann	Swift
Civera	Heiser	Mowery	Taddonio
Clymer	Honaman	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Cornell	Hutchinson, W.	Murphy	Telek
Cunningham	Itkin	Nahill	Vroon
DeVerter	Jackson	Noye	Wass
Daikeler	Johnson	Perzel	Wenger
Davies	Kanuck	Peterson	Weston
Dietz	Kennedy	Piccola	Wilson
Dininni	Klingaman	Pitts	Wogan
Dorr	Lashinger	Pott	Wright, J. L.
Durham	Lehr	Pratt	
Earley	Levi	Pucciarelli	Ryan,
Fee	Lewis	Punt	Speaker
Fischer			

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

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. MURPHY offered the following amendment No. A357:

Amend Sec. 5, page 3, line 25, by striking out "five" and inserting two

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

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, in committee we changed the language on page 2, line 17, from 5 years to 2 years for which a civic or veterans or county fair or agricultural association had to be chartered, but we forgot to do it on line 25, page 3, where we permit associations to have bingo for 10 days at a time at a carnival. This simply changes the language from 5 years to 2 years to keep it consistent in the legislation. Thank you.

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I would agree to that amendment.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—186

Alden	Emerson	Letterman	Ritter
Anderson	Evans	Levi	Rocks
Armstrong	Fischer	Levin	Rybak
Arty	Fleck	Lewis	Saurman
Barber	Foster, W. W.	Livengood	Serafini
Belardi	Foster, Jr., A.	Lloyd	Seventy
Belfanti	Frazier	Lucyk	Showers
Beloff	Fryer	McCall	Shupnik
Berson	Gallagher	McClatchy	Sieminski
Bittle	Gallen	McIntyre	Sirianni
Blaum	Gamble	McMonagle	Smith, B.
Borski	Gannon	McVerry	Smith, E. H.
Bowser	Geist	Mackowski	Smith, L. E.
Boyes	George	Manderino	Snyder
Brandt	Gladeck	Manmiller	Spencer
Brown	Grabowski	Marmion	Stairs
Burd	Gray	Merry	Steighner
Burns	Greenfield	Michlovic	Stevens
Caltagirone	Greenwood	Micozzie	Stewart
Cappabianca	Grieco	Miller	Stuban
Cawley	Gruitza	Miscevich	Swaim
Cessar	Gruppo	Mowery	Sweet
Cimini	Hagarty	Mrkonic	Taddonio
Civera	Haluska	Mullen	Taylor, E. Z.
Clark	Harper	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Cochran	Hasay	Nahill	Telek
Colafella	Hayes	Noye	Trello
Cole	Heiser	Olasz	Van Horne
Cordisco	Hoeffel	Oliver	Vroon
Cornell	Honaman	Pendleton	Wachob

Coslett	Horgos	Perzel	Wambach
Cowell	Hutchinson, A.	Peterson	Wargo
DeMedio	Hutchinson, W.	Petrarca	Wass
DeVerter	Irvis	Petrone	Wenger
DeWeese	Itkin	Phillips	Weston
Daikeler	Jackson	Piccola	White
Davies	Johnson	Pievsky	Wiggins
Dawida	Kanuck	Pistella	Williams, H.
Deal	Kennedy	Pitts	Williams, J. D.
Dietz	Klingaman	Pott	Wilson
Dininni	Kolter	Pucciarelli	Wogan
Dombrowski	Kowalyszyn	Punt	Wozniak
Donatucci	Kukovich	Rappaport	Wright, D. R.
Dorr	Lashinger	Rasco	Zwinkl
Duffy	Laughlin	Reber	
Durham	Lehr	Richardson	Ryan,
Earley	Lescovitz	Rieger	Speaker

## NAYS—9

Clymer	Madigan	Moehlmann	Pratt
Cunningham	Maiale	O'Donnell	Swift
Fee			

## NOT VOTING—1

Wright, J. L.

## EXCUSED—7

Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

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

On the question,

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

Mr. STUBAN offered the following amendment No. A553:

Amend Sec. 5, page 3, line 28, by removing the period after "only." and inserting in which case a volunteer fire company may be hired to manage, set up bingo, and operate or actually run the game.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

## AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

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

Mr. STUBAN. Mr. Speaker, would it be possible to take up amendment A618 and come back to that one? If A618 should go through, we will not need that one.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, who withdraws amendment A553 and submits amendment A618, which the clerk will read.

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. STUBAN offered the following amendment No. A618:

Amend Sec. 5, page 3, line 28, by removing the period after "only" and inserting in which case any charitable organization may be hired to manage, set up bingo, and operate or actually run the game.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. STUBAN. Mr. Speaker, we say we want to give charitable organizations the right to run bingo, and in the bill it says that it gives county fairs and organizations the right to hire—I guess run bingo. There are so many instances that county fairs do not run bingo themselves; they bring in outside operators to run bingo. In one instance, the county fair in my county, which is one of the largest fairs in the State of Pennsylvania, has five or six locations, and what my amendment says is that the county fair shall either hire, lease, or let a charitable organization run these bingos. I feel that if we are going to let a county fair bring in an outside operator who operates along the coast from Florida to Maine and across the United States, who is a bigger operator than any other bingo concession in the country, possibly makes more money in 1 week at a local county fair than the fire company does running bingo all year, then those locations ought to be given to charitable organizations so the money stays in that community and county.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Mr. Dorr, on the Stuban amendment.

Mr. DORR. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection with the gentleman's intent. The problem is that there is nothing in the bill to prevent that now, and the way the amendment is drawn, I do not know if it is his intention to force the county fairs to hire charitable organizations if they are going to run bingo, but that certainly is not what his amendment says. It is a "may" amendment, and, frankly, the bill does not need the amendment in order to allow the county fairs to lease space to the charitable organizations and to allow them to run bingo under those circumstances. I am afraid that what might happen if the amendment goes in is that we would have confusion as to whether or not charitable organizations can lease space to run bingo under normal circumstances; that is, with the money games which, under the bill as it is written, they would be allowed to do for that week if they have the regular license.

The problem is that if we put it in this way, they will be locked into the prize-only type of situation, and we will not be, I think, accomplishing what the gentleman really intends to accomplish. I am afraid also that if the county fairs have some kind of problem with leasing space to charitable organizations, then they are not going to do it under the gentleman's amendment any more than they would under the regular bill anyway. So I think we ought to leave the bill uncluttered, let the charitable organizations lease space if they can at the county fairs, and run bingo in the normal course there. I would recommend a negative vote.

The SPEAKER. On the question of the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Stuban.

Mr. STUBAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that the proponents of this bill continue to say we want to keep this game clean and green, but yet we are going to let outside operators come into fairs and carnivals and have no connection with any charitable organization whatsoever. As far as the bill is concerned now, I do not think that anybody should be able to walk into

a county fair, a professional operator. What the bill says is that the association can run bingo, but there is no reason for them just to rent a location and possibly—we will take my county fair—five locations, five of the best locations on the fairgrounds, for a measly \$100 license to that county. Now, all that association has to do is buy one license, and I personally think it is all wrong and I ask for an affirmative vote on this amendment.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—110

Table listing names of members who voted 'YEAS' (110 total). Includes names like Barber, Belardi, Belfanti, Berson, Blaum, Brown, Caltagirone, Cappabianca, Cawley, Clark, Clymer, Cochran, Colafella, Cole, Cordisco, Coslett, Cowell, Cunningham, DeVerter, DeWeese, Dawida, Deal, Dietz, Dombrowski, Donatucci, Duffy, Emerson, Fischer, Fryer, Gallagher, Gallen, Gamble, Geist, George, Grabowski, Gray, Greenfield, Grieco, Gruppo, Haluska, Harper, Hasay, Hayes, Hoeffel, Hutchinson, A., Hutchinson, W., Irvis, Jackson, Johnson, Klingaman, Kolter, Kowalyszyn, Kukovich, Laughlin, Lescovitz, Letterman, Livengood, Lloyd, Lucyk, McCall, McVerry, Madigan, Manderino, Miller, Miscevich, Murphy, O'Donnell, Olasz, Oliver, Pendleton, Peterson, Petrarca, Petrone, Phillips, Piccola, Pievsky, Pistella, Pitts, Pott, Punt, Rasco, Richardson, Ritter, Rybak, Serafini, Seventy, Showers, Shupnik, Sieminski, Sirianni, Smith, L. E., Stevens, Stewart, Stuban, Swaim, Sweet, Taylor, F. E., Trello, Van Horne, Wachob, Wambach, Wargo, Wenger, White, Wiggins, Williams, H., Wilson, Wozniak, Wright, D. R., and Zwilk.

NAYS—84

Table listing names of members who voted 'NAYS' (84 total). Includes names like Alden, Anderson, Armstrong, Arty, Bittle, Borski, Bowser, Boyes, Brandt, Burd, Burns, Cessar, Cimini, Civera, Cornell, DeMedio, Daikeler, Davies, Dininni, Dorr, Durham, Earley, Evans, Fee, Fleck, Foster, W. W., Foster, Jr., A., Frazier, Gannon, Gladeck, Greenwood, Gruitza, Hagarty, Heiser, Honaman, Horgos, Itkin, Kanuck, Kennedy, Lashingner, Lehr, Levi, Levin, Lewis, McClatchy, McIntyre, McMonagle, Mackowski, Maiale, Manmiller, Marmion, Merry, Micozzie, Moehlmann, Mowery, Mrkonic, Mullen, Nahill, Noye, Perzel, Pratt, Pucciarelli, Rappaport, Reber, Rieger, Rocks, Saurman, Smith, B., Smith, E. H., Snyder, Spencer, Stairs, Steighner, Swift, Taddonio, Taylor, E. Z., Telek, Vroon, Wass, Weston, Williams, J. D., Wogan, Wright, J. L., Ryan, Speaker.

NOT VOTING—2

Table listing names of members who did not vote (2 total). Includes Beloff and Michlovic.

EXCUSED—7

Table listing names of members who were excused (7 total). Includes Cohen Freind, Morris Salvatore, Spitz Tigue, and Wilt.

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. ANDERSON offered the following amendment No. A571:

Amend Sec. 5, page 4, line 22, by removing the period after "week" and inserting , except those associations excluded under subsection (c).

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this amendment just permits those fairs to operate bingo more than twice a week, especially those fairs that are now running 8 or 9 days. It is really a corrective amendment, and I think it should be adopted.

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I agree that because of the nature of the fairs, an adjustment has to be made in this area, and I would urge the adoption of Mr. Anderson's amendment.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

Table listing names of members who voted 'YEAS' (191 total). Includes names like Alden, Anderson, Armstrong, Arty, Barber, Belardi, Belfanti, Beloff, Berson, Bittle, Blaum, Borski, Bowser, Boyes, Brandt, Brown, Burd, Burns, Caltagirone, Cappabianca, Cawley, Cessar, Cimini, Civera, Clark, Clymer, Cochran, Colafella, Cole, Cordisco, Cornell, Evans, Fischer, Foster, W. W., Foster, Jr., A., Frazier, Fryer, Gallagher, Gallen, Gamble, Gannon, Geist, George, Gladeck, Grabowski, Gray, Greenwood, Grieco, Gruitza, Gruppo, Hagarty, Haluska, Harper, Hasay, Hayes, Heiser, Hoeffel, Honaman, Horgos, Hutchinson, A., Hutchinson, W., Livengood, Lloyd, Lucyk, McCall, McClatchy, McIntyre, McMonagle, McVerry, Mackowski, Madigan, Maiale, Manderino, Manmiller, Marmion, Merry, Micozzie, Moehlmann, Mowery, Mrkonic, Mullen, Nahill, Noye, Perzel, Peterson, Rocks, Rybak, Saurman, Serafini, Seventy, Showers, Shupnik, Sieminski, Sirianni, Smith, B., Smith, E. H., Smith, L. E., Snyder, Spencer, Stairs, Steighner, Stevens, Stewart, Stuban, Swaim, Sweet, Swift, Taddonio, Taylor, E. Z., Taylor, F. E., Telek, Trello, Van Horne, Wachob, Wambach, Wargin, Wenger, White, Wiggins, Williams, H., Wilson, Wozniak, Wright, D. R., and Zwilk.

Coslett	Irvs	Petrarca	Wargo
Cowell	Itkin	Petrone	Wass
DeMedio	Johnson	Phillips	Wenger
DeVerter	Kanuck	Piccola	Weston
DeWeese	Kennedy	Pievsky	White
Daikeler	Klingaman	Pistella	Wiggins
Davies	Kolter	Pitts	Williams, H.
Dawida	Kowalyshyn	Pott	Williams, J. D.
Deal	Kukovich	Pratt	Wilson
Dietz	Lashingner	Pucciarelli	Wogan
Dininni	Laughlin	Punt	Wozniak
Dombrowski	Lehr	Rappaport	Wright, D. R.
Donatucci	Lescovitz	Rasco	Wright, J. L.
Dorr	Letterman	Reber	Zwinkl
Duffy	Levi	Richardson	
Durham	Levin	Rieger	Ryan,
Earley	Lewis	Ritter	Speaker
Emerson			

NAYS—2

Cunningham Fee

NOT VOTING—3

Fleck Jackson O'Donnell

EXCUSED—7

Cohen Morris Spitz Wilt  
Freind Salvatore Tigue

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

On the question recurring,

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

Mr. STUBAN offered the following amendment No. A554:

Amend Sec. 5, page 4, line 22, by striking out "twice" and inserting once

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. STUBAN. The bill as written says that a charitable organization may run twice a week. What I am doing here is I am saying that a charitable organization could run once a week. The reason I do this is because there are a lot of fire companies around and a lot of charitable organizations. In some little communities there are as many as five and six bingo games in one night, and some of them are running two and three nights a week, which just does not give everybody an opportunity at it, and with this big money here, the big outfit draws and the little country fire company's bingo just has too much competition. So what it does, it just breaks it down and gives more charitable organizations an opportunity to get in on some of these bucks.

The SPEAKER. On the question of the amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Mr. Burns.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, here again we had to come to a decision. Since many places play bingo four, five, and even seven times a week, we had to come to some sort of compromise, and the compromise we reached with the organizations that we were in communication with was that we settled on two nights a week. That seemed to be a fair number; it seemed to be the number that people could agree upon; and regardless

of whether it is two nights a week or one night a week, there are going to be some big games. They cannot be bigger than what we have in the bill, and we have tried to control it through those figures, but these are the figures that I say again have been agreed upon. I can only say that most of the organizations everywhere in the Commonwealth have accepted these and are willing to go along with them.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—49

Armstrong	Deal	McVerry	Pott
Belardi	Dietz	Madigan	Richardson
Belfanti	Geist	Manderino	Seventy
Berson	Grabowski	Manmiller	Showers
Blaum	Hasay	Murphy	Shupnik
Bowser	Hayes	O'Donnell	Sirianni
Cawley	Hutchinson, A.	Oliver	Stewart
Clymer	Irvs	Peterson	Stuban
Cochran	Klingaman	Phillips	Taddonio
Cole	Levi	Piccola	Taylor, F. E.
Cunningham	Lloyd	Pievsky	Telek
DeWeese	Lucyk	Pitts	Wright, D. R.
Dawida			

NAYS—144

Alden	Fischer	Lewis	Saurman
Anderson	Fleck	Livengood	Serafini
Arty	Foster, W. W.	McCall	Sieminski
Barber	Frazier	McClatchy	Smith, B.
Beloff	Fryer	McIntyre	Smith, E. H.
Bittle	Gallagher	McMonagle	Smith, L. E.
Borski	Gallen	Mackowski	Snyder
Boyes	Gamble	Maiale	Spencer
Brandt	Gannon	Marmion	Stairs
Brown	George	Merry	Steighner
Burd	Gladeck	Michlovic	Stevens
Burns	Gray	Micozzie	Swaim
Caltagirone	Greenfield	Miller	Sweet
Cappabianca	Greenwood	Miscevich	Swift
Cessar	Grieco	Moehlmann	Taylor, E. Z.
Cimini	Gruitza	Mowery	Trello
Civera	Gruppo	Mrkonc	Van Horne
Clark	Hagarty	Mullen	Vroon
Colafella	Haluska	Nahill	Wachob
Cordisco	Harper	Noye	Wambach
Cornell	Heiser	Olasz	Wargo
Coslett	Hoeffel	Pendleton	Wass
Cowell	Honaman	Perzel	Wenger
DeMedio	Horgos	Petrarca	Weston
DeVerter	Hutchinson, W.	Petrone	White
Daikeler	Itkin	Pistella	Wiggins
Davies	Jackson	Pratt	Williams, H.
Dininni	Johnson	Pucciarelli	Williams, J. D.
Dombrowski	Kanuck	Punt	Wilson
Donatucci	Kennedy	Rappaport	Wogan
Dorr	Kolter	Rasco	Wozniak
Duffy	Kowalyshyn	Reber	Wright, J. L.
Durham	Lashingner	Rieger	Zwinkl
Earley	Lehr	Ritter	
Emerson	Lescovitz	Rocks	Ryan,
Evans	Letterman	Rybak	Speaker
Fee	Levin		

NOT VOTING—3

Foster, Jr., A. Kukovich Laughlin  
EXCUSED—7

Cohen Morris Spitz Wilt  
Freind Salvatore Tigue

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 as amended?

Mr. GALLAGHER offered the following amendment No. A535:

Amend Sec. 5, page 4, lines 25 through 28, by striking out all of said lines and inserting (e) Compensation.—No person participating in the operation of or the actual running of a bingo game shall be compensated for that function.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is to help make sure that bingo is run properly for the charitable organizations and fire companies, that there is no big bingo operation that Mr. Stuban was referring to over the last couple of amendments with professionals who garner most of the money from the fire companies and from the charitable associations and the churches.

The amendment would prohibit any compensation for any person actually running a bingo. They shall receive no compensation whatsoever for that function.

If it is really a charitable organization that is running it, the ones in my area do not pay the parishioners, the men and women who run the games in the parishes, and the fire companies do not charge each other or pay each other. That is what we are really interested in. The bill tries to minimize it to say no more than \$50 shall they be paid, but even that is enough to allow the real organized group which is festering in southeastern Pennsylvania. They come over from New Jersey because we do not have a law. And even if we pass this into law, it will be higher than the New Jersey law, so they will still be coming over here to run the alleged charitable bingos and make a lot of money and pay their employees.

I think if it is a real charitable organization, those who want to help the organization, the churches, the fire companies do not want to take any money out of it. So I urge that we adopt this amendment.

The SPEAKER. On the question of the Gallagher amendment, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Columbia, Mr. Stuban.

Mr. STUBAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this amendment, and I agree with Mr. Gallagher. If it is a charitable organization and you have your heart in charity and you believe in that organization you belong to, there is no reason that you have to pay anybody \$50 or so to run a bingo game. I think that is what happens to our organizations and our clubs. They do not give of themselves to their organizations.

If anybody has the problem of wanting to know how to run a bingo game, I have a dear little old mother who has run one for 30-some years. She has run them for the charities and the churches. She has a third-grade education, and I am sure she could educate anybody on how to run this game. I wish that

this committee that met would have asked my mother to participate in some of their discussions, because I think we are talking here about charities and we are talking here about our problems in state government and everything else. Here we are dealing with a piece of legislation today that most likely could pay for a \$1 prescription for senior citizens programs. We did it with the lottery; we could do it with bingo, and the charitable organizations could all profit by it. I ask for a vote on this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it seems

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. STUBAN. Well, it seems to me that I left the microphone here and I asked for a vote on this, and everybody is just up in arms here as to which way to go. My dear mother would say, give us a positive vote for this amendment.

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

Mr. DORR. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the gentleman's concern, there is nothing in this bill that says his mother has to pay her friends \$50 a night to run the bingo games. That is the point, Mr. Speaker. There is no provision in the bill that forces anybody to pay anybody else to operate the bingo game. It is a "may" provision. The provision was placed in the bill because there are some fire companies in particular which contacted us throughout the state and said this: Some of our older members who live particularly around the fire company like to come in and make a few bucks a night being runners or whatever they call them at these bingo games, passing out the cards or whatever services are needed, and this is a way we can help some of the people in the neighborhood who need a little extra cash. The limit was placed on it for that very reason. We did not want to get outside operators in; we did not want to get professionals in, and we felt that the limit was large enough so that this purpose of supplying a little extra cash to the senior citizens and others in the neighborhoods of the fire companies that do this type of thing, that money could be helpful in that respect but would not attract the big operators. I would recommend a negative vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. POTT. Will the gentleman, Mr. Gallagher, consent to brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Gallagher, indicates he will consent to interrogation. The gentleman, Mr. Pott, may proceed.

Mr. POTT. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, he is completely eliminating lines 25 through 28 and inserting a new subsection (e).

Mr. Speaker, what would you define as compensation?

Mr. GALLAGHER. What the amendment does is take the language from the bill which says compensation and we say in subsection (e): "Compensation.—No person participating in the operation of or the actual running of a bingo game shall be compensated for that function." It means that anybody who is running or operating it shall be compensated. Compensation is salary.

Mr. POTT. Mr. Speaker, you do not identify the word "compensation" by using the word "compensation." I do not see the word "compensation" identified in the definition section 3. Do you mean by compensation that a man cannot get two hotdogs for running the tickets back and forth or cannot get a fish sandwich, or what do you mean? The word "compensation" is not defined. I believe the amendment is deficient without a definition of "compensation."

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think you make a very good point. If you were a lawyer, you would be saying that you forgot to put the right definition in, Gallagher; you are not a lawyer and you do not know what you are doing. But we are just following the pattern of the bill.

Now, if you want to make a big argument about it, compensation is known like workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation. That is not hotdogs and fish steaks; that is compensation. If a charitable organization wants to give its workers something to drink - some coffee, tea, or punch - and a hotdog, that is fine. That is not compensation. That is just feeding them enough to keep them running around giving out the cards and collecting the money. But I think you are making a very good point. If you really want to drive home that they should be paid up to \$50, that is what the bill says - they shall receive compensation up to \$50. But they did not put the definition in there. I am just amending it out and saying no compensation. If you are going to work for a charitable organization and if you really believe in that fire company and that church or that organization you belong to, you should be able to do it for free.

Mr. POTT. Will the gentleman answer the question and not talk on the amendment, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Has the gentleman, Mr. Gallagher, concluded his answer to the interrogation?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think so. I am not sure.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. POTT. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman, Mr. Pott, requesting

Mr. POTT. I think the gentleman, Mr. Gallagher, has given us a very good reason to vote against this amendment because the word "compensation" is not defined. Legally compensation can mean a fish sandwich; it can mean a couple hotdogs; it can mean a couple beers at the volunteer fire hall. I think that by putting this type of an amendment into the legislation, we are doing an awful lot to give the attorneys a reason to try to shut down any type of bingo that a charitable organization wants to run. You could not give that senior citizen to whom Mr. Dorr referred even a free hotdog or a free fish sandwich or a free cup of coffee.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment is technically deficient and should be voted down because of its technical deficiencies. Thank you.

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

Mr. CORDISCO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Gallagher amendment

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. CORDISCO. —in that I will give— That is twice in a week, Mr. Speaker.

Basically, I would like to use another point of logic, if I may, in that we are trying to stop the professionals from coming into Pennsylvania and taking away charitable funds. So what is to stop that criminal mind or mind of such from coming in and saying that he has employed 10 to 20 people at \$40 a person, therefore keeping \$20 for himself and paying that individual \$20 who is working that night, looking towards the end of an evening, where a person who is managing or operating a bingo being compensated somewhere in the area of \$300 to \$500, which is not covered by the present law? I would ask Mr. Dorr to look at the bill, because under the provisions of this particular bill, that is not covered.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman requesting Mr. Dorr to consent to interrogation?

Mr. CORDISCO. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Dorr, indicates that he is agreeable to being interrogated. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DORR. Mr. Speaker, on page 4, line 28, the reason for that line is the exact problem that the gentleman raises. Any person who is to be compensated for participating in the operation of bingo must be paid individually so that no one can come in and claim several hundred dollars because he is paying a number of other people.

Mr. CORDISCO. Mr. Speaker?

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

Mr. CORDISCO. In reply to Mr. Dorr's argument, that still does not stop or prevent the case that I have just stated. They may be paid individually, but what is to stop that person from leaving that particular hall and the following day turning over \$20 of the \$40 that he earned to the person who is operating or managing the bingo? If you go with Mr. Gallagher's amendment, it would prohibit anyone from being paid so that you do not run into that difficulty thereafter.

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

Mr. STUBAN. May I interrogate Mr. Dorr?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he agrees to be interrogated. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. STUBAN. Okay. You just said here on line 28 that any person compensated shall be paid individually. There is nothing wrong with paying 10 people \$50 apiece.

Mr. DORR. If the fire company or whoever is operating bingo feels that they can afford that and that is an appropriate fee, that is correct.

Mr. STUBAN. And then the intent of the bill is to keep organized crime out of here. You bring in an organization; they pay 10 people \$50 apiece; they take half of the money back home with them because they got their shills out in the crowd who won money, and, you know, just in a discussion here with Mr. Lucyk, I can tell you of games where people come in there with their specials and their little stamps, and you call a jackpot and they stamp the numbers in and walk out with the money.

You know, I have to say we should support Mr. Gallagher's amendment here, because if you truly want to keep this thing charitable, then whoever is concerned for that organization—and I am sure the membership of any good organization—will work for nothing. And I do not think that anybody would question compensating a few people out there running, with a few glasses of beer or soda or hotdogs and a little meal or something after, and most charitable organizations usually do have parties for people who work at their functions, and that is what makes the organization. So there is no reason to pay anybody any money. I ask for support for Mr. Gallagher's amendment.

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

Mr. DORR. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if that was interrogation or not. The point I would just like to make in response to the gentleman is this: There is nothing in the bill that says that any organization has to pay anybody. I think we are going to have to place some trust in the volunteer fire companies and the charitable organizations, the civic clubs, the churches of this Commonwealth, in order to get this system up and operating on a legal basis, and I believe those are the people who ought to be making the decision as to whether or not it is appropriate fiscally or otherwise to pay individuals to help them operate the game. I do not think we can afford to place a strict limitation on this, because there are places in the Commonwealth where it is a practice that is going on. It is widespread enough that I think we have to have some leeway in the bill, even though we do not force people to pay anybody anything.

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

Mr. RASCO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this amendment. As I read this bill, it says there can be compensation up to \$50 a day. Now, I do not think this is exorbitant up to that point. Any volunteer organization, if someone wants to work and conduct a bingo game free, there is nothing in this bill that says they cannot. But in some of these cases—I know some of the people from the other side of the aisle say they should do it free—setting up these bingo games could possibly take, maybe twice a week, 3 to 4 hours a night. Sometimes people do not like to do this week in and week out free. You might have to compensate them. So I do not see any problem with the way the bill now reads, and I would oppose this amendment. Thank you.

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, just so that the members have the reasoning for putting this in the bill. Most of this request came from the local fire companies. They claim that they have a difficult time getting people just to come in and work for nothing. Their members answer fires; their members do other work in the organization, and to get them to run and volunteer to do bingo in some areas apparently is quite difficult, especially if that person has to get into his automobile and drive 10 or 15 or 20 miles to get to that particular organization, and for this we had to decide, should we make the limit

\$5? Should we make it \$10? And those were the numbers that we thought about in the very beginning, but because of the great disparity, the vastness, maybe, I might say, of this state, there were all different kinds of figures raised. We allowed in the bill the local organizations, if they so desired—and it is strictly on their initiative—to pay people, and we had to come to a figure, and in this day and age people said, well, \$50 is not too high. We arrived at that figure; the organizations have agreed to it, especially the volunteer fire companies that are affected more than anyone else with this type of language in the bill.

So I would oppose these amendments based on the experience that we have had with the volunteer fire companies throughout the state, and they are the ones who really say they need this more than any other group. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

## YEAS—45

Berson	Emerson	Letterman	Pievsky
Caltagirone	Gallagher	Levi	Pistella
Cawley	Gamble	Lucyk	Pitts
Cochran	Geist	Madigan	Pucciarelli
Cordisco	Greenfield	Mullen	Rappaport
Cunningham	Harper	O'Donnell	Seventy
DeWeese	Hoeffel	Oliver	Showers
Dawida	Horgos	Peterson	Shupnik
Deal	Hutchinson, A.	Petrone	Stuban
Dietz	Irvis	Phillips	Swaim
Donatucci	Kukovich	Piccola	Wiggins
Duffy			

## NAYS—150

Alden	Fee	Livengood	Sieminski
Anderson	Fischer	Lloyd	Sirianni
Armstrong	Fleck	McCall	Smith, B.
Arty	Foster, W. W.	McClatchy	Smith, E. H.
Barber	Foster, Jr., A.	McIntyre	Smith, L. E.
Belardi	Frazier	McMonagle	Snyder
Belfanti	Fryer	McVerry	Spencer
Beloff	Gallen	Mackowski	Stairs
Bittle	Gannon	Maiale	Steighner
Blaum	George	Manderino	Stevens
Borski	Gladeck	Manmiller	Stewart
Bowser	Grabowski	Marmion	Sweet
Boyes	Gray	Merry	Swift
Brandt	Greenwood	Michlovic	Taddonio
Brown	Grieco	Micozzie	Taylor, E. Z.
Burd	Gruitza	Miller	Taylor, F. E.
Burns	Gruppo	Miscevich	Telek
Cappabianca	Hagarty	Moehlmann	Trello
Cessar	Haluska	Mowery	Van Horne
Cimini	Hasay	Mrkonic	Vroon
Civera	Hayes	Murphy	Wachob
Clark	Heiser	Nahill	Wambach
Clymer	Honaman	Noye	Wargo
Colafella	Hutchinson, W.	Olasz	Wass
Cole	Itkin	Pendleton	Wenger
Cornell	Jackson	Perzel	Weston
Coslett	Johnson	Petrarca	White
Cowell	Kanuck	Pott	Williams, H.
DeMedio	Kennedy	Pratt	Williams, J. D.
DeVertter	Klingaman	Punt	Wilson
Daikeler	Kolter	Rasco	Wogan
Davies	Kowalshyn	Reber	Wozniak
Dininni	Lashinger	Rieger	Wright, D. R.
Dombrowski	Laughlin	Ritter	Wright, J. L.
Dorr	Lehr	Rocks	Zwikl

Durham	Lescovitz	Rybak	
Earley	Levin	Saurman	Ryan,
Evans	Lewis	Serafini	Speaker

NOT VOTING—1

Richardson

EXCUSED—7

Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

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 as amended?

Bill as amended was agreed to.

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. O'Donnell, on the question of final passage.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Mr. Speaker, may I interrogate Mr. Burns or Mr. Dorr?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Burns, indicates he will consent to be interrogated. The gentleman, Mr. O'Donnell, may proceed.

Mr. BURNS. If you get into the lawyer's technicality, Mr. Speaker, I will refer you to Mr. Dorr, my legal counsel.

Mr. O'DONNELL. I am not sure that this is a technicality or not. I am not going to take a lot of the time of the House because I think their mood is clear, given the disposition of the amendments, but there are a couple of things in here that interest me. I am going to limit myself to maybe one or two questions.

At the end of the bill, there is a provision for the district attorney, an authorization for him to require the licensee to produce books, accounts, records, et cetera. I am interested in how that could occur. My experience with folks who are about to be accused of crime or who are the targets of an investigation is that their inclination is to not so readily turn over their records to the district attorney, and, in fact, fairly common practice for them is to plead the fifth amendment.

Now, I am very interested in exactly how that section is going to work. The district attorney gets some information that somebody is violating the law, illegal gambling here, and he sends a letter, I assume, to the licensee saying, send your books. The licensee's attorney sends back a letter and says, not on your life, and refers him to the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution. Maybe you can tell me, how does that work from there?

Mr. BURNS. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the district attorney would apply for an order from the court to subpoena, or whatever the court would do, ordering the organization to give them their books. Now, if they opposed it, I suspect there would be a hearing, and I suspect that if there was a hearing, that would certainly be the basis to close down this game.

One of the reasons that we put this in there is so that if the organization was a legitimate charity, they would hopefully have no reason not to show their books to whatever designated authority that would ask them, and if they did, it would be my hope, as a sponsor of the bill, that that authority would then close them down, because it would seem to me that they have not met the intent of the bill.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Well, that is good. Maybe you can elaborate a little further. First of all, your understanding is that if the books were not produced, the district attorney could go to court and get an order of the court producing the books. It may interest you to know that that flies in the face of I guess everybody argues the Constitution, but certainly it runs counter to the experience in Philadelphia where we have a bingo operation in the Drake Hotel, and that bingo operation collects huge amounts of money every night. When the Drake Hotel went bankrupt, because the hotel was merely a pass-through to the central states pension fund of the Teamsters, the trustee in bankruptcy, a gentleman in whom you may have some confidence, David Marston, Republican candidate for district attorney, required, as his position suggests as being in charge via the bankruptcy, that they turn over the books, and he went to court and said, turn over the books. Well, Stanton and Robert Miller and the fellow who operated the bingo game and everybody else went to court and said, we claim the fifth amendment; those books could well incriminate us; we do not have to turn those books over. And, quite naturally, the court said, you are right; you do not have to turn the books over. Under your suggestion here that the district attorney simply require that the books be turned over, you are right that a good charitable organization is going to turn the books over, but as to those folks who are violating the law, I suggest to you that your answer may not fulfill the needs of the situation, because I think they are not going to turn it over.

I want to ask you another question about the second part of your answer in which if somebody did not turn over the books, your hope is that they would be shut down. Could you tell me where in the bill the power to shut down for failure to produce the books is?

Mr. BURNS. I think one of the things in the bill is it gives the county treasurer the power to license for the conduct of bingo. Now, it would seem to me that if in the county treasurer's opinion he or she felt that there was some deception, maybe because they did not turn over the books or they did turn over the books, that would certainly give the county treasurer the right to say at that point, I do not agree that this group should be licensed. Then I would contend that it would be, I guess, the right of the organization then to go to court and show why it should be licensed, but the intent of the bill is to give the county treasurer the power to say you should not be licensed or not to issue the license when it becomes due again.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Well, it may be the intent of the bill, but my question still recurs, it is only a six-page bill, and a county treasurer is now going to pick it up and say, what are my duties under this bill? What did Ed Burns and the legisla-

ture mean? I think that we have said fairly clearly here, the county treasurer shall—shall; no discretion; not may but shall—issue a license when the following things exist, and anybody who meets those standards is entitled as a matter of law, our law, to receive that license whether or not the county treasurer is, as you put it, suspicious. Now, maybe it has been written in here, but I am hard pressed to find any authority on the part of the county treasurer to revoke the license on suspicion or on failure to produce the books.

Mr. BURNS. I have just been advised that he cannot revoke it, but he can refuse to issue it the next time, and I would suggest

Mr. O'DONNELL. He can refuse to issue next time?

Mr. BURNS. He could refuse to issue the next time based on the fact that in his opinion—and I suspect that a refusal to produce books would give him the authority to have an opinion—they are not a charitable organization.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Oh, now wait a minute; wait a minute. You are saying that somebody who does not produce books is therefore not a charitable organization?

Mr. BURNS. No, no. All it says, on page 5, the bottom of the page, is: "(b) Production of records.—The county treasurer may require the licensees to produce their books, accounts and records relating to the conduct of bingo in order to determine whether a license should be revoked or renewal thereof denied." So I contend that if the district attorney or anyone in the county would question an operation, it would be the duty of the county treasurer, under this section, to require not only the books but their accounts and their records and to make a determination based on what he finds in those books or accounts or records whether or not this group is in fact a charitable organization. If in his determination they are not, he has the power under the bill to revoke or he has the power to not renew.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. O'Donnell.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Mr. Speaker, on the bill. I think there is a series of maybe 10 to 20 issues that could be pursued in the context of this bill. They can be pursued at length or they can be pursued briefly. It can be done by interrogation or it can be done by statement. I do not think either one is going to be particularly profitable in terms of the outcome this afternoon. Therefore, I just want to make a few points, leave them with you for purposes of the record and for purposes of—I hope not, but for purposes of—coming back at a later time when my fears have been shown to be groundless or not.

I think that what is going on in the bill has been accurately described by the previous speakers. I think this bill is, as one speaker pointed out, the product of extended negotiations. I think those negotiations were conducted with the people who sought to be included under the bill and to have their bingo game legalized. I think the negotiations were conducted in good faith, and I do not think they ever really seriously considered people who should not be licensed.

I think frequently the legislative process tends to become an accommodation of various interests. In debate earlier this afternoon one of the speakers said, the ACLU approved and

the district attorneys approved. Does that not resolve it for the Pennsylvania legislature? Have we not heard from the extremes and have we not gone through the exercise of accommodating every conceivable special interest in Pennsylvania? And if we have accommodated every special interest in Pennsylvania, do we not therefore have a perfect bill? I think the answer to that is no, because I think there is another question, and that is, are there not people who should be excluded, excluded, from the operation of this bill? And I think the answer to that is yes. What difference does it make? It is going to make a big difference, in my opinion, in a significant number of counties here in Pennsylvania. It is going to make a difference to some of the very people who have come to you and said, we want this bill.

The Immaculate Conception Church in Germantown needs this bill. They need it up until the time when all the clubs in Germantown start running a bingo on their second floor and Immaculate Conception cannot get anybody into their hall. At that point they do not make \$1,000 a night; they do not make a dime, because those clubs down the street are going to be able to operate a lot more efficiently and a lot more effectively.

Now, what we have done in this bill to deal with that problem is to make several gestures. There is a recitation in the opening part of the bill about organized crime, and in the very last paragraph of the bill there is a reference to the district attorney shall require. There is no chance in the world that we can write language that is going to enable a district attorney to waive the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution. He is not going to require; he is not even going to get a letter in reply.

The definitional section, I think, is critical. If you take a look at the definitional section, you will understand, in my opinion, the entire bill here. The definitional section lets everybody in. For those of you who are concerned about St. Michael the Archangel, the local VFW, the firehouse, Mom and Pop bingo, they are in. They are in. You have nothing to worry about. There is nobody that you are concerned about getting into this bill who is not included. Everybody will play bingo, including the folks at the Drake Hotel, including the Mafia, and the device that I suggest by which this is going to happen is as follows: If you take the definition of civic and charitable association under this bill and you lay it side by side with the Liquor Code, you will realize that everybody who has a club license in Pennsylvania— Now step back a minute mentally from St. Michael the Archangel, if you will; step back mentally and look at the people who are running clubs in your district. I am talking about after-hours clubs. Those are the new licensees under this bill, and if you think St. Michael the Archangel can compete with those guys, I think you are crazy.

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

Mr. DORR. Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of reasons why it is necessary to license bingo in Pennsylvania. The first is that the law against bingo, as we all know, is selectively enforced in Pennsylvania. In fact, in most cases it is not

enforced in Pennsylvania, and, in my opinion, at that point we ought to really examine whether we should have that law against bingo because the people are not obeying it.

Secondly, and perhaps more important and at least more currently important, is the situation which most of our charitable organizations face with regard to the Internal Revenue Service, which has said that unless we legalize bingo in Pennsylvania, they will have the right to come in and tax the proceeds from bingo as an unrelated business operation of those nonprofit groups. It is therefore, in my judgment, critical that we legalize bingo in Pennsylvania.

Now, there are a number of ways to go about that. In my judgment, it was best to keep the legislation as simple, as free of red tape, as possible, because that was the best way to keep in the operation of bingo those small games and charitable organizations which traditionally have relied upon it as a source of revenue, and they are the ones that can best keep out the big operations or the unsavory operations as enumerated by Mr. O'Donnell. I think they are our best policemen. It may well be that a monstrous bureaucracy here in Harrisburg or in the city of Philadelphia or in some other place in this Commonwealth could do a marvelous job of keeping the Mafia out of bingo in Pennsylvania. My judgment is that monstrous bureaucracies have not been terribly successful at keeping the Mafia out of very much, and they probably would not be any more successful at this than they would at other things, and therefore, I am interested in keeping those small operators, those small organizations in the game so that they can police the system, because I think they are best capable of doing it.

I would recommend that we vote for this legislation. Let us get it on the books and keep our nonprofit organizations, which do such a marvelous job of funding so many things that are important to the citizens of Pennsylvania, in this with this ability to raise money in this fashion and hope that as time goes along, if necessary, the state legislature can react to necessary improvements.

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

Mr. GALEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. There are many senior citizens organizations and indeed apartment houses and senior citizens homes that conduct their own little bingo game on Wednesday afternoon. Each person pays 50 cents, and they might win a couple of cans of beans or something like that. I think they would be out in left field if they had to pay \$100 per license.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, it says on page 1: "It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Legislature that all phases of licensing, operation and regulation of the game of bingo be strictly controlled...." I think the most important thing that this bill does not address is that control which speaks to what percentage of the total take must be given away in prizes. There is just nothing in here, and I think it leaves just too much latitude for groups to really take the people who are participating in the games. I oppose the bill.

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

Mr. WASS. Mr. Speaker, may I interrogate Mr. Dorr, please?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he is willing to be interrogated. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. WASS. Mr. Speaker, just for clarification for the record, where it speaks to licensing in one location, if a church or a fire company had their permanent building and then a camping ground or a picnic area, would the license be valid in the picnic area or would this mandate two licenses?

Mr. DORR. Mr. Speaker, if the organization was going to play at two different places at the same time, I think they would have to have two different licenses.

Mr. WASS. Excuse me, sir. At the same time?

Mr. DORR. Yes. It seems to me that we could probably transfer the license from one location to another during the licensing period. I do not think that is spoken to in the legislation, but I do not think there would be any problem with that. However, if the organization wanted to play bingo in the picnic grounds on Tuesday night and at the club headquarters on Friday night, I think they would have to have two licenses.

Mr. WASS. But again, the intent of my questioning relates to the fact that they would use the same license not at the same time. They could move the license from their permanent location to the other location?

Mr. DORR. In my judgment, they would be permitted to do that as long as it was not a continuous movement back and forth.

Mr. WASS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Susquehanna Township, Miss Sirianni.

Miss SIRIANNI. Susquehanna County, not Township. That is right up the river, the township.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill. I think it is a sham. It is not a bingo bill; it is a gambling bill, and all you are doing in it is setting the regulations for gambling. My church, St. Patrick's Catholic Church, opposes this bill.

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

Mr. DUFFY. I would like to ask Mr. Dorr a question if I may.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order; he may proceed.

Mr. DUFFY. During the last session of the House, the big push for this bill was because of an Internal Revenue Service ruling about the profits of these different organizations, that they would be taxed. Now, on the floor, there was just a mention here a few minutes ago about this provision. Now, what has the Internal Revenue Service done in the last 6 or 8 months with the bingo games that have been operating in the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. DORR. I do not know, Mr. Speaker. I do not know whether there has been any attempt to enforce that regulation as yet or not. I suspect it was not done, at least before November 4 or whatever that date was last year, for obvious political reasons, but let me just say that if I were operating bingo in Pennsylvania, I would be very concerned about the Internal Revenue Service at this point.

Mr. DUFFY. Well, they have not done anything as yet, and that is probably in the last 8 months, and the big furor here to get this bill passed in the last session was because of the Internal Revenue Service ruling. So I think everybody should look very, very closely at this bill. All I hear is about the charitable aspects of this bill. Now, is this the reason behind it or is there something else? I do not know. Just look at it closely. Thank you.

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

Mr. ROCKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill. I do not pretend, Mr. Speaker, to have the constitutional expertise of my colleague, Mr. O'Donnell, from Philadelphia; nor do I pretend to have his understanding of the underworld in the city of Philadelphia as it might involve itself in the game of bingo. I also, at the very other end of it, understand the concern of the gentleman, Mr. Gallen, when he speaks of the tiny senior citizens' game that might be held at the local hall on a Wednesday afternoon.

The fact before us with this bill, Mr. Speaker, is that our nonprofit organizations, be they a volunteer fire company or a VFW post or a parochial school or some small ethnic parish, are going to be deprived of what has become for them a very important source of revenue in their charitable operations if we do not have this legislation.

I would ask the members, Mr. Speaker, to please be aware that the bill may not be perfect, and if the problems described by Mr. O'Donnell or Mr. Gallen do in fact surface, it is then incumbent upon this legislature to come back and address those problems. But at this point in time in Pennsylvania, if we do not have HB 261, then we are greatly putting in jeopardy those nonprofit organizations that have come to very much rely on bingo as an important source of revenue to their very existence. I ask for the members' support of this bill, and I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the lady from Susquehanna County, Miss Sirianni.

Miss SIRIANNI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to interrogate Mr. Rocks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman consents to interrogation. The lady is in order and may proceed.

Mr. ROCKS. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. In consenting to interrogation, I wanted to tell the lady I do not live too far from Susquehanna Avenue.

Miss SIRIANNI. That is all right, as long as it is not in Susquehanna County, with that bill.

Mr. Speaker, you said that there were some problems with the bill as addressed by Mr. Gallen and Mr. O'Donnell, and this legislature should come back and address those later. Why would you not straighten out the bill first? Why would you put a bad bill out first? Why do you not straighten it out?

Mr. ROCKS. Is that a question?

Miss SIRIANNI. Yes.

Mr. ROCKS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the lady, my friend from Susquehanna, I said that if there are problems, if there are. I do not know that, and how many times do we ever come on this floor pretending that what we are proposing for

the law of this Commonwealth is a perfect bill? I say if there are problems, we will come back and address that, but today we need this bill to protect our nonprofit organizations that have bingo.

Miss SIRIANNI. You recognize the fact, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Gallen had good points, so you apparently recognize the fact that the bill has problems.

Mr. ROCKS. No. I say they raise legitimate points that if they would become a problem, then we should come back and look at it. But this bill, with all of the work that has gone into it—and there has been some, frankly, compromise in this bill; I think all of us are aware of that

Miss SIRIANNI. This bill is ruining the volunteer fire companies in all the rural areas of Pennsylvania, and it is also ruining all the small churches in the rural areas of Pennsylvania or any other charitable organization. This bill is for big gambling, period.

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

Mr. ROCKS. Mr. Speaker, I am answering the interrogation, if I may. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have a gambling bill in front of us, and you know, we can try to do that in here this afternoon. This bill, with a lot of effort by its sponsors, has attempted to address a problem that we have in helping, yes, the volunteer fire companies all across Pennsylvania; the small, rural church; yes, the Catholic parishes that are in the 199th district that I represent; and a number of Catholic schools that have come to rely on that revenue alone to help them exist. I would therefore ask that you support this bill.

On the question recurring,

Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER. Agreeable to the provisions of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

YEAS—168

Alden	Evans	Lucyk	Saurman
Anderson	Fee	McCall	Serafini
Armstrong	Fleck	McClatchy	Seventy
Arty	Foster, Jr., A.	McIntyre	Shupnik
Barber	Frazier	McMonagle	Sieminski
Belardi	Fryer	McVerry	Smith, B.
Belfanti	Gallagher	Mackowski	Smith, E. H.
Beloff	Gamble	Maiale	Snyder
Berson	Gannon	Manderino	Spencer
Bittle	George	Manmiller	Stairs
Blaum	Gladeck	Marmion	Steighner
Borski	Grabowski	Merry	Stevens
Bowser	Gray	Michlovic	Stewart
Boyes	Greenfield	Micozzie	Stuban
Brandt	Greenwood	Miller	Swaim
Brown	Grieco	Miscevich	Sweet
Burd	Gruitza	Moehlmann	Swift
Burns	Gruppo	Mowery	Taddonio
Caltagirone	Hagarty	Mrkonic	Taylor, E. Z.
Cappabianca	Haluska	Mullen	Taylor, F. E.
Cawley	Harper	Murphy	Telek
Cessar	Hasay	Nahill	Trello
Cimini	Heiser	Olasz	Van Horne
Civera	Honaman	Oliver	Wachob
Clark	Horgos	Pendleton	Wambach
Cochran	Hutchinson, A.	Perzel	Wargo
Colafella	Irvic	Petrarca	Wass
Cole	Irkin	Petrone	Wenger
Cordisco	Jackson	Phillips	Weston
Cornell	Kanuck	Pievsky	White

Coslett	Kennedy	Pistella	Wiggins
Cowell	Klingaman	Pott	Williams, H.
DeMedio	Kolter	Pratt	Williams, J. D.
Daikeler	Kowalyszyn	Pucciarelli	Wilson
Davies	Kukovich	Punt	Wogan
Dawida	Lashinger	Rappaport	Wozniak
Dininni	Laughlin	Rasco	Wright, D. R.
Dombrowski	Lehr	Reber	Wright, J. L.
Donatucci	Lescovitz	Rieger	Zwinkl
Dorr	Letterman	Ritter	
Durham	Levin	Rocks	Ryan,
Earley	Lewis	Rybak	Speaker
Emerson	Livengood		

NAYS—26

Clymer	Fischer	Levi	Piccola
Cunningham	Foster, W. W.	Lloyd	Pitts
DeVerter	Gallen	Madigan	Showers
DeWeese	Geist	Noye	Sirianni
Deal	Hayes	O'Donnell	Smith, L. E.
Dietz	Hoeffel	Peterson	Vroon
Duffy	Johnson		

NOT VOTING—2

Hutchinson, W. Richardson

EXCUSED—7

Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

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

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

\* \* \*

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 158, PN 159**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 22, 1931 (P. L. 594, No. 203), referred to as the Township State Highway Law, deleting a route in Franklin Township, Westmoreland County.

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

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

YEAS—195

Alden	Evans	Levin	Rieger
Anderson	Fee	Lewis	Ritter
Armstrong	Fischer	Livengood	Rocks
Arty	Fleck	Lloyd	Rybak
Barber	Foster, W. W.	Lucyk	Saurman
Belardi	Foster, Jr., A.	McCall	Serafini
Belfanti	Frazier	McClatchy	Seventy
Beloff	Fryer	McIntyre	Showers
Berson	Gallagher	McMonagle	Shupnik
Bittle	Gallen	McVerry	Sieminski
Blaum	Gamble	Mackowski	Smith, B.
Borski	Gannon	Madigan	Smith, E. H.
Bowser	Geist	Maiale	Smith, L. E.
Boyes	George	Manderino	Snyder
Brandt	Gladeck	Manmiller	Spencer
Brown	Grabowski	Marmion	Stairs
Burd	Gray	Merry	Steighner
Burns	Greenfield	Michlovic	Stevens

Caltagirone	Greenwood	Micozzie	Stewart
Cappabianca	Grieco	Miller	Stuban
Cawley	Gruitza	Miscevich	Swaim
Cessar	Gruppo	Moehlmann	Sweet
Cimini	Hagarty	Mowery	Swift
Civera	Haluska	Mrkonic	Taddonio
Clark	Harper	Mullen	Taylor, E. Z.
Clymer	Hasay	Murphy	Taylor, F. E.
Cochran	Hayes	Nahill	Telek
Colafella	Heiser	Noye	Trello
Cole	Hoeffel	O'Donnell	Van Horne
Cordisco	Honaman	Olasz	Vroon
Cornell	Horgos	Oliver	Wachob
Coslett	Hutchinson, A.	Pendleton	Wambach
Cowell	Hutchinson, W.	Perzel	Wargo
Cunningham	Irvis	Peterson	Wass
DeMedio	Itkin	Petrarca	Wenger
DeVerter	Jackson	Petrone	Weston
DeWeese	Johnson	Phillips	White
Daikeler	Kanuck	Piccola	Wiggins
Davies	Kennedy	Pievsky	Williams, H.
Dawida	Klingaman	Pistella	Williams, J. D.
Deal	Kolter	Pitts	Wilson
Dietz	Kowalyszyn	Pott	Wogan
Dininni	Kukovich	Pratt	Wozniak
Dombrowski	Lashinger	Pucciarelli	Wright, D. R.
Donatucci	Laughlin	Punt	Wright, J. L.
Dorr	Lehr	Rappaport	Zwinkl
Duffy	Lescovitz	Rasco	
Durham	Letterman	Reber	Ryan,
Earley	Levi	Richardson	Speaker
Emerson			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—1

Sirianni

EXCUSED—7

Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

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

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTED

Mr. E. H. SMITH called up **HR 39, PN 1150**, entitled:

House memorialize President and Congress establish a Tomb of Unknown for Vietnam War.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—195

Alden	Evans	Lewis	Ritter
Anderson	Fee	Livengood	Rocks
Armstrong	Fischer	Lloyd	Rybak
Arty	Fleck	Lucyk	Saurman
Barber	Foster, W. W.	McCall	Serafini
Belardi	Foster, Jr., A.	McClatchy	Seventy
Belfanti	Frazier	McIntyre	Showers
Beloff	Fryer	McMonagle	Shupnik
Berson	Gallagher	McVerry	Sieminski
Bittle	Gallen	Mackowski	Sirianni
Blaum	Gamble	Madigan	Smith, B.
Borski	Gannon	Maiale	Smith, E. H.
Bowser	Geist	Manderino	Smith, L. E.
Boyes	George	Manmiller	Snyder

Brandt	Gladeck	Marmion	Spencer
Brown	Grabowski	Merry	Stairs
Burd	Gray	Michlovic	Steighner
Burns	Greenfield	Micozzie	Stevens
Caltagirone	Greenwood	Miller	Stewart
Cappabianca	Grieco	Miscevich	Stuban
Cawley	Gruitza	Moehlmann	Swaim
Cessar	Gruppo	Mowery	Sweet
Cimini	Hagarty	Mrkonic	Swift
Civera	Haluska	Mullen	Taddonio
Clark	Harper	Murphy	Taylor, E. Z.
Clymer	Hasay	Nahill	Taylor, F. E.
Cochran	Hayes	Noye	Teiek
Colafella	Heiser	O'Donnell	Trello
Cole	Hoeffel	Olasz	Van Horne
Cordisco	Honaman	Oliver	Vroon
Cornell	Horgos	Pendleton	Wachob
Coslett	Hutchinson, W.	Perzel	Wambach
Cowell	Irvic	Peterson	Wargo
Cunningham	Itkin	Petrarca	Wass
DeMedio	Jackson	Petrone	Wenger
DeVerter	Johnson	Phillips	Weston
DeWeese	Kanuck	Piccola	White
Daikeler	Kennedy	Pievsky	Wiggins
Davies	Klingaman	Pistella	Williams, H.
Dawida	Kolter	Pitts	Williams, J. D.
Deal	Kowalyshyn	Pott	Wilson
Dietz	Kukovich	Pratt	Wogan
Dininni	Lashinger	Pucciarelli	Wozniak
Dombrowski	Laughlin	Punt	Wright, D. R.
Donatucci	Lehr	Rappaport	Wright, J. L.
Dorr	Lescovitz	Rasco	Zwikl
Duffy	Letterman	Reber	
Durham	Levi	Richardson	Ryan,
Earley	Levin	Rieger	Speaker
Emerson			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—1

Hutchinson, A.

EXCUSED—7

Cohen	Morris	Spitz	Wilt
Freind	Salvatore	Tigue	

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

**SENATE MESSAGE**

HOUSE BILL  
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate informed that the Senate has concurred in **HB 417, PN 942**.

**BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER**

The Chair gave notice that he was about to sign the following bill, which was then signed:

**HB 417, PN 942**

An Act amending the "Real Estate Tax Sale Law," approved July 7, 1947 (P. L. 1368, No. 542), further providing for the returns by collectors in certain cases.

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

**HB 47, PN 1176 (Amended)**

By Rep. WILSON

An Act amending the "Tax Reform Code of 1971," approved March 4, 1971 (P. L. 6, No. 2), relating to sale or use tax exemption for volunteer fire companies.

FINANCE.

**HB 82, PN 83**

By Rep. WILSON

An Act amending the "Pennsylvania Cigarette Tax Act," approved July 22, 1970 (P. L. 513, No. 178), removing an exemption from taxation.

FINANCE.

**HB 149, PN 150 (Unanimous)**

By Rep. WILSON

An Act amending Title 54 (Names) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for certain filing fees.

FINANCE.

**HB 217, PN 218**

By Rep. WILSON

An Act amending the "Tax Reform Code of 1971," approved March 4, 1971 (P. L. 6, No. 2), further providing for the acquisition date for income tax purposes of property sold by a decedent's estate.

FINANCE.

**HB 532, PN 559 (Unanimous)**

By Rep. WILSON

An Act amending the "Tax Reform Code of 1971," approved March 4, 1971 (P. L. 6, No. 2), further providing for filing of documents and payment of taxes with respect to taxes imposed for education, personal income taxes and corporate net income taxes.

FINANCE.

**RESOLUTION REPORTED  
FROM COMMITTEE**

**HR 24, PN 1177 (Amended) (Concurrent)**

By Rep. HAYES

General Assembly urges and directs Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing revise and resubmit sentencing guidelines.

RULES.

**ESSAYS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD**

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit these remarks for the record. There was an essay contest in Philadelphia sponsored by the Simon Gratz High School, and during the time they were here during Black History Month, the theme of the essay contest was "America - A New Beginning." There were three contest winners, and I would like to submit them for the record so they will be shown on the record here in the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and asks that the materials be sent to the desk.

The following essays were submitted for the Legislative Journal:

"America - A New Beginning"  
Jill K. Adams

January 20, 1981 will supposedly mark a change in the "American Way". It will be on this date that the inauguration [sic] ceremony for our 40th president, Ronald Reagan, will be held.

For me and others like me, "A New Beginning" should mean that the obstacles which have been steadily clocking our paths to humane, academic and economic achievement for over two hundred years will finally be moved. This time should be like a renaissance, a new birth which is long overdue.

"A New Beginning" should mean giving everyone a fair chance to succeed in this society which is called a democracy. Instead of "inflation roaring there should be jobs soaring". Where we now have an abundance of persons dependent upon a variety of public assistance programs, we should have a new incentive for selfhelp, so that public monies could be utilized on other areas, such as providing better educational systems where there will be quality education, not only in the schools that already have it, but also in those schools that have been denied the right to it.

The Reagan administration should instill in the people of the United States a unique and positive frame of mind. We should be a people who not only torment ourselves with the problems of foreign relatives and defense but also alleviate the domestic affairs as well as those perplexing [sic] wars of our homeland. Although we have to protect ourselves from foreign invasions, we must also suppress the attacks which plague us right at home.

It has been implied that on Mr. Reagan's "New Beginning" agenda there are plans for war. It is know [sic] that the United States, historically has only been capable of surviving economic [sic] hardships such as the ones presently among us during and following war time. We should be anticipating an economic policy that excludes war. For it will not be the sons and daughters of Mr. Reagan and his administration that will fight the war, but the backbone of this country, the poor people, who will suffer and die. "Our New Beginning" should also include an economic policy which clearly states the uses of taxpayers money. We should also have an economic policy whereby the taxpayer can receive the maximum number of dollars from his salary for food, shelter, clothing and other personal uses instead of the maximum number of dollars for city, state and federal taxes.

The "New Beginning" should also include equal rights for women and minorities with all fifty states ratifying the ERA bill. If women and minorities are to withstand the economic and social pressure of this society, they deserve the right to the same benefits as others.

The "New Beginning" must be constant. Ronald Reagan and his administration must provide a system which will be everlasting. If these changes are to become valid in the years to come they must be sustained now!

America - A New Beginning  
Isaiah Devine

The new beginning that Reagan administration has proposed will affect the United States in many ways. Although I do not agree with some of Reagan's ideas, I do feel this country is indeed ready for a new beginning.

A new beginning should not be built upon numerous campaign promises, but upon the intention of making the United States a better and more prosperous country. Reagan in many of his campaign speeches has made promises, some of which will help the country and others in my opinion, will not.

Some of Reagan's promises include bringing forth a substantial tax cut to reduce the current deficit, produce jobs, and provide a strong defense and foreign policy. I feel that these promises (if carried out) would help this nation to establish a new beginning.

The Reagan administration has also proposed to cut many programs which are important to minorities and lower income people. Some of these programs include welfare, social security, (DPA) and other important programs which poor people depend upon. Reagan also plans to lower the minimum wage. This action would produce jobs for younger people, but force older people out of their jobs.

The paramount way to establish a new beginning, would be to bring the country together in unity. This great country has suffered many years from racial violence and prejudice. If the Reagan administration could succeed in doing so I feel his slogan "America-A New Beginning," would not be in vain. Although this is only my opinion of a new beginning, I sincerely hope that Ronald Reagan and his cabinet members will make this its primary goal in establishing a new beginning.

America - A New Beginning  
Kevin Peterson

On November 4, 1980 President Carter approached the podium, his face contorted with four years of presidency, and graciously conceded the election bout. Reagan, flamboyant, debonair or Hollywood stereo-types [sic] was the new President of the United States. He was faced with the external, and internal aversaries [sic] which haunted the presidency.

Abortion, busing, prayer in the schools: all major inquiries of years past, now have to take a back seat to other such problems as the SALT II Treaty, hostages, interest rates, and rising unemployment—which throw America into a black hole of turmoil. With the complicated agenda that awaits President-Elect Reagan, the feeling of some is ambivalence that he will be successful as other "recession and turmoil" presidents were, or another "fluke" as others were before him.

In all hopes, America's future can be rejuvenated by President Reagan's "New Beginning" campaign slogan and that it will be optimistic. His idea to cut the welfare program and increase education and defense may be an acute judgment on his part; it will make America more intelligent (which means more skills and more jobs, which also means that there will be fewer on the welfare program) and defense will make this country more secure again, and a super power in the world.

What I expect from President Reagan and his cabinet is a government that is strong enough to heal the problems of the black community, and to readjust the maladjusted valves of equality. It is felt solely and throughout the United States that Reagan's Administration will be a successful, auspicious [sic] term in which malignant [sic] problems will come to termination and other achievements will be finalized. In a final opinion. I believe that America and Reagan's "New Beginning" have only just begun.

## COMMUNICATION

### LOBBYIST LIST PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. The Chair acknowledges receipt of the lobbyist registration report from the Secretary of the Senate and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives which will become part of this record, the report being dated March 31, 1981.

The following report was read:

Senate of Pennsylvania  
March 31, 1981

To the Honorable, the Senate of the  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
To the Honorable, the House of Representatives  
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

In compliance with Act No. 712 of the 1961 Session and Act No. 212 of the 1976 Session of the General Assembly titled the "Lobbying Registration and Regulation Act," we herewith jointly present a list containing the names and addresses of the persons who have registered from February 1, 1981 to March 30, 1981 inclusive for the 165th Session of the General Assembly. This list also contains the names and addresses of the organizations represented by these registrants.

Respectfully submitted:  
W. Thomas Andrews  
Secretary of the Senate  
John J. Zubeck  
Chief Clerk  
House of Representatives

(For list, see Appendix.)

### COMMUNICATION FROM JOINT STATE GOVERNMENT COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. The Chair acknowledges receipt of a communication dated March 31, 1981, from the Joint State Government Commission concerning the Probate, Estates and Fiduciaries Code and amendments thereto.

The following communication was read:

General Assembly of the  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
Joint State  
Government Commission  
Room 108 - Finance Building  
Harrisburg 17120  
March 31, 1981

To the Honorable, the  
House of Representatives  
of the General Assembly of the  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

On behalf of the Joint State Government Commission, I have the honor to transmit herewith the publication Probate, Estates and Fiduciaries Code, Proposed Amendments and Comments—1981 and Proposed Revision of Inheritance Tax Laws and Codification of Chapter 17, Title 72 of Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes.

Copies of this publication for members of the House of Representatives have been placed in their post office boxes.

Respectfully submitted,  
William D. Hutchinson  
Chairman

(For report, see Appendix.)

### ADDITIONS AND DELETION OF SPONSORSHIPS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the record the additions and deletions of sponsors of bills.

#### ADDITIONS:

HB 200, Morris; HB 261, Anderson; HB 509, Sweet; HB 538, Wilt, Wambach, Pratt, Dombrowski, Boyes, Gruitza, Wozniak, Cordisco, Zwikl, Fee, Cappabianca, Kukovich, Manderino; HB 539, Wilt, Wambach, Pratt, Dombrowski, Boyes, Gruitza, Wozniak, Cordisco, Zwikl, Fee, Cappabianca, Kukovich, Manderino; HB 653, Morris; HB 990, Swaim, W. D. Hutchinson, Alden, Snyder; HB 1038, Marmion.

#### DELETION:

HB 691, J. L. Wright.

### 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 none.

### WELCOMES

The SPEAKER. The Chair welcomes to the floor of the House Bernard McAndrew and Charles Gasberetti of Locust Gap, Pennsylvania, here today as the guests of Mr. Belfanti.

The Chair is pleased to welcome to the floor of the House Patricia Hendricks from West Hempfield Township, Lancaster County, here today as the guest of Mr. Brandt and the Lancaster County delegation.

The Chair is further pleased to welcome to the floor of the House, here today as the guests of the distinguished Representative from Philadelphia, Mr. Barber, Mr. Jesse Patricks and his daughter Patricia.

The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House today Attorney Amil Minora and Attorney Carmen Minora of Scranton, Lackawanna County, here today as the guests of Messrs. Serafini and Belardi.

The Chair is pleased to welcome to the hall of the House Beth Cunnard, Cheryl Gulish, Jerry Rooney, and John Zahorsky from Ambridge High School, here today as the guests of Messrs. Colafella and Laughlin.

The Chair is pleased to welcome the brother-in-law and nephew of the minority whip, Mr. Manderino, Robert Pastor and his son Patrick, who are fresh from the NCAA finals in Philadelphia. The Pastors are from Valparaiso, Indiana.

The Chair at this time recognizes and welcomes to the hall of the House Mr. and Mrs. Donald Degenhardt, guests today of Mr. Dawida.

### ADJOURNMENT

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until Wednesday, April 1, 1981, at 11 a.m., e.s.t.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and at 4:22 p.m., e.s.t., the House adjourned.